

947th meeting

Friday, 6 December 1974, at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Per LIND (Sweden).

A/SPC/SR.947 and Corr.1

AGENDA ITEM 38

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (concluded) (A/9582, A/9613, A/9740, A/9789, A/9815 and Corr.1, A/SPC/172 and Corr.1, A/SPC/L.316, A/SPC/L.317, A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.319-322):

- (a) Report of the Commissioner-General;
- (b) Report of the Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East;
- (c) Report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine;
- (d) Report of the Secretary-General

1. The CHAIRMAN referred to the draft resolutions on the item under discussion (A/SPC/L.316, A/SPC/L.317, A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.319 and A/SPC/L.320) which were before the Committee and announced that Denmark had become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.316 and A/SPC/L.319 and that the German Democratic Republic, India, Indonesia, Mali, Uganda and Zambia had become sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.320.

2. Mr. HERNDL (Secretary of the Committee), speaking on behalf of the Secretary-General, made an additional statement to supplement the note by the Secretary-General (A/SPC/L.322) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1.

3. In accordance with the Secretary-General's interpretation, if draft resolution A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1 was adopted, the Financial Regulations of the United Nations would have to be applied in respect of the preparation, presentation, approval and administration of the budget for the expenses for salary costs of international staff in the service of UNRWA. Consequently, the funds for those salaries would in future be included in a separate section of the programme budget in which reference would also be made to the other expenses of UNRWA which would continue to be met by extra-budgetary funds and about which fuller information was provided in the report of the Commissioner-General (A/9613). The Secretary-General would submit to the General Assembly, through the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, his proposals for the programme budget concerning the international staff of UNRWA, and the funds which the General Assembly decided to allocate for that purpose would be assigned to the Commissioner-General who would administer them on behalf of the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General would submit the relevant accounts to the Board of Auditors for verification in accordance with article XII of the Financial Regulations. With regard to the rules contained in the Staff Rules applicable to the staff concerned, the Secretary-General intended to consider that

matter in 1975, in consultation with the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, and to report back to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session.

4. Mr. DORON (Israel), referring to draft resolution A/SPC/L.320, said that, as on a number of previous occasions, his delegation was obliged to point out the discrepancies between the real facts and the "facts" which were presented on paper. In operative paragraph 4 and the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution under consideration, it was alleged that Israel had attacked refugee camps. He reaffirmed that Israel's actions had been directed solely against bases and other installations of the terrorist organizations.

5. At the 943rd meeting of the Committee, he had quoted from the statement of the representative of Bahrain at the 2016th meeting of the First Committee, on 11 November 1974, a quotation which that representative had denied, saying that he had referred to Israeli attacks on refugee camps and not on commando camps and affirming that there was an error in the English version of the relevant verbatim record and that his delegation had already asked the Secretariat to make the appropriate correction. His own delegation had checked the tapes of the relevant meeting of the First Committee and he asked Mr. Aphek, a member of his delegation, to read out the relevant passages in Arabic.

6. Mr. APHEK (Israel) read out, in Arabic, the relevant passages taken from the tapes of the 943rd meeting of the Special Political Committee and the 2016th meeting of the First Committee. In that second passage, the representative of Bahrain had referred to the bombing of "commando camps" by Israel.

7. Mr. DORON (Israel) said that what had just been read out was a glaring example of the fact that some delegations seemed to think that "anything goes". In the current instance, an Arab delegation had made unjust accusations against an interpreter, had deliberately tried to falsify the official record of one of the Main Committees of the General Assembly, and had made false accusations in the Committee. On the strength of such distortions and similar machinations, an attempt was being made to make the Committee and the General Assembly vote on the draft resolution under consideration and on others.

8. While the Committee was considering various draft resolutions, the Arab terrorist organizations were continuing to attack Israeli civilians. Groups belonging to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) were killing Israeli civilians while the General Assembly listened to Yassir Arafat, the head of PLO; the most recent terrorist attack, against the collective farm at Rosh Ha'Nikra, had taken place at almost the same time as one of the representatives of PLO had been permitted to speak in the Committee.

9. He affirmed that no matter how many resolutions were adopted they would not prevent his country from doing everything necessary to protect and defend its citizens against Arab terrorist attacks.

10. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation, which was a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.320, wished to point out that the references made in that draft resolution to Israeli attacks against refugee camps were based on various passages of the report of the Commissioner-General, which had received the approval of those who had participated in the debate. Paragraph 24 of that report, for example, described the loss of life and material damage caused in refugee shelters and UNRWA installations by Israeli raids in May and June 1974. The United Nations should do everything it could to stop those attacks, which were not falsifications or a product of the imagination.

11. Mr. AL-SAYEGH (Kuwait) supported the observations made by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania and observed that the factual basis of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.320 was provided by the reports the Committee had received, including the reports of the Secretary-General on the implementation of previous resolutions. The wording of those paragraphs did not differ substantially from that of other resolutions. The same was true of paragraph 3. Paragraph 4 was based on various passages of the report of the Commissioner-General, which many delegations had commended. In addition to paragraph 24, mention was made in paragraph 64 of loss of life and material damage caused by Israeli raids on refugee camps.

12. He failed to understand how an attack which was not aimed at a refugee camp could destroy and damage installations and kill persons living in the camp. If the information provided in the report was reliable, it was an inescapable conclusion that Israel had attacked the refugee camps.

13. With reference to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, it had been said that the Israeli forces had adopted special measures to attack terrorists without attacking refugee camps; that was hard to believe. In support of his view, he drew attention to a series of press releases issued by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). On 9 October 1973, ICRC had reported that it had urged the belligerents to respect international rules in order to avert civilian casualties. In its press releases of 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17 October, ICRC had indicated that it had received satisfactory replies from Iraq, the Syrian Arab Republic, and Egypt. In its press release of 30 October, it had reported that a negative reply had been received from Israel with regard to the protection of civilians which ICRC had requested.

14. In that connexion, he drew attention to a publication produced by the Rabbinate of the Israeli army, in which the author of one article, Lieutenant-Colonel Avraham Avidara, the Rabbi of the Central Command, maintained that, in accordance with the Tosafot—interpretation and commentary on the Babylonian Talmud—the Israeli troops, when attacking an enemy, could—and even should, according to *halakhah*—kill innocent civilians.

15. He was not citing anti-Semitic sources but an Israeli army publication. Accordingly, all the objections that had been made with regard to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.320 appeared to be groundless. His delegation supported that draft resolution.

16. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the purpose of the meeting was to vote on the draft resolutions and that members who so wished could exercise their right of reply at the end of the meeting.

17. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) said that it was not Israel's intention to speak on the draft resolutions but to use the forum of the Committee to distort the facts. At the preceding meeting the Israeli representative had withdrawn when the observer for PLO had taken the floor. If that was the attitude it adopted in the Committee, one could readily imagine how Israel would treat the Palestinians in Israel. He reserved his right to speak again at the end of the meeting in exercise of the right of reply.

18. Mr. AL-SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1, said that he would support that draft resolution for two reasons. First, he believed that the operative part of the draft resolution represented a step in the right direction. The primary responsibility for the financing of UNRWA should be borne by those who were profiting from the use of the property of the Palestinians. Secondly, he considered it fair that, as the Commissioner-General had stated at the 941st meeting, the expenses for international staff should be charged to the regular budget of the United Nations and the funds thus released should be used to meet the most urgent needs of the local staff.

19. Referring to draft resolution A/SPC/L.317, submitted by the United States of America, which made repeated references to General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, he said that his delegation would support it on the understanding that it was something more than a mere formality and should be interpreted in the light of Count Bernadotte's report, and that, accordingly: repatriation was one of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian refugees; the exercise of that right was also an inalienable right; the concept of free choice involved being able to act in accordance with one's choice since, if that were not the case, there would be no free choice; in returning to their homes the Palestinians should do so with full citizenship rights; as an alternative to repatriation, Palestinians should be entitled to compensation and there should also be some form of compensation for those who did return in recognition of their right of ownership.

20. Mr. AL-ATTIYYAH (Iraq), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1 because it considered that those who had caused the refugee problem should bear the responsibility for financing the needs of UNRWA. Moreover, the fact that expenses for the salaries of international staff, which otherwise would be met by voluntary contributions, would be financed under the regular budget of the United Nations appeared to be a measure which discriminated between the local staff, the majority of whom were Palestinians, and the international staff. His delegation would have preferred funds to be

allocated to UNRWA to pay both the local staff and the international staff.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 133 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, he would put the draft resolutions to the vote in the order in which they had been submitted. He also drew the Committee's attention to the notes by the Secretary-General (A/SPC/L.321 and A/SPC/L.322) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.316 and A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1, respectively.

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.316

The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.317

The draft resolution was adopted by 106 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1

22. Mr. PONGO MAVULU (Zaire) requested a vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1.

23. Mr. TELLMANN (Norway), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, recalled that he had already stated that, in their view, the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote if it was to achieve its purpose. Moreover, as a result of the consultations that had been held, the sponsors had had the impression that all the members of the Committee were agreed that that should be the procedure. Accordingly, he appealed to the representative of Zaire to withdraw his request since, if he insisted that the draft resolution be put to a vote, the sponsors would have to withdraw it.

24. Mr. PONGO MAVULU (Zaire) said that he would not insist on his proposal, but would explain his position after the draft resolution had been put to the vote.

25. Mr. TELLMANN (Norway) thanked the representative of Zaire for his spirit of co-operation.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

It was so decided.

The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.319

The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.320

27. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania and Egypt had requested a roll-call vote.

28. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, if the Committee was prepared to adopt the draft resolution, he would not insist on a roll-call vote.

29. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) felt that it would be appropriate for the Chairman to ask the Committee whether it was prepared to adopt draft resolution A/SPC/L.320 without a vote.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that he had not raised that point because two delegations had requested a roll-call vote. However, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

31. Mr. DORON (Israel) requested a roll-call vote.

At the request of the representative of Israel, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/SPC/L.320.

The Dominican Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark.

Against: Israel, Nicaragua, United States of America, Bolivia, Costa Rica.

Abstaining: El Salvador, Germany (Federal Republic of), Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Belgium, Canada, Chile.

The draft resolution was adopted by 97 votes to 5, with 15 abstentions.

32. Mr. MELHUIISH (Australia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.320, but, while it did not question the information provided by the Commissioner-General of UNRWA concerning the casualties resulting from the Israeli attacks on Palestinian refugee camps, it felt that the Commissioner-General was not required to report all the details, especially the circumstances in which the attacks had been launched or in which there had been tragic losses of civilian lives. In any event, it was regrettable—although perhaps inevitable—that the draft resolution reflected only a partial view of the situation.

33. Mr. LECLERCQ (France), speaking in explanation of his vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1, said that his delegation had joined the consensus in order to help UNRWA to overcome its financial difficulties. However, it considered the system of voluntary contributions to be an equitable one, and found it regrettable that the salaries of the UNRWA staff would be financed under the regular budget of the United Nations, since that might give rise to problems in the future. It therefore reiterated its reservations about the advisability of that practice, which it regarded as contrary to the system of voluntary contributions.

34. Mr. DORON (Israel) explained that his delegation had not requested a vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1, although it entertained reservations about it since it felt that the budgets of UNRWA and the United Nations should be kept separate.

35. Mr. COTTON (New Zealand) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.320, although it had reservations about the references in the text to attacks against refugee camps. If a separate vote had been taken on the last preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 4, his delegation would have abstained because, while those paragraphs contained references to attacks against refugee camps, no mention was made of terrorist attacks against Israeli villages.

36. Mr. RENS (Belgium) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.320 because, in its view, the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4 made the text unbalanced.

37. Moreover, he had on another occasion already expressed regret at the haste with which members of the Committee had been requested to decide on the various texts. He noted that draft resolution A/SPC/L.320 had been distributed on 4 December, so that there had not been sufficient time to study it thoroughly, submit amendments or consult other delegations. His delegation's abstention did not imply a lack of interest in the activities of UNRWA, as was shown by the fact that it had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.316 and A/SPC/L.317, and also by Belgium's contribution to UNRWA. However, the vote reflected a political compromise which required careful consideration. He therefore felt that, if the Committee continued to adopt such a procedure, the results obtained would be meaningless.

38. Mr. BOERTIEN (Netherlands), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that his delegation had been pleased to be able to vote in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.316, A/SPC/L.317, A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1 and A/SPC/L.319. Concerning draft resolution A/SPC/L.320, his delegation wished to point out that it had always opposed all acts of violence against innocent persons and that that applied to acts committed against the refugee camps as well as to those which originated in them. That balanced criterion was not reflected in the draft resolution in question, and accordingly, his delegation had not been able to vote in favour of it.

39. Mr. VANDERGERT (Sri Lanka), speaking in explanation of his delegation's vote on draft resolution A/SPC/

L.317, said that its affirmative vote on it by no means implied that it agreed that the problem should be dealt with as basically a refugee problem. Although in principle the Palestine refugees should be considered to have the right to return to their homes, the practical circumstances might make it impossible for those wishes to be fulfilled.

40. Paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) laid down two conditions for the return of the refugees to their homes: they must wish to return and they must be prepared to live in peace with their neighbours. In accordance with its declared policy of support for Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which accepted the principle that every State in the Middle East had the right to live within secure boundaries, his delegation felt that there must be no attempt to destroy the State of Israel, and it had clearly expressed that position in its statement on the question of Palestine at the 2295th plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

41. Mr. BUSSE (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that his delegation's positive attitude towards the work of UNRWA was reflected in its co-sponsorship of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.316 and A/SPC/L.319. His Government had staunchly supported the work of that Agency and expected to continue to do so. His delegation felt that draft resolution A/SPC/L.320 lacked balance, since it deplored Israeli military activities but did not mention the acts of violence by Palestinians which were organized in and carried out from the territories in which UNRWA operated.

42. Mr. SCHAUFLELE (United States of America), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that his delegation had been pleased to join the unanimous expression in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1 and understood that its adoption was in accordance with the wishes of the Commissioner-General and that the funds released as a result of that resolution would be used to improve the remunerations of the local staff. The support of his delegation for that transfer for specific purposes should not be interpreted as endorsing further transfers of other elements of the UNRWA budget to the regular budget of the United Nations.

43. His delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/L.320, since that text did not preserve the careful balance of Security Council resolution 347 (1974), from which part of operative paragraph 4 of the draft in question had been taken and which had condemned all acts of violence, including attacks on refugee camps and raids against Israel. In order to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, acts of violence on both sides must be ended. His country would continue to give its full support to the right of the persons displaced in 1967 to return to their homes.

44. Mr. TALLARIGO (Italy), speaking in explanation of his vote, said his delegation felt that it would be inappropriate to speak at length on the Middle East crisis—on which its position had been clearly set out in the debate in the General Assembly on the question of Palestine—and that the item which the Committee was considering was confined to UNRWA and the situation of the refugees who received assistance from it.

45. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/L.320, his delegation felt particular concern about the two paragraphs which differed from previous resolutions of the same kind and related to air raids on refugee camps in Lebanon. While it deplored those raids, it wished to place on record the fact that it held the same attitude towards other forms of violence, such as those which guerrilla forces carried out against innocent civilians in Israeli territory.

46. Mr. PONGO MAVULU (Zaire), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that his delegation had associated itself with the consensus in the Committee but wished to point out that continued efforts should be made to eliminate the causes of the refugee problem, for which the international community was responsible and whose definitive solution called for a solution of the underlying political problem.

47. Mr. GUTIERREZ MACIAS (Mexico), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that, although his delegation had not wanted to impede the unanimity on draft resolution A/SPC/L.318/Rev.1, it wished to place on record its reservations regarding the change in the system of financing, which had budgetary implications of some importance.

