



General Assembly

Seventy-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
11 February 2020

Original: English

Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee)

Summary record of the 25th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 15 November 2019, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Bahr Aluloom (Iraq)

Contents

Agenda item 50: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (*continued*)Agenda item 51: Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories (*continued*)Agenda item 121: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Completion of the Committee's work

This record is subject to correction.Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>)

19-19784 (E)



Please recycle A small graphic of a recycling symbol, consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda item 50: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

(continued) (A/C.4/74/L.10, A/C.4/74/L.11, A/C.4/74/L.12 and A/C.4/74/L.13)

Agenda item 51: Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories (continued) (A/C.4/74/L.14, A/C.4/74/L.15, A/C.4/74/L.16 and A/C.4/74/L.17)

1. **Mr. Koba** (Indonesia), introducing the four draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 50 (A/C.4/74/L.10, A/C.4/74/L.11, A/C.4/74/L.12 and A/C.4/74/L.13), said that they were based on those adopted the previous year, with updates reflecting the situation of the Palestine refugees and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), including the ongoing severe shortages in funding that had continued to jeopardize the Agency's operations. The international community recognized the Agency's vital role in fostering regional stability and its contribution towards the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. Further efforts were urgently needed to support the renewal of the Agency's mandate and secure sufficient, predictable and sustainable funding for the duration of that mandate. All delegations were urged to support the efforts in that regard, in line with longstanding commitments and responsibilities and as a critical reaffirmation of solidarity with the Palestine refugees until a just solution for their plight was realized on the basis of General Assembly resolution 194 (III).

2. In draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.10, the General Assembly would decide to extend the mandate of UNRWA until 30 June 2023, without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III). In draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.12, reference was made to the establishment in March 2019 of a waqf fund at the Islamic Development Bank to support Palestine refugees through enhanced support to the Agency.

3. **Ms. Rodríguez Abascal** (Cuba), introducing draft resolutions A/C.4/74/L.16 and A/C.4/74/L.17 submitted under agenda item 51, said that they focused on the grave and systematic violations of international law, particularly humanitarian and human rights law, committed by Israel, the occupying Power, in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan. Those violations had been well documented by various United Nations bodies and human rights organizations. Unfortunately, the

human rights and protection crises had intensified. The violence and destruction of the previous days underscored the volatility of the situation and the suffering inflicted on millions of innocent civilians. The occupying Power had continued to implement its illegal settlement campaign, threatening the contiguity of Palestinian lands and the viability of the two-State solution. It was therefore urgent for the international community to take action in accordance with international law, including the resolutions of the United Nations. In the draft resolutions, Israel was called upon to comply with its legal obligations, and the international community to uphold respect for international law.

4. **Mr. Gertze** (Namibia), introducing draft resolutions A/C.4/74/L.14 and A/C.4/74/L.15, said that Israel must comply with the Charter of the United Nations, the Fourth Geneva Convention and the relevant human rights instruments and resolutions of the United Nations. All human rights violations must come to an end, and immediate efforts should be made to prevent the situation from deteriorating. Such efforts should include the consideration of measures to ensure accountability for continuing violations. Serious efforts were also needed in order to arrive at a just, comprehensive and lasting peace.

5. The text of draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.14 had been streamlined in order to focus on the core parameters of the mandate of the Special Committee and strengthen support for the Committee's work. The text of draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.15 had been merged with key provisions from the resolution adopted at previous sessions concerning applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, to the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the other occupied Arab territories.

6. **Mr. Bourgel** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the confusing and redundant text of the draft resolutions was intended solely to entrench a Manichean outlook in which the Palestinians were always in the right and Israel was always in the wrong. There were two sides to the story; the aspirations and concerns of Israel also deserved to be heard. For instance, the draft resolutions referred to the Haram al-Sharif complex, but the very idea that the term "Temple Mount" might be included appeared virtually inconceivable. That very week, Israel had come under constant rocket fire from Gaza; yet no reference was made to the terrorist organizations Hamas and Islamic Jihad. The mandate of UNRWA was to be renewed automatically, without the slightest request for assurances from an Agency that had recently been shaken by an unprecedented scandal.

