

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

*Official Records**



UN LIBRARY

DEC 13 1978

UN/CA COLLECTION

SIXTH COMMITTEE
66th meeting
held on
Thursday, 7 December 1978
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 66th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FERRARI BRAVO (Italy)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 118: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRY (continued)
ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.6/33/SR.66
11 December 1978

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 118: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRY
(continued) (A/33/26, A/33/231; A/C.6/33/L.14/Rev.1)

1. Mr. FIFOOT (United Kingdom) said draft resolution A/C.6/33/L.14/Rev.1 presented a balanced expression of the views concerning an incident involving a permanent representative which had much exercised the Committee on Relations with the Host Country earlier in the current year. His delegation had hoped that the short form of the resolution, used at the past two sessions, would be adopted at the current session. The longer form was, perhaps, the price of achieving a consensus. Nevertheless, the short form had obvious advantages and his delegation hoped that the Sixth Committee would be able to resume using that form the following year. That could be facilitated by the more timely issue of the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country.
2. Regarding the number of very serious violent attacks on missions, mission personnel and their families during the past year, his delegation wished to express its sympathy to the missions and the people concerned and joined in condemning those attacks and those who perpetrated them. Such attacks were inexcusable whatever the cause on whose behalf they were committed and wherever they took place. The fact that there were attacks on missions did not, however, justify the allegations of connivance by the authorities of the host country; those allegations were unworthy and it was regrettable that they had been made.
3. Mr. EL-BANHAWI (Egypt) said his delegation found that draft resolution A/C.6/33/L.14 answered the question of how to ensure the security of missions accredited to the United Nations in New York and felt that at the current stage that was adequate.
4. Mrs. LOPEZ (Philippines) said her delegation had taken note of the comments made by various delegations regarding the unfortunate incident which had recently taken place at the Philippine Centre. Her Government had issued various formal statements deploring that incident. The two Governments involved were in touch on that question with a view to ensuring the inviolability of the Philippine Centre. Her delegation expressed the earnest hope that there would be no recurrence of similar incidents that might lead to misunderstanding and adversely affect relations between Member States. As a State Party to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, the Philippines scrupulously adhered to its provisions and believed that it had the right to expect others to do the same. She hoped that that problem would be solved through mutual co-operation and would not arise again.
5. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said his delegation traditionally spoke last on the item under consideration because it believed it should listen to the views of all concerned and then express its own view on the matter. His Government was proud and pleased to be the host of the United Nations and joined unqualifiedly in the condemnation of all acts of violence against diplomats, diplomatic premises and the property of diplomats. Nothing could justify such acts.

(Mr. Rosenstock, United States)

His Government would continue to strive to do its best within the capacity of a free society to provide reasonable protection. It welcomed the statements of those delegations which recognized that the security record in New York City was a good one in the light of the world situation. His delegation was pleased and proud that many private citizens made the effort to be hospitable to members of delegations to the United Nations and that the City of New York had an office devoted exclusively to dealing with any problems diplomats might encounter there.

6. On the whole, the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country (A/33/26) were a balanced reflection of the views of delegations. He thought, however, that they tended to over-emphasize the security problems of a few delegations. Nevertheless, any threat against the security of a diplomat was sufficiently serious that his delegation would not object to stressing that issue, although it would have wished to see other issues touched upon as well. He was pleased that the draft resolution on that item was one on which consensus would be possible. His delegation did not interpret anything in that resolution in any way which would diminish the ability of the United States to take appropriate measures within the law to safeguard its security. He expressed regret over aspects of a particular incident to which reference had been made. Though the Sixth Committee might have been wiser to adopt the type of resolution it had adopted at the past two sessions, his delegation felt it could accept the recommendations of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. He was gratified that appreciation had been expressed to the City Commission and others who had striven to assist his Government in being a good host. His Government would continue to do its utmost in that regard.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.6/33/L.14/Rev.1 seemed ready for adoption. He then read out a correction to the third preambular paragraph of the French text of the draft resolution. Aside from that point, there did not seem to be any opposition to adoption by consensus.

8. Mr. CORDOVA (Ecuador) said there was a similar error in the Spanish text which would also have to be corrected.

9. The CHAIRMAN said the Translation Division would take account of the remarks made by the representative of Ecuador. Nevertheless, the Sixth Committee could adopt the original English text of the draft resolution and have the appropriate corrections made in the other language versions before sending the draft to the plenary.

10. Mr. PANCARCI (Turkey) supported the Chairman's suggestion that draft resolution A/C.6/33/L.14/Rev.1 should be adopted by consensus in order to expedite matters.

11. Mr. AL-KHASAWNEH (Jordan) said there were also errors in the third preambular paragraph of the Arabic text and requested that the necessary corrections be made. However, his delegation had no objection to the Sixth Committee adopting the English text of the draft resolution.

12. The CHAIRMAN said that the Translation Division would take note of the remarks of the representative of Jordan. He took it that the Sixth Committee was prepared to adopt the English text of draft resolution A/C.6/33/L.14/Rev.1 by consensus.

13. It was so decided.

/...

14. Mr. MUSEUX (France), explaining his delegation's participation in the consensus, said that its concern regarding the third preambular paragraph should be construed as meaning that the host country of an organization had the right to adopt whatever measures it deemed necessary to protect its security.

15. Mr. ANOMA (Ivory Coast), explaining his participation in the consensus, expressed his delegation's complete satisfaction at the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution on a very serious question which had exceptional aspects. It could be seen from the reassurances given by the United States representative, who had himself recognized the gravity of the events in question and deplored them, that the United States Government was making continuous efforts to ensure that the various missions enjoyed tranquillity and stability for the exercise of their functions. Those reassurances were important and the efforts made by the United States police forces to protect the security of missions and of members of missions and their families enabled missions of various countries to perform their work and ensured friendly relations between those countries and the United States. His country, which was a member of the Committee on Relations with the Host country, therefore welcomed the wise decision just taken by the Sixth Committee.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

16. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution to be submitted on the report of the International Law Commission on the work of its thirtieth session (A/C.6/33/L.16).

17. Mr. CABADA BARRIOS (Peru) said he wished to have his delegation included in the list of sponsors of the draft resolution in question.

18. Mr. EL-BANHAWI (Egypt) said that the delegation of Jordan and his own also wished to be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/33/L.16.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that owing to lack of time, the Committee would be unable to consider agenda item 122. It would therefore have to decide whether to delete the item or to include it in the agenda of the next session. He thought that it might be appropriate for members to hold informal consultations on the question.

20. Mr. KPOTSRA (Togo), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Egypt, the Ivory Coast and his own, proposed that the item should be included in the agenda of the next session.

21. Mr. PANCARCI (Turkey), supported by Mr. ROSENNE (Israel), thought that the Committee was in a position to take a decision at the current stage and that the item should be included in the agenda of the next session.

22. Mr. ELBACCOUCH (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) supported the proposal that the item should be included in the agenda of the next session.

23. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates) thought that the Committee could take a decision at the current stage to postpone consideration of the item to the next session.

24. Mr. DIA (Senegal) associated his delegation with the views expressed by previous speakers.

25. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) thought that the Chairman should first determine whether any representative wished the item to be deleted. The most logical course would be to postpone consideration of the item to the next session.

26. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the proposal that consideration of the item should be postponed to the next session. In his delegation's opinion, the Committee was in a position to take a decision along those lines at the current stage.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided, by consensus, that the item should be included in the agenda of the next session.

28. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.