48. Mr. BATTISCOMBE (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.320 because it felt that the draft resolution was one-sided and unbalanced. His delegation deplored all acts of violence, not only those committed by Israel, which alone were mentioned in the draft.

49. Mr. CHAVES (Grenada), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that in associating itself with the unanimous feeling in the Committee, his delegation was following his Government's policy of supporting assistance for the victims of war and violence. It reaffirmed the Grenadian position stated in the General Assembly on the question of Palestine and favoured a peaceful solution of the problem.

50. Mr. DORON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Kuwait was trying to appear more innocent than he actually was. The terrorist bases were situated in refugee camps in Lebanon and it was Lebanon that had the means of avoiding attacks against the inhabitants of the camps by expelling terrorists from them.

51. Israel had decided not to adopt the cynical attitude taken by the three Arab countries in declaring that they accepted the appeal by ICRC and yet continuing to allow terrorist attacks.

52. He did not feel that there was any need to discuss rabbinical matters, and he recalled that the Egyptian authorities had issued orders in writing to the effect that Israelis should not be taken prisoner but should be killed even if they were willing to surrender.

53. Mr. AL-SHAKAR (Bahrain), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Israeli allegations concerning the statements made by the representative of Bahrain in the First Committee showed how Zionism tried to misrepresent the facts. The representative of Bahrain in the First Committee had referred to the Israeli aggression of

1967, in which napalm bombs had been used against refugee camps, not commando camps. There had been a mistake in the English text of the verbatim record, and his delegation had already requested the Secretariat to make the necessary corrections.

54. The important question was whether the Zionists intended to deny that they had used napalm bombs against refugee camps in the 1967 aggression or to claim that they had used such bombs to attack Palestinian commandos.

55. It was nothing new for Israel to falsify the words and statements spoken in the United Nations in order to manipulate them for its own interests. Israel had extensive experience in such manoeuvres, just as it had experience in attacking peaceful Palestinian refugee camps with napalm bombs. Proof was to be found in hundreds of photographs showing the crimes committed by Israel and the slaughter of old people, children and women in those camps. That was the truth, and the attempts of the representative of Israel to juggle words to falsify what the representative of Bahrain had said were intended only to mislead the Committee.

56. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolutions which exposed to public opinion the tragedy of the Palestinian refugees. The problem of the Palestinian refugees had arisen primarily because of the Zionists. It was the Zionists who had organized a demonstration opposite the United Nations Headquarters building and had burned a United Nations flag in front of Dayan, as if the United Nations had absolutely no meaning for them. History had shown that unbridled power always disregarded justice. Nazism's lust for power had been the cause of the disintegration of the League of Nations, and now Israel was threatening the very existence of the United Nations by refusing to implement its resolutions.

57. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the draft resolutions adopted that day were eloquent proof of world opinion. When Israel spoke of responsibility, it should remember that the Palestinians were refugees because of Israel. All Palestinians should return to their homes pursuant to the resolutions adopted by the United Nations, and he assured Israel that, when those resolutions were implemented and the Palestinians returned to their homeland, they would do so without arms and with an olive branch.

58. Mr. AL-SAYEGH (Kuwait) said that he wished to make three comments because he did not understand exactly what Israel's position was. Firstly, it had begun by denying the truth of what was stated in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.320 and had ended by admitting that the attacks had taken place and trying to explain them. Secondly, it had affirmed that the Arab States that had responded positively to ICRC had done so cynically. Perhaps neither Israel's interpretation of the matter nor his own was important, but it was important that ICRC had stated that the response of the Arab countries had been positive and that of Israel negative. Thirdly, Israel had expressed an unwillingness to go into interpretations of rabbinical writings; but he had referred not to theological texts but to a statement by the Rabbi of

the Central Command, who was a lieutenant-colonel in the Israeli Army.

59. Mr. DORON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he did not want the representative of Kuwait to misrepresent his words. He explained that Israel did not attack refugee camps. Israel took action against terrorist bases situated within, or in the immediate vicinity of, refugee camps; the responsibility for such action lay with those who allowed terrorists to establish themselves there. Replying to the representative of Bahrain, he said that he would like the Committee to hear the voice of the representative of Bahrain making his statement at the 2016th meeting of the First Committee held on 11 November 1974. He would therefore proceed to play the official recording of that meeting.

60. Mr. SAHAD (Libyan Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, said that the Special Political Committee should not be made into a theatre for reproducing the debates of other committees of the General Assembly. If reference had to be made to what had happened in other forums of the United Nations, the Committee could do so by referring to the documents. The Special Political Committee was not a court, and neither it nor any other committee of the General Assembly should violate the rules of the Organization. In opposing the play-back of the official recording of the 2016th meeting of the First Committee, he was defending the standards of United Nations procedure established by the General Assembly.

61. Mr. AL-SHAKAR (Bahrain), speaking on a point of order, associated himself with the statement made by the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic and said that he could not accept the manoeuvre being attempted by Israel, which was not in accordance with normal procedures.

62. Mr. DORON (Israel) said that the representatives of the Libyan Arab Republic and Bahrain had good reason for not wishing to listen to the truth. The Committee had the opportunity to listen to the official recording of the statement made by the representative of Bahrain in the First Committee. Bahrain could not lie and blame the words on others. Talk of "theatre" was inappropriate from the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic, who was trying to convert the Special Political Committee into a children's theatre. The question whether or not Israel had the right to play the official recording of the statement made by the representative of Bahrain in the First Committee was a matter for the Chairman to decide.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that, in his opinion, the Committee should not listen to any recording because that would create a dangerous precedent.

64. Mr. DORON (Israel) said that he accepted the Chairman's decision, which would prevent certain Arab representatives from finding themselves in an embarrassing situation.

65. Mr. SAHAD (Libyan Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, said that the Chairman had already taken a decision and that there was no need to keep referring to the matter.

66. Mr. DORON (Israel) said that he accepted the Chairman's decision but felt that it was not incorrect to refer to United Nations documents. Accordingly, he would yield to another member of his delegation, who would read out in Arabic the verbatim record [provisional version, p. 111, third paragraph] of the 2016th meeting of the First Committee.

67. Mr. APHEK (Israel) read out the Arabic text of part of the statement of the representative of Bahrain at the 2016th meeting of the First Committee.

68. Mr. EL-HENDAWY (Egypt), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation had never resorted to unknown documents published years before but had always quoted United Nations documents relating to the item under discussion.

69. At a previous meeting of the Committee he had already refuted the lies of the representative regarding the number of refugees returning to . . . Nevertheless, during the current meeting, Israel lied in referring to a 1973 communiqué of the Egyptian command. He (the representative of Egypt) did not see that the communiqué had any relation to the murder of innocent refugees. In any case, he did not think it necessary to refute that accusation, as it was sufficient to read the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA.

70. He pointed out that the representative of Kuwait had already replied to the allegations of the representative of Israel regarding the documents of ICRC. It should be borne in mind, as had already been mentioned, that the Committee was examining the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA.

71. Mr. AL-SHAKAR (Bahrain), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he did not wish to engage in futile discussions with the representative of Israel but asked the secretariat to read the Arabic text of the verbatim record of the 2016th meeting of the First Committee, which was an official document of the United Nations.

72. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) remarked that the question of the commando or refugee camps had made the representative of Israel very nervous. It was worth recalling that, years before, Ben-Gurion had stated that Israel had no right whatsoever to bereave any Arab child, even if that would benefit Israel. On another occasion, he had said that if he had been an Arab, he too might have become one of the fedayeen. General Dayan had apparently expressed a similar opinion several years later.

73. Mr. DORON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the whole question could have been settled by listening to the recording. He would therefore limit himself to explaining for the benefit of the representative of Egypt that he had spoken not of a communiqué but of a pamphlet published in October 1973.

74. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan) said that more than 1.5 million Palestine refugees had been denied all their rights. In his opinion, the debate on the question of Palestine had been based on certain objective facts: for example, the rights of the Palestinian refugees. Jordan, as a country that had

accepted many refugees, was glad that the Special Political Committee had done something towards mitigating the suffering of the Palestinians. He therefore thanked the sponsors of the draft resolutions.

75. Sir John RENNIE (Commissioner-General, United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East) thanked all the delegations that had commended the Agency's work. He then proceeded to explain UNRWA's financial prospects for 1975 after the meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the General Assembly for the Announcement of Voluntary Contributions to UNRWA. Forty-six Governments had made pledges for a total of \$56.4 million. To that amount should be added the contributions of the European Economic Community, of some Governments which might contribute although they had not taken part in the pledging conference, of other United Nations agencies and of non-governmental organizations. There would also be some miscellaneous income. In spite of all that, a deficit of about \$40 million was still expected. In other words, UNRWA's financial situation was still most alarming, and all that he had said in his introductory statement at the 941st meeting of the Committee was still valid. For example, stocks of flour on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip would be exhausted at the end of February, and those in Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan at the end of March, if the normal winter ration of flour was maintained at its current level. A decision must therefore be taken very soon whether to purchase more flour or to reduce the ration at the beginning of the year. However, if there were not sufficient funds to maintain the programmes, the purchase of more flour would involve bigger cuts in other programmes in due course.

76. For all those reasons, he appealed again to the international community, as a matter of urgency, for a concerted effort to avoid the disastrous consequences of a breakdown in UNRWA's programmes.

Completion of the Committee's work

77. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its work on the 6 items allocated to it and had recommended 14 draft resolutions and 1 decision to the General Assembly.

78. Although the items which had been considered could in a sense be regarded as permanent, there was no doubt that the circumstances in which they had been considered during the current session had differed in various ways from previous years, and the Committee had consequently had to modify its approach.

79. Of all the Main Committees, the Special Political Committee was allocated the smallest number of items and held the fewest meetings. He believed that its potential should be more fully utilized at subsequent sessions of the General Assembly. In that respect, he recalled the relevant recommendations of the Special Committee on the Ration-

alization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly contained in annex V to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, particularly paragraphs 25 and 30 concerning the rational distribution of agenda items among the Main Committees and the utilization of the potential of those committees to the full. Moreover, with regard to the Special Political Committee in particular, the Special Committee on the Rationalization, reaffirming the major role which must be played by the Special Political Committee, had recommended that the General Assembly should consider transferring one or two items to it with a view to ensuring a better division of work among the Main Committees.¹

80. He recalled, in particular, paragraph 27 of the memorandum "Organization of the twenty-ninth regular session of the General Assembly, adoption of the agenda and allocation of items",² in which the Secretary-General had quoted the Special Committee's aforementioned recommendation and had suggested that the General Committee should consider recommending to the General Assembly the transfer of one or more items to the Special Political Committee. Regrettably, that suggestion of the Secretary-General had not generated specific proposals from any quarter and therefore the General Committee merely took note of the Secretary-General's recommendation.

81. In the Chairman's opinion, it would undoubtedly be in the interest of the General Assembly if the workload of the Main Committees were more evenly distributed. There was a certain imbalance between the items allocated to the First Committee and the Special Political Committee, an imbalance more marked at the current session than ever before. Accordingly, thought should be given to the idea of transferring to the Special Political Committee items of a political nature discussed by the General Assembly in plenary meeting and/or political items of a specialized nature discussed by the First Committee, such as outer space, or even items with a predominantly political character discussed in other Main Committees, such as, for example, items concerning the review of the Charter. The Special Political Committee certainly had the capacity to deal with one or two such items in addition to those traditionally allocated to it.

82. He hoped that members of the Committee would ponder the matter and that at future sessions efforts would be made to allocate the workload more evenly among the Committees, thus permitting the Special Political Committee to fulfil its role more fully in facilitating the work of the Assembly as a whole.

After an exchange of courtesies, the Chairman declared that the Special Political Committee had completed its work for the twenty-ninth session.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

¹ A/520/Rev.12, annex V, para. 34.

² A/BUR/182.