7. The draft resolutions were far from promoting peace and security. Instead, they indulged the Palestinians' intransigence and their maximalist position. In so doing, they confirmed the view in Israel that the Committee was incapable of playing a constructive role in achieving peace. Moreover, they played into the hands of tyrannical regimes such as those of Damascus and Tehran, which lost no opportunity to pose as defenders of the Palestinians while shamelessly violating their own citizens' most fundamental rights.

8. **Ms. Norman-Chalet** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her Government continued to oppose the annual submission of more than a dozen draft resolutions biased against Israel. Such a one-sided approach damaged the prospects for peace by undermining trust between parties. It was disappointing that, despite the support for reform, Member States continued to single out Israel. The draft resolutions were quick to condemn Israeli actions, but said almost nothing regarding terrorist attacks against innocent civilians. Moreover, Israel was blamed for the situation in Gaza, while there was no mention of Hamas or of any armed groups in Gaza. That very week, Palestinian Islamic Jihad in Gaza had fired barrages of rockets at Israeli civilians. It was shameful that those acts of terrorism were not condemned in any of the draft resolutions.

9. Her delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolutions and encouraged other nations to do the same. That position applied also to draft resolution [A/C.4/74/L.10](#), by which the mandate of UNRWA would be extended. The United States Government no longer provided financial contributions to UNRWA because the Agency's fundamental model and fiscal practices were simply unsustainable. Palestinians deserved better than a crisis-driven provision model that routinely imperilled the services that UNRWA sought to provide, and the United Nations could not expect the international community to fund a model based on an endlessly expanding number of beneficiaries. Moreover, given the preliminary findings of the investigation conducted by the Office of Internal Oversight Services, it was disappointing that members of the Committee were not taking a more discerning approach to the Agency. During the interactive dialogue with the acting Commissioner-General, donors to UNRWA had had an opportunity to raise concerns and engage openly, but only three had asked questions. Irrespective of the very political aspects of UNRWA, all Member States should press for full accountability for any malfeasance, increased transparency, and credible assurances that effective measures were in place to prevent waste, fraud and abuse in future. The United States remained ready

to engage with other stakeholders regarding plans to transfer some services to host Governments or to other international or local non-governmental organizations, as appropriate, in order better to provide Palestinians with a more durable and dependable path towards a brighter future. Failing such steps, the United States stood prepared to engage with all Member States to ensure that any management practices or alleged misconduct that were currently under investigation would not be repeated.

10. The United States remained firmly and consistently committed to achieving a comprehensive and lasting peace agreement between Israelis and Palestinians. Resolutions such as those that would be passed that day served as a distraction from that process. Progress towards peace could begin only once the bias of the United Nations against Israel ended. Her delegation would continue to oppose every effort to delegitimize Israel and hoped that other Member States would join the United States in voting against the draft resolutions.

11. The Chair said that said that recorded votes had been requested on the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 50, which had no budget implications.

Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.10: Assistance to Palestine refugees

12. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Angola, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

13. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea,

Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Canada, Guatemala, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Vanuatu.

14. *Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.10 was adopted by 170 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.11: Persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities

15. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Guinea, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritania, Namibia, Nicaragua, Qatar, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan and Suriname had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

16. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Togo, Vanuatu.

17. *Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.11 was adopted by 162 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.12: Operations of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

18. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

19. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic,

Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Guatemala, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Vanuatu.

20. *Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.12 was adopted by 167 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.13: Palestine refugees' properties and their revenues

21. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

22. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan,

Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Guatemala, Honduras, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Togo, Vanuatu.

23. Draft resolution [A/C.4/74/L.13](#) was adopted by 163 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.

Draft resolution [A/C.4/74/L.14](#): Work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories

24. **The Chair** said that recorded votes had been requested on the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 51, which had no budget implications.

25. **Ms. Rikalainen** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting, said that while the European Union member States would follow a coordinated voting pattern on the draft resolutions introduced under agenda item 51, the European Union as a whole had not adopted a legal definition of the term "forced displacement", which was used in some of the draft resolutions. Furthermore, the use of the term "Palestine" could not be construed as recognition of a State of Palestine and was without

prejudice to the individual positions of member States on the issue and, therefore, to the question of the validity of the accession of Palestine to the international instruments referred to in the draft resolutions. The European Union welcomed the efforts of the Palestinian Mission to streamline the draft resolutions and encouraged it to continue such efforts in the future.

26. With respect to the holy sites in Jerusalem, the European Union was concerned at the troubling developments and recurrent violent clashes at the Temple Mount/Haram al-Sharif. Recalling the special significance of the holy sites, the European Union called for the status quo of the Temple Mount/Haram al-Sharif established in 1967 to be upheld, in line with previous understandings and acknowledging the special role of Jordan. The position of the European Union with respect to the draft resolutions did not imply a change in its stance on the terminology concerning the Temple Mount/Haram al-Sharif.

27. The European Union welcomed the addition of wording reaffirming the special significance of the holy sites and the importance of the city of Jerusalem for the three monotheistic religions. However, the fact that changes had been made less than 24 hours before the vote was unfortunate from the standpoint of procedure and created unnecessary ambiguity. The European Union understood the wording referring to the holy sites of Jerusalem as reflecting the importance and historical significance of both the city of Jerusalem and the holy sites for the three monotheistic religions. It understood the word "obligation" as referring to the importance of respecting the historic status quo. It was important for wording used in reference to the holy sites to take account of religious and cultural sensitivities; the future choice of language used in draft resolutions might affect the collective support of the European Union for the draft resolutions according to the established voting pattern.

28. **Mr. de Souza Monteiro** (Brazil), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that Brazil maintained its principled position concerning the illegal Israeli settlements to which reference was made in draft resolution [A/C.4/74/L.15](#). It supported a two-State solution to the conflict and regretted the constant expansion of settlements, a practice that was contrary to the resolutions of the Security Council and other international norms, and that created an obstacle to the peace process and to social and economic development. Nevertheless, his delegation was not in a position to support the draft resolution in its current form and would therefore abstain.

29. His delegation believed that the number of draft resolutions concerning the Palestinian issue and the

occupied Syrian Golan that were considered by the General Assembly and by the Second, Third and Fourth Committees should be streamlined. In particular, with a view to reducing the number of draft resolutions before the Fourth Committee, the texts of the draft resolutions concerning illegal settlements should be merged with those of other draft resolutions.

30. With regard to the occupied Syrian Golan, Brazil wished to reaffirm its unequivocal understanding that acquisition of territory by force was inadmissible under international law. In the Charter of the United Nations, Article 2, paragraph 4, it was stated that all Members should refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any State. Moreover, Brazil understood that the Fourth Geneva Convention was fully applicable to the situation in the occupied Syrian Golan. His delegation encouraged the parties to seek a constructive political environment conducive to the return of meaningful negotiations. Nevertheless, it considered that the relevant draft resolution in its current form was unbalanced, as it drew attention exclusively to the actions of Israel in the occupied Syrian Golan, and failed to address all dimensions of the situation.

31. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan and United Arab Emirates had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

32. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Gabon, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Trinidad and

Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.14 was adopted by 82 votes to 11, with 78 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.15: Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan

34. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Nicaragua, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

35. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, South Sudan, Togo, Vanuatu.

36. Draft resolution *A/C.4/74/L.15* was adopted by 156 votes to 6, with 15 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.16: Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem

37. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritania, Namibia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa and Sudan had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

38. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Guatemala, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Namibia, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Belarus, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Haiti, Honduras, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, South Sudan, Togo, Vanuatu.

39. *Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.16 was adopted by 154 votes to 8, with 14 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.17: The occupied Syrian Golan

40. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Namibia, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa and Sudan had joined the sponsors.

41. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.17.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore,

Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, South Sudan, Togo, Vanuatu.

42. *Draft resolution A/C.4/74/L.17 was adopted by 155 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions.*

43. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, at more than 50 sessions of the General Assembly, an overwhelming majority of Member States had voted in favour of draft resolutions concerning the Israeli occupation of Arab territories, including the Golan, and calling for Israel, the occupying Power, to bring an end to the occupation and desist from its violations of international law, international humanitarian law, the Charter of the United Nations and the Fourth Geneva Convention. The Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory and of the Syrian Golan was not a matter subject to Israeli whims but rather a legal matter that United Nations diplomats handled as such.

44. The United States of America had been a major partner in Israeli aggression and had for decades prevented the Security Council from holding Israel accountable. The United States vote made it clear to all that that country had never been neutral and was not qualified to play the role of Middle East peace broker that it had arrogated to itself. As a great Power, a permanent member of the Security Council and host country of United Nations Headquarters, it behoved the United States to form an international coalition to achieve peace, end the Israeli occupation and restore occupied Arab territories to their rightful owners instead of forging an illegal alliance with sponsors of terrorism, perpetrating aggression, entrenching occupation and stealing Syrian oil.

45. An overwhelming majority of States recognized that the occupied Syrian Golan was Syrian territory. It would be restored to Syria by any means necessary, whether Israel liked it or not. By refusing to return the

Syrian Golan to its people and Government, Israel was opening the door to the military option.

46. **Mr. Sahraei** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that said that the adoption of all resolutions under agenda items 50 and 51 by an overwhelming majority was indicative of the widespread support among Committee members for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and for holding the occupying Israeli regime accountable for its crimes against Palestinians, in particular, women and children. Over the previous seven decades, the question of Palestine had been the core issue facing the Middle East and had directly or indirectly affected the other problems in the region. The continuing occupation of Palestinian and other Arab territories, acts of aggression and unabated atrocities lay at the heart of the question. The killing of innocent children, women and elderly people, including in Gaza, had shocked the world; and they were merely one example of the suffering of the Palestinian people over the previous decades. It was therefore absurd for the Israeli regime to use empty rhetoric against other countries as a smokescreen for its crimes.

47. Since the tragedy of Palestine had occurred, various concerned countries, the United Nations and other organizations had taken numerous initiatives to address the crisis and mitigate the plight of the Palestinian people. Resolutions had been adopted condemning the Israeli regime, various plans for peace had been proposed, and fact-finding missions had been established. However, support for the Israeli regime on the part of certain powers had prevented the international community from finding a just solution to the crisis.

48. Only by ending the Israeli occupation, restoring the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, facilitating the return of Palestine refugees to their homeland and establishing an independent and viable State of Palestine with Jerusalem as its capital would it be possible to bring decades of conflict and instability in the Middle East to an end and establish a durable peace.

49. **Mr. Mansour** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that, although 15 November was the national day of the State of Palestine, his people was mourning 34 civilians, including eight children, who had been slaughtered in a barbaric act of aggression committed by the Israeli occupying authority in the Gaza Strip. The State of Palestine condemned the attack in the strongest possible terms, demanded that such actions come to an immediate end, and urged the international community and, in particular, the Security Council, to ensure that those responsible were brought to justice.

50. Draft resolution [A/C.4/74/L.10](#) had received 170 votes in favour, an unprecedented number; only two delegations had voted against it. His delegation was grateful that despite bullying, blackmail and pressure, Member States had decided to extend the mandate of UNRWA pending a just solution to the question of Palestine refugees on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. The adoption of the draft resolution sent a powerful signal that the international community would not abandon UNRWA, which had proved to be one of the outstanding success stories of the United Nations. The State of Palestine was grateful to the 30,000 staff members of UNRWA and, in particular, to its outgoing Commissioner-General, Pierre Krähenbühl, who had been targeted by certain parties owing to his principled defence of the Agency's mandate and of Palestine refugees. It expressed its gratitude to all delegations whose participation in the current session had sent a message that the human rights of the Palestinian people could not be ignored, that those who had violated international law must be held accountable, that the occupation must end, and that an independent State of Palestine must be established with East Jerusalem as its capital.

Agenda item 121: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.4/74/L.9)

Draft decision A/C.4/74/L.9: Proposed programme of work and timetable of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) for the seventy-fifth session of the General Assembly

51. **The Chair** said that the programme of work would be revisited by the Bureau of the seventy-fifth session and changes would be made if necessary. He took it that the Committee wished to adopt draft decision [A/C.4/74/L.9](#) without a vote.

52. *It was so decided.*

53. *Draft decision A/C.4/74/L.9 was adopted.*

Completion of the Committee's work

54. **The Chair**, after presenting an overview of the activities of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee), said that the Committee had completed its work for the main part of the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.