

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly
FORTY-FIFTH SESSION
Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
22nd meeting
held on
Monday, 26 November 1990
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 22nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KARUKUBIRO-KAMUNANWIRE (Uganda)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 75: 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 74: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 73: INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned
within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750,
2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/45/SR.22
3 December 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

90-57355 3273S (E)

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 75: 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/45/84, A/45/306, A/45/576)

1. Mr. KHANI (Syrian Arab Republic) quoted extensively from a letter dated 28 June 1990 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and circulated as an official document of the General Assembly (A/45/333) under agenda item 75, which contained the statement of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic on the Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the Syrian Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan and had been presented to the Special Committee during its visit to Damascus, Syria, from 23 May to 5 June 1990. He said that his delegation would have liked to have seen the Israeli violations described and the comments of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic contained therein included in the report of the Special Committee (A/45/576).

2. Further to those comments, he said that Israel's rejection of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the specialized agencies constituted a challenge to the international community and world public opinion. The massacre committed by Israel at the Haram al-Sharif in Jerusalem on 8 October 1990 was a new phase in Israel's bloody practices in the occupied Arab territories. It was an unprecedented demonstration of Israel's aggressive and terrorist nature as well as of its desecration of both Muslim and Christian holy places, and a challenge to humanitarian and religious values. The detailed information contained in the report showed an escalation of Israel's violations of international and humanitarian law and of Israel's racist and barbarous practices, which had prompted numerous Security Council resolutions, including 605 (1987) and 607 (1988). Since 1948, such Israeli practices had given rise to hundreds of thousands of refugees and immigrants. It should be remembered that Israel had been admitted as a Member of the United Nations on the basis of its undertaking to implement General Assembly resolution 194 (III), which had provided for the return of Palestine refugees to their homes. Israel had similarly refused to allow the return of refugees from the Israeli aggression of 1967, despite the fact that the Security Council had called upon Israel to facilitate their return by its unanimous resolution 237 (1967). International co-operation was needed to prevent Israel's crimes of war and genocide and to relieve the Arab people in the occupied territories from Israel's oppression and tyranny. That should be done by removing the Israeli occupation from all the occupied Arab territories.

3. Mr. AL-SUWAIDI (United Arab Emirates) thanked the members of the Special Committee for their efforts in revealing the truth about Israeli practices, despite Israel's refusal to allow them to visit the occupied Arab territories. He said that their report clearly showed that the repressive measures of the Israeli authorities were flagrant violations of human rights in the occupied territories and crimes against the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza and the Arab citizens in the Syrian Golan Heights, committed despite repeated General Assembly and Security Council resolutions calling upon Israel to abide by the fourth Geneva

(Mr. Al-Suwaidi, United Arab Emirates)

Convention. The inhabitants of the occupied territories were still living under the Israeli "iron fist" policy, which was based on premeditated murder, barbarous torture, collective punishments, closure of schools and universities, obstruction of freedom of movement, destruction of houses and collective administrative detention without trial.

4. The fearless uprising of the Palestinian people was a natural reaction to such practices and expressed the Palestinians' rejection of the occupation and their devotion to their sacred right to an independent State on their national soil. On a daily basis, the Zionist forces burned houses, broke bones and used live ammunition, beatings, electric shocks and tear-gas against helpless inhabitants. Israel's claim to be a democratic State was belied by the heroes of the stones; its practices could only be compared with those of fascism. The world had witnessed the recent repugnant crime of the Israeli forces at the Haram al-Sharif, which had resulted in 21 Palestinian martyrs and hundreds of Palestinians wounded. The documentary film shown in the Security Council had refuted Israeli claims that Muslim religious leaders had incited worshipers to "massacre the Jews". That crime had prompted Security Council resolution 672 (1990) condemning the Israeli acts of violence.

5. The Special Committee's mandate was based on the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the third and fourth Geneva Conventions, the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 and the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, all of which had been violated by Israel, which claimed that the fourth Geneva Convention did not apply to the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories. International bodies such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, the International Commission of Jurists and the Commission on Human Rights had all upheld the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention, and every year the General Assembly adopted unanimously (with the exception of Israel) a resolution reaffirming the applicability of that Convention to the occupied territories. Yet Israel persisted in refusing to comply with international legality.

6. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait had diverted attention from the arbitrary Israeli practices against the Palestinians and the flood of Soviet Jewish immigrants to Israel, who were being settled in the occupied territories. His delegation held the Iraqi Government responsible for that additional prejudice to the Palestinians and the Palestinian cause. The oppression in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories was a consequence of their occupation by Israel, whose violations would continue as long as the occupation lasted.

7. Mr. MANSOUR (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it ill behoved the Syrian representative to speak of Nazi-like crimes when his own Government continued to give asylum to Nazi war criminals. The Syrian Arab Republic itself engaged in the systematic violation of human rights brutal repression, which had led in at least one instance to the loss of tens of thousands of lives, and exceptionally cruel and extreme forms of torture. Israel was engaged in an effort to maintain public order and safety in the territories it occupied, in

(Mr. Mansour, Israel)

the face of hundreds of acts of violence, involving the murder of over 350 people and the injuring of thousands more. Any democratic Government facing such violence was confronted with the dilemma of attempting to maintain public safety while upholding international standards of human rights; Israel took its obligation to maintain those rights very seriously, and was attempting to do so. No such dilemma existed for the Syrian Arab Republic, whose behaviour in Lebanon, which had become a Syrian protectorate, was another example of its brutality. For the Syrian Arab Republic to pose as the protector of the Palestinians was ironic, in view of the fact that the Syrian army had broken the Palestine Liberation Organization in 1976, killing thousands of its members, and that there were still 3,000 Palestinians in Syrian gaols, while many more had died there of torture and ill-treatment. Israel, its people and Government, desired peace and appealed to the Arab countries to begin direct talks in order to open the way to it.

8. Mr. KHANI (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Israel was seeking to divert attention from his Government's crimes by his references to Syrian actions. Syrian legislation prohibited both torture and arbitrary arrest, and neither was practised in the Syrian Arab Republic. Israeli allegations to the contrary were put forward for political purposes, as was clear from the fact that the Committee on Human Rights had during the past year refused even to consider similar allegations put forward by some organizations. The Syrian Government treated all of its people equally. It was ironic that Israel should refer to Syrian actions in Lebanon; those actions had in fact put an end to civil war and factional fighting in Lebanon at the cost of many Syrian casualties. What disturbed Israel was not the violation of civil rights but the prospect that the restoration of legitimate authority in Lebanon would lead to the expulsion of Israel from south Lebanon. The Prime Minister of Israel had said recently that it was his Government's duty to preserve the land of Israel from Jordan to the Mediterranean for future generations. Israel was refusing to obey the General Assembly's resolutions, as it had always done, because it thought only of expansion and aggression. The Syrian Arab Republic favoured a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East based on the implementation of all the resolutions of the United Nations on the subject.

9. Mr. MANSOUR (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Syrian Arab Republic's intentions with respect to Lebanon were clear from the fact that its President had long claimed that all of the territory formerly under French mandate, including Lebanon, should be a part of the Syrian Arab Republic. More than 750 people had been killed in the recent suppression by the Syrian Arab Republic of the opposition to Syrian rule in Lebanon.

10. Mr. KATRA (Lebanon), speaking on a point of order, said that the discussion seemed to be going far beyond the agenda item before the Committee; speakers should be asked to confine themselves to that subject.

11. Mr. KHANI (Syrian Arab Republic) agreed with the Lebanese representative that the discussion should be restricted to the subject before the Committee.

AGENDA ITEM 74: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/SPC/45/L.5, L.6*, L.7, L.18, L.19, L.20, L.21, L.22, L.23/Rev.1, L.24 and L.25)

12. Mr. SNOOK (United States of America), introducing the draft resolution on assistance to Palestinian refugees (A/SPC/45/L.5), commended the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) for its response to the emergency needs of refugees affected by the violence in Lebanon and the continuing unrest in the occupied territories. Strong financial support from the international community was needed to enable UNRWA to carry out its humanitarian mission, and his delegation urged other countries to donate generously.

13. Mr. BAS BACKER (Netherlands), introduced, on behalf of its sponsors, the draft resolution entitled "Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East" (A/SPC/45/L.6), and appealed to Member States to respond to the requests of the Commissioner-General and the Working Group to help solve UNRWA's financial problems and ensure the continuity of its assistance.

14. Mr. LIDEN (Sweden) introduced the draft resolution on "Assistance to persons displaced as the result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities" (A/SPC/45/L.7) and expressed confidence that it would be approved by consensus, as in previous years.

15. Mr. HANNAN (Bangladesh), introducing draft resolutions A/SPC/45/L.18, L.21, L.22 and L.24, said that his delegation had always placed great value on the important work of UNRWA in providing educational, health and relief services to Palestine refugees. He briefly outlined the main points of each of the resolutions, entitled "Offers by Member States of grants and scholarships for higher education, including vocational training, for Palestine refugees", "Return of population and refugees displaced since 1967", "Revenues derived from Palestine refugees' properties" and "University of Jerusalem 'Al-Quds' for Palestine Refugees", respectively. He and the other sponsors expected that the resolutions would receive the overwhelming support of the Committee.

16. Mr. GARDEZI (Pakistan), introducing draft resolutions A/SPC/45/L.19, L.20 and L.25, briefly described the main provisions of the first two resolutions, entitled "Palestine refugees in the Palestinian territory occupied by Israel since 1967" and "Resumption of the ration distribution to Palestine refugees", respectively. He then noted that draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.25, "Protection of Palestinian students and educational institutions and safeguarding of the security of the facilities of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East in the occupied Palestinian territory", reflected the shocking conditions under which UNRWA was being forced to function due to the oppressive policies of the Israeli authorities, which included raids on UNRWA installations, the closing of UNRWA schools for prolonged periods and the killing and wounding of students in and outside UNRWA schools. The sponsors hoped that the three draft resolutions would receive the overwhelming support of the Committee at a time when the situation in the occupied territories had deteriorated considerably. The unequivocal and

(Mr. Gardezi, Pakistan)

comprehensive assistance of the international community was necessary so that UNRWA could help to alleviate the sufferings of millions of Palestine refugees.

17. Mr. YOUSIF (Sudan), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.23/Rev.1, "Protection of Palestine refugees", said that it was basically identical to draft resolution A/SPC/44/L.15 and Corr.1, which the Committee had adopted by an overwhelming majority the previous year. He outlined the changes which had been made to the current year's draft resolution, including the deletion of a paragraph on the sovereignty and integrity of Lebanon owing to recent positive developments in that country, the addition of a new operative paragraph (para. 5) and the use of stronger language in paragraph 6. All of the available information had clearly established that there was a marked deterioration in the security situation of the Palestine refugees as a result of the acts which Israel continued to perpetrate against the refugees and against UNRWA employees, and that Israel continued to disregard the will of the international community. The circumstances which had led to the adoption of the draft resolution the previous year had worsened, as evidenced by the October 1990 massacre at the Haram al-Sharif, and the sponsors therefore urged the Committee to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

18. Mr. SNOOK (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his Government strongly supported UNRWA and its vital humanitarian programmes, as reaffirmed by its sponsorship of the resolution on assistance to Palestine refugees (A/SPC/45/L.5). His delegation also joined the consensus regarding draft resolutions A/SPC/45/L.6 and L.7. Regrettably, however, many of the other resolutions submitted under that item were highly politicized, containing sweeping, unbalanced criticism of Israel's treatment of refugees, or making proposals that his Government considered financially unsound, making no practical contribution to UNRWA's objectives and only serving to exacerbate tensions. His Government supported the practical approach to meeting the needs of refugees for higher education as found in draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.18. It had reservations, however, regarding the proposed University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds".

19. His delegation could not support draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.19, "Palestine refugees in the occupied Palestinian territory". That resolution referred to an "inalienable right of return" while making no reference to negotiations for a comprehensive and lasting peace among the concerned parties, which would be necessary to resolve the underlying issues. The Commissioner-General should retain the authority to administer UNRWA's programmes with regard to such matters as issuance of identification cards without outside interference. His Government opposed such measures as the destruction of dwellings in the occupied territories but would not object in principle to the concept of voluntary relocation of refugees. The United States had traditionally opposed "resumption of the ration distribution to Palestine refugees" (A/SPC/45/L.20) because, again, it attempted to usurp the authority of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA.

20. His delegation objected to draft resolutions A/SPC/45/L.21 and L.22 on the grounds that they made no reference to necessary direct negotiations among all parties concerned.

(Mr. Snook, United States)

21. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.23, "Protection of Palestine refugees", his Government believed that Israel, as the occupying Power in the West Bank and Gaza, had the authority and responsibility to maintain security in that area and must carry out those obligations in strict accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1949.

22. Though it strongly supported practical efforts designed to promote higher educational opportunities for Palestinian refugees, his delegation opposed draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.24, "University of Jerusalem 'Al-Quds' for Palestine Refugees" as an unreasonable and unworkable approach to the problem. It would also vote against draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.25, despite its concern over school closures and disruption of UNRWA's activities in the West Bank and Gaza, because of its harsh condemnation of Israel. His Government had repeatedly made it clear that it would not support such extreme and unbalanced resolutions.

23. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.5.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

24. The draft resolution was adopted by 123 votes to none, with one abstention.

/...

25. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.6, informed the Committee that, according to the Programme Planning and Budget Division, the assistance necessary for the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA to conduct its work would entail the servicing of 10 one-day meetings of the Working Group in 1991, and no additional cost would arise. It was his understanding that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

26. Draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.6 was adopted without a vote.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that it was his understanding that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.7 without a vote.

28. Draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.7 was adopted without a vote.

29. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.18.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

30. Draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.18 was adopted by 122 votes to none, with one abstention.

31. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.19, informed the Committee that, according to the Programme Planning and Budget Division, the Secretary-General had indicated that he was unable to comply with the request contained in paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 44/47 E. All refugee families currently registered with UNRWA received registration cards issued by that Agency; however, the Commissioner-General did not have the means to issue identity cards. Should the draft resolution be adopted, the Secretary-General would keep the situation under review regarding appropriate documentation of the registration status of individual members of refugee families.

32. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.19.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

33. Draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.19 was adopted by 121 votes to 2, with no abstentions.

34. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.20.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Hungary, Liechtenstein, Poland, Romania, Spain.

35. Draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.20 was adopted by 93 votes to 20, with 9 abstentions.

36. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.21.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

/...

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

37. Draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.21 was adopted by 96 votes to 2, with 25 abstentions.

38. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.22

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

39. Draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.22 was adopted by 95 votes to 2, with 26 abstentions.

40. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.23/Rev.1 as orally revised.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

41. Draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.23/Rev.1 as orally revised was adopted by 120 votes to 2, with no abstentions.

42. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.24, informed the Committee that, according to information provided by the Programme Planning and Budget Division, the functional feasibility study on the proposed University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds" had not been completed as planned. Thus, the Secretary-General was not in a position to foresee related programme budget implications. Should the situation change during 1991, he would initiate action under the provisions of the resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses in the biennium 1990-1991.

43. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.24.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

44. Draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.24 was adopted by 121 votes to 2, with no abstentions.

45. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.25.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania,

Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

46. Draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.25 was adopted by 121 votes to 2, with no abstentions.

47. Mr. D'ELIA (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the 12 members of the European Community, reaffirmed the full support of the Twelve for the work of UNRWA and the vital services it provided to Palestine refugees, though in some cases they had not been able to vote in favour of resolutions just adopted. The Twelve shared the deep concern voiced by the Commissioner-General with regard to the financial uncertainties of UNRWA operations, particularly emergency aid. While they supported in principle the development of the various services UNRWA could provide for Palestine refugees, they wondered about the advisability of confronting the Commissioner-General with unrealistic demands.

48. Mr. AMIN-MANSOUR (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all resolutions relating to agenda item 74, as they could only help to alleviate the suffering of the Palestinian people. The ultimate solution, however, would lie in the restoration of their right to self-determination and the establishment of a Palestinian State.

49. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that Austria had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.19 on the understanding that paragraphs 2 and 3 would be considered in the light of the means available to the Agency and the actual possibilities of compliance with those requests.

50. Mr. SMERAL (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of most of the draft resolutions in order to emphasize its support for the work of UNRWA. Nevertheless, it had abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/45/L.20, L.21 and L.22. His delegation felt that the ration distribution discussed in A/SPC/45/L.20 was no longer necessary. As regarded A/SPC/45/L.21 and L.22, the complicated repatriation and property questions contained therein would be better addressed in a different forum.

51. Mr. POPESCU (Romania) said that his delegation had not voted in favour of some of the draft resolutions considered, but not because of lack of support for the commendable efforts of UNRWA. Owing to its critical financial situation, UNRWA should focus on its most vital programmes. He hoped that in the new international climate, a more realistic solution to the Middle East problem could be promoted, and that the deadlock which had existed for many years might be broken.

52. Mr. INBAR (Israel) said that his Government welcomed the humanitarian assistance given through UNRWA to refugees. In addition, between 1 July 1989 and 1 July 1990, his Government had contributed over \$20 million towards education, welfare, health and housing for Palestine refugees and had made many good-will gestures, such as the release of detainees, the opening of schools and assistance with agricultural exports. In addition, Israel was accepting large numbers of Palestinians fleeing Kuwait and Iraq. The draft resolutions just adopted were political in nature and based on assumptions and prejudices. Regarding the destruction of Palestinians' houses, there was no deliberate policy in that regard. Legal procedures had been followed, and the owners had been found guilty of terrorist activity.

53. Regarding the University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds", before 1967 there had been no single functioning university in Judea, Samaria or Gaza. Since then, six had been established, all enjoying academic freedom.

54. Draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.25 addressed Israeli raids on UNRWA installations. However, the Agency was employing residents of the occupied territories who had been sentenced for security violations. The Palestinian people was taking advantage of the Agency and exploiting it to further its political goals.

55. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer for Palestine), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, thanked the delegates who had voted in favour of the draft resolutions. Although the representative of Israel had insisted on reopening a debate that had been closed some time earlier, he had not convinced any of the delegations of the accuracy of his arguments. Only Israel and the United States of America had voted against draft resolutions A/SPC/45/L.23/Rev.1 and L.25, which meant that none of the other delegations had been persuaded to change their position. He hoped that the Israeli Government would heed the call of the international community and implement all 11 resolutions. In particular, the solution of the problem of Palestine refugees depended on the implementation of paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III), as indicated in paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.5. Since no delegation had voted against that draft resolution, he hoped that it would be implemented in the course of the current year and that, by allowing the reintegration of Palestine refugees, the Israeli Government would eliminate one aspect of the tragedy of the Palestinian people.

56. Mr. KATRA (Lebanon), speaking on behalf of the Arab Group of the Whole, thanked all those who had collaborated on the current year's draft resolutions.

AGENDA ITEM 73: INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE
(continued) (A/SPC/45/L.17)

57. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that, with regard to draft resolution A/SPC/45/L.17, the Programme Planning and Budget Division did not anticipate any programme budget implications arising from the adoption of that resolution. Provision had been made under the programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991, inter alia, for substantive support of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS), its Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, and its subsidiary

(The Chairman)

bodies, training activities, international technical studies, and space information services, as well as for substantive and Secretariat support of the Legal Sub-Committee of COPUOS, its working groups and its ad hoc working groups. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote.

58. It was so decided.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that during the Special Political Committee's deliberations, several delegations had expressed interest concerning membership in COPUOS. Further consultations on the matter were needed because of the requirement for balanced geographical distribution of the membership of that Committee. In addition, he noted that the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic would fill the seat in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space which had been vacated as a result of the accession of the German Democratic Republic to the Federal Republic of Germany. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Special Political Committee took note of that change.

60. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.