

Statement of the Bangladesh delegation on the reports of the Special Rapporteurs on their Mission to Lebanon and Israel, 4 October 2006

Mr. President,

1 I thank the Special Rapporteurs for their reports. We ^{would not hide our} ~~are~~ disappointed ^{at} the observations and recommendations of the team of Special Rapporteurs. ~~On the contrary,~~ We appreciate the report of the Special Rapporteur on right to food for his objective and ^{would not form any comment} ~~bold~~ remarks. ~~The findings and recommendations are in sharp contrast in two reports. While~~ The Special Rapporteur remain consistent with his mandate, the team of Rapporteurs went beyond their territories particularly on their recommendations. Mr. Zeigler's recommendations suggest measures targeted at recovery and reconstruction, and solutions to protect the right to food of the Lebanese people. In the other hand, in the recommendation of the team one would hardly see references to housing, health or internal displacement which are there mandates. ~~We will not be in a position to give any credit to it until the report of the International Inquiry Commission is available.~~

→ The report of the team did not serve the purpose of the Lebanese people who have suffered from a month long Israeli brutal onslaught. We all saw even in the western media the atrocities committed. If the statement of the High Commissioner for Human Rights or the UN Under Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs are taken into consideration, then the report did a great disservice to the hundreds of civilians killed by Israeli attacks, thousands of injured, millions of homeless in Lebanon.

5 The team of Rapporteurs does indicated that they had tried to bring in a comparative picture of the impact of the war on both side. ~~The notion of so-called balanced approach is espoused by certain countries to look at the situation in Middle East. The fact remains, there was no balance on the ground. It was an asymmetrical war between two entities, a mighty military power against a non state actor. The magnitude of civilian deaths and injuries, destructions of property and infrastructure in Lebanon would testify it. The entire south of the country was on the ruins. It will take decades for Lebanon to recover from this devastation.~~

The intent of ~~balancing~~ ^{would not be question} at the immense suffering of the Lebanese children.

I thank you.

2

The first question came to my mind ^{after reading reports was} like many other delegations why the Special Rapporteur on Right to Food were not in the team to undertake the visit. The Special Rapporteurs have specific mandates. ~~We agree~~ the war had impact on the areas they are mandate. Also there are other areas ^{affected} where we have special rapporteurs. Do we given to understand they will also undertake visits in Lebanon and Israel. At para 3, it is mentioned that the Rapporteurs undertook the visit on their own initiative. The question is, who financed the trip, OHCHR or any other sources.

3

We expected their trip to be ^{objective,} ~~a fact finding Mission~~, not a judgemental one. Reading para 35, to my delegation it seems that the Rapporteurs are passing a judgement on the Israeli actions.



4

At para 12 the Rapporteurs mentioned about damages in Lebanon and Israel. Unfortunately, the proportionality was not reflected. At para 9, we notice a vague statement when they said several hundred thousand persons were displaced in Israel. Whereas, at para 8 they mentioned that 1 million persons were displaced. It was categorical. Now, what would we understand by several hundred thousands. Is it 1 million, 2 million, or 10 thousands? There are many mentions like this which are subjected to interpretation.

Would the special rapporteurs comment on these observations?

2