United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FORTY-FIRST SESSION
*Official Records**

SIXTH COMMITTEE
52nd meeting
held on
Tuesday, 25 November 1986
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 52nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FRANCIS (Jamaica)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 133: DEVELOPMENT AND STRENGTHENING OF GOOD-NEIGHBOURLINESS BETWEEN STATES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 131: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRY

AGENDA ITEM 135: DRAFT STANDARD RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 123: PROGRESSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRINCIPLES AND NORMS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW RELATING TO THE NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 134: DRAFT BODY OF PRINCIPLES FOR THE PROTECTION OF ALL PERSONS UNDER ANY FORM OF DETENTION OR IMPRISONMENT

*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 fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.6/41/SR.52
28 November 1986

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

86-57720 6275S (E)

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 133: DEVELOPMENT AND STRENGTHENING OF GOOD-NEIGHBOURLINESS BETWEEN STATES (continued) (A/C.6/41/L.14 and L.17)

1. Mr. DROUSHIOTIS (Cyprus) said that a number of principles (sovereign equality of States, respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of States, the prohibition of the use or threat of force in international relations, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, pacta sunt servanda, and peaceful settlement of disputes), together with strict compliance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and United Nations resolutions, in particular those of the Security Council, constituted the essential elements of good-neighbourliness.

2. The work of the International Law Commission on international liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law, and on the law of the non-navigational uses of international watercourses was relevant to the identification of the elements of good-neighbourliness. The results of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea were also relevant in that respect, as was the work of regional organizations.

3. He wished to point out that a certain party was not respecting the principles that constituted the essential elements of good-neighbourliness, but had invaded and occupied a neighbour, violating the human rights of the population and attempting to establish an illegal State, while purporting to be a proponent of good-neighbourliness. Moreover, the circulation of texts emanating from an illegal entity (A/41/587-S/18328) was in violation of Security Council resolutions and was not acceptable to his delegation.

4. The development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States through the identification of the elements of good-neighbourliness and the areas in which it might be developed could prove a valuable contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the achievement of international co-operation among States.

5. Mr. GUNEY (Turkey) said that the basic condition for the development of good-neighbourliness was the political will to abide strictly by the fundamental principles of international law set forth in the United Nations Charter.

6. In view of the lack of agreement in the Sub-Committee on Good-Neighbourliness on the elements of good-neighbourliness, the Sub-Committee should continue the process of identifying and clarifying them at its next session. That pragmatic approach would be a good point of departure for the elaboration of an international document on the subject. The Sub-Committee should define the concept of good-neighbourliness on the basis of geographical proximity.

7. Mrs. SILVERA NUÑEZ (Cuba) said that although the report of the Sub-Committee (A/C.6/41/L.14) provided the basis for work on the item, her delegation considered that those provisions of the Charter that constituted the essential legal elements of good-neighbourliness should be studied in greater depth. Such principles as

/...

(Mrs. Silvera Nuñez, Cuba)

non-interference in the internal affairs of States, sovereign equality, the promotion of friendly relations, and co-operation between States should be included among the elements of good-neighbourliness. Her delegation considered that refraining from establishing military bases in neighbouring territories, eliminating existing ones, and refraining from applying coercive economic measures against neighbouring States were particularly important elements of good-neighbourliness. Those elements, which should be included in the instrument that would ultimately be adopted, were not new; they were to be found in the Charter of the United Nations and in other international instruments.

8. The report of the Sub-Committee did not contain a definition of good-neighbourliness; nor did it establish the scope of the principle. Whether the term was intended to cover good-neighbourliness between States with a common frontier or between States in geographical proximity should be specified. At its next session, the Sub-Committee should consider those fundamental aspects.

9. Mr. AL-ATTAR (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, although oblique references had been made to the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States in Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter and, in particular, in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the matter had yet to be addressed in a direct and unequivocal manner.

10. The legal and other elements of good-neighbourliness set out in the conference room paper submitted by Romania (A/C.6/41/SC/CRP.1) and in the report of the Sub-Committee on Good-Neighbourliness (A/C.6/41/L.14) would undoubtedly help to clarify that concept. His delegation would like to reaffirm that the most important of the legal elements on which good-neighbourliness depended were: the prohibition of the use or threat of force; the prohibition of the occupation of the territory of a neighbouring State, even for reasons of security; full respect for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States; and the prohibition of military, political, economic or other measures to compel a State to subject the exercise of its sovereign rights to the will of another State. If such principles were not applied in international relations, it would be impossible to ensure respect for other principles linked with good-neighbourliness, such as those governing co-operation in the economic, political, humanitarian and cultural fields.

11. Good-neighbourliness was incompatible with policies of aggression, expansion, occupation and annexation, the establishment of settlements in occupied territory, the expulsion of indigenous populations, the imposition of agreements violating the sovereignty of a State under military occupation, defiance of United Nations resolutions, and violation of the principles of the Charter and of international law, particularly the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. As long as racist and colonialist régimes continued to exist, the practical application of the principle of good-neighbourliness would remain impossible. The international community must deter such régimes from carrying out acts of aggression against neighbouring States, and must oblige them to comply with the principles of international law and morality. It would then be a simple matter to establish legal principles and norms relating to good-neighbourliness.

/...

(Mr. Al-Attar, Syrian Arab Republic)

12. His delegation endorsed the principles contained in the report of the Sub-Committee on Good-Neighbourliness, and considered that account should also be taken of the proposals submitted by Member States, particularly those of his Government contained in document A/38/336.

13. Mr. THIOUNN Prasith (Democratic Kampuchea) said that from the juridical point of view, the Charter of the United Nations was the appropriate context in which to place good-neighbourly relations between States. All States, whether or not they were Members of the United Nations, had an obligation to respect the purposes and principles of the Charter and, where appropriate, resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. A State Member of the United Nations should not be selective in applying the provisions of the Charter or General Assembly resolutions. The major principles of the Charter relating to good-neighbourliness were contained in the Preamble and in Article 1, paragraph 2, and Article 2, paragraph 4. In addition, the good faith referred to in Article 2, paragraph 2, was essential in relations between States. Without it, good-neighbourliness between States was not possible.

14. In practice, certain Powers and their allies were pursuing a continuing policy of expansion, interference in the internal affairs of other States and recourse to the threat or use of force in international relations. Kampuchea had been the victim of violation of the principles of good-neighbourliness as a result of its eastern neighbour's ambition to establish an "Indo-Chinese Federation" to camouflage the annexation of Kampuchea and Laos. In the effort to realize that ambition, it had had recourse to sabotage, subversion and the assassination of politicians. On more than one occasion, it had attempted a coup d'état. When such methods had failed, it had resorted to invasion and a continuing war of aggression, although its Prime Minister had earlier assured the countries of the region of its peaceful intentions and good-neighbourliness towards Kampuchea. Since then, that neighbour had sought to justify its aggression by every available means, since it could not deny it completely. It was continuing to sabotage the efforts of the United Nations to end the conflict. It had rejected all General Assembly resolutions on the subject, the Declaration of Kampuchea adopted by the International Conference on Kampuchea and the Kampuchean eight-point peace proposal, all of which were based on fundamental principles of the Charter.

15. Kampuchea had always been willing to maintain relations of good-neighbourliness, friendship and solidarity with that neighbour, but the latter, wich was supported by the Soviet Union, only wanted a relationship which would allow it to absorb Kampuchea. However, the peace-loving Members of the United Nations were stepping up their efforts to ensure the independence and survival of Kampuchea and to restore peace and security in South-East Asia. In particular, the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations were contributing actively to the search for a peaceful and political settlement.

16. The Sub-Committee on Good-Neighbourliness should consider specific cases such as Kampuchea and Afghanistan, and, in the light of such cases, identify and clarify the elements of good-neighbourliness.

/...

17. Mr. SENANAYAKE (Sri Lanka) said that international legal principles relating to the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States had evolved progressively over the years. They were contained in the Charter of the United Nations, in General Assembly resolutions, in declarations of the United Nations and its agencies, in international conventions, in the opinions of legal experts and in international judicial decisions. The Charter established the principle that States should refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. It also emphasized the maintenance of international peace and security, and the development of friendly relations and co-operation among States. His delegation considered that any international document on the elements of good-neighbourliness should be based on those principles, which had been reiterated in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV)).

18. Sri Lanka welcomed the efforts to identify and clarify the elements of good-neighbourliness, which could provide a legal framework for the development of relations between States on the basis of strict observance of established principles of international law. It considered that if a dispute or disagreement arose, recourse should be had to traditional methods of dispute settlement, such as discussion, negotiation or mediation in an international forum.

19. Mr. VOICU (Romania) said that a key idea emerging from the 1979 Romanian proposal on good-neighbourliness had been that there were particularly favourable opportunities for mutually advantageous co-operation between neighbouring countries in many fields, and that the development of such co-operation might have a positive influence on international relations as a whole. The great changes of a political, economic and social nature, as well as the scientific and technological progress which had taken place in the world and had led to unprecedented interdependence of nations, had given new dimensions to good-neighbourliness in the conduct of States, and had increased the need to develop and strengthen it. International developments demonstrated that good-neighbourliness was an effective means of preventing international conflicts and of dealing peacefully with the sources of tension and war. The establishment of good-neighbourly relations also encouraged the democratization of international relations and facilitated the participation of all countries in international life.

20. As to the specific elements of good-neighbourliness, further analysis was needed. While the generally accepted principles of international law were a basic requirement of good-neighbourliness, those principles were never applied in the abstract. The specific norms of good-neighbourliness should be based on objective realities. The proof that such norms were useful and that respect for them was likely to avert conflicts and promote friendship was that, in many situations which occurred daily between neighbouring States, the great majority of those States observed such norms. Moreover, they could be considered as specific in the sense that they had legal features (rights and obligations) which differentiated them from other legal norms.

21. The definition of good-neighbourliness could not be regarded as a necessary pre-condition for the identification and clarification of the elements of good-

/...

(Mr. Voicu, Romania)

neighbourliness, for such a definition presupposed a thorough knowledge of the subject, which could only result from a detailed study of it. As a result of such an analysis, it would undoubtedly become evident that good-neighbourliness was much more than a political notion or attitude and had a definite legal content. It was to be noted that a preliminary list of the elements of good-neighbourliness had been drawn up by the Sub-Committee on Good-Neighbourliness (A/C.6/41/L.14).

22. The observation had rightly been made that codification in the area of good-neighbourliness would fill a significant legal lacuna. The development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness was directly linked to efforts to promote peace, international co-operation and the democratisation of international relations. Geographical proximity was an objective reality which could not be changed physically, but which could be improved politically and legally. The United Nations must play a decisive role to that end.

23. In the light of those considerations, his delegation wished to introduce draft resolution A/C.6/41/L.17 on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by Honduras, Nicaragua and Uganda. A few revisions had been made to the text. In the fourth preambular paragraph, the words "geographic proximity and to other" should be replaced by the word "various". In paragraph 5, the phrase "as part of a process of elaboration of a suitable international document on the subject" should be deleted. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution, as revised, would be adopted without a vote.

24. Mr. EDWARDS (United Kingdom) asked whether the deletion of the phrase "geographical proximity" in the fourth preambular paragraph meant that geographical proximity was not considered to be a relevant reason.

25. Mr. VOICU (Romania) said the sponsors had decided that it would be better to use the more general formulation, which would cover geographical proximity.

26. Mr. EDWARDS (United Kingdom) suggested that the entire phrase, "owing to various relevant reasons", might be deleted without affecting the meaning of the sentence.

27. Mr. VOICU (Romania) said that it was late in the proceedings to undertake an exercise in editing, as the problem had already been discussed sufficiently in informal consultations.

28. Mr. VREEDZAAM (Suriname) suggested that, in paragraph 1, the phrase "principles of the Charter of the United Nations" might be amended to read "principles of the United Nations as embodied in the Charter".

29. Mr. VOICU (Romania) said that, since the change would not affect the substance of the paragraph, the sponsors would accept it.

30. Draft resolution A/C.6/41/L.17, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.

31. Mr. BADR (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the Arab Group, said that the Arab delegations had participated in the adoption of the draft resolution without a

/...

(Mr. Badr, Qatar)

vote. That did not imply, however, that they recognized Israel or were committed to establishing good-neighbourly relations with it. Good-neighbourliness, as an extension of peaceful relations between States, could not be applied at a time when Israel continued to occupy Arab territories by force and deny the Palestinian people's right to self-determination.

32. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said that his country was proud to have coined the term "good-neighbourliness" to describe its approach towards the countries along its borders, with which it shared a common tradition of settling issues in strict compliance with the principles embodied in the Charter. The standing United States-Canadian commissions for resolving certain problems had been the first international organizations. However, there were potential risks in limiting the universal application of the principles contained in Article 2 of the Charter and in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation by suggesting that they applied particularly to neighbours. Furthermore, it was doubtful that principles de lege lata or de lege ferenda applied particularly to neighbouring countries. History proved that environmental damage in certain countries, as in the case of the Chernobyl accident, might have international repercussions. Furthermore, in the field of human rights, while neighbouring countries might initially be most affected by refugee flows, it was unreasonable to expect them to bear a disproportionate share of that burden.

33. From the outset, the United States had had doubts that progress could be achieved in the legal sphere on the topic of good-neighbourliness, particularly because the field of application of the concept of "neighbour" had yet to b clarified. By focusing on non-existent legal principles, the Sixth Committ detracted from the potentially useful contribution which might be made, for example, by the Special Political Committee or the Second Committee. United States acquiescence in the adoption of draft resolution A/C.6/41/L.17 had been contingent upon the deletion from paragraph 5 of any mention of what would follow once the listing process was completed. That made it possible to approach the question with an open mind.

34. Mr. SKIBSTED (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that in participating in the adoption of the draft resolution, they had been mindful of their own close co-operation, which was a testimony to what could be achieved by good-neighbourliness. However, the Nordic delegations were concerned about the need to rationalize the work of the United Nations. Some of the topics referred to in the draft resolution were already being dealt with in other forums. The task of identifying and clarifying the elements pertaining to good-neighbourliness should be entrusted to one of the special committees which reported to the Sixth Committee. However, certain practical issues, such as levels of pollution and the use of nuclear energy, might necessitate the elaboration of more specific norms. The future work of the Sub-Committee on Good-Neighbourliness should focus on such issues, on the basis of a functional approach to relations between neighbours rather than a general analysis of the concept. That would not, of course, preclude the subsequent elaboration of more detailed rules by the relevant forums or by the States concerned.

/...

35. Ms. CHOKRON (Israel) said that her delegation had welcomed the inclusion of the item under consideration in the agenda of the General Assembly. However, although there had been much talk of tolerance and coexistence, those concepts had not been reflected in the statements made by Israel's Arab neighbours, which did not bode well for the outcome of future work on the topic.

36. Although it must be recognized that the principle of good-neighbourliness was a relative one, it must also be borne in mind that the concept reflected an undeniable physical fact, imposed on individual countries by geography and history. Acting on the basis of the principle of reciprocity, Israel would continue to do everything within its power to establish relations with its neighbours that were based on peace, security and co-operation through negotiation, dialogue and consultation.

37. Mr. ROMPANI (Uruguay) said he regretted that the words "geographic proximity and to other" had been deleted from the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

38. Mr. VAN WULFFTEN PALTHE (Netherlands) said that his delegation had joined in the adoption of draft resolution A/C.6/41/L.17 without a vote because of the revision to paragraph 5. The proceedings of the Sub-Committee on Good-Neighbourliness clearly illustrated that there was a substantial lack of agreement on the identification and clarification of the elements of good-neighbourliness. Furthermore, no definition of the principle had yet been formulated. It was therefore much too early for a draft resolution to refer to the preparation of a suitable international document or to any other future steps. In fact, his delegation would have preferred a simple decision by the Sixth Committee to include the item in the provisional agenda of the forty-second session of the General Assembly. As the report of the Sub-Committee clearly indicated, much remained to be done.

39. Mr. TREVES (Italy) said that his delegation had supported the consensus on the draft resolution because the reference to a "suitable international document" had been deleted from paragraph 5. He noted that there was little agreement on the topic under consideration.

AGENDA ITEM 131: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRY (A/41/26, A/41/80, A/41/207, A/41/208, A/41/209, A/41/219, A/41/224, A/41/236, A/41/401)

40. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus), speaking as Chairman of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, introduced the report of that Committee (A/41/26). In the period covered by the report, namely January to November 1986, the Committee had held nine meetings, and its officers had met once. The report was structured in the usual way. In the reporting period, the Committee had continued consideration of the question of the security of missions and the safety of their personnel, the question of privileges and immunities, and other matters. However, its meetings had been mainly devoted to consideration of questions arising from the imposition by the host country of limits on the size of the staff of the Permanent Missions of the Soviet Union, the Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR to the United Nations, under the agenda item entitled "Consideration of, and recommendations on, issues

/...

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

arising in connection with the implementation of the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations". The deliberations of the Committee on all questions before it had been substantive, business-like and exhaustive.

41. Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country was a useful record of that Committee's activities. Moreover, he welcomed the inclusion of a reference to the principle of consultation between the host country and the parties concerned in the draft resolution to be submitted on the item.

42. His delegation wished to draw the Sixth Committee's attention to a serious and continuing problem, namely, the restrictions imposed on the use of his delegation's primary residence at Englewood. He would confine his remarks to the legal aspects of the matter, which was an issue of international law concerning the status, rights and privileges of delegations to the United Nations. The rights and privileges in question were governed by the following international instruments: the Charter of the United Nations; the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations (the General Convention); the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations; and the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations (the Headquarters Agreement).

43. The Charter recognized the need to grant privileges and immunities to representatives of Member States (Art. 105, para. 2). However, apart from laying down the minimum standard for functional immunity, the Charter was silent. Moreover, there was no elaboration of the concept of such functional immunity. Instead, the Charter provided that the details of such immunity might be elaborated by the General Assembly in the form of recommendations to the States Members of the United Nations or conventions (Art. 105, para. 3), as in the case of the General Convention.

44. The purpose of the General Convention was to provide certain privileges and immunities to the United Nations as an organization and to its officials, as well as to the representatives of Member States. Article IV accorded such representatives a broad range of privileges and immunities while they exercised their functions, including immunity from arrest, inviolability for all papers and documents, exemption from immigration restrictions and "such other privileges, immunities and facilities, not inconsistent with the foregoing, as diplomatic envoys enjoy ...". On the basis of article IV, Professor L. Gross had concluded that it was the clear purpose of the General Convention to assimilate in that respect the representatives of Members to diplomatic envoys, and to grant them all the privileges accorded under customary international law, and that freedom of movement and travel within the territory of the receiving State was part of those privileges. Restrictions (except in limited cases) imposed on freedom of movement within the United States were thus inconsistent with the General Convention. By way of analogy, the same was true of restrictions on the place of residence of permanent representatives to the United Nations.

45. The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations codified the rights, privileges and immunities of permanent diplomatic missions. Article 26 expressly prohibited

/...

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

the imposition of restrictions upon the freedom of movement and travel of members of the mission, subject to the receiving State's laws and regulations concerning zones entry into which was prohibited or regulated for reasons of national security. Thus the Vienna Convention recognized the right of the receiving State to restrict the movements of diplomatic representatives, but only as a very limited exception to the general rule of freedom of movement. Although the national security exception in article 26 might encompass more than military installations, it was not designed as a "catch-all" extending to zones that were clearly unrelated to national security. With respect to the premises of diplomatic missions, he wished to draw attention to articles 21 and 25 of the Convention. In sum, the Convention strongly supported the position that the receiving State was not to impose unreasonable restrictions on the place of residence. The imposition of unreasonable restrictions would not be consistent with the general rule of freedom of movement or the spirit of the provisions requiring the receiving State to assist rather than to impede the obtaining of suitable residences.

46. Restricting the area in which permanent representatives could reside would not seem consistent with the granting of full diplomatic privileges to permanent representatives under section 15 of the Headquarters Agreement. That conclusion was buttressed by the provisions of the Vienna Convention, which made it clear that diplomatic envoys were generally permitted freedom of movement in the receiving State, and that the receiving State was to provide assistance in the obtaining of facilities. Moreover, the Headquarters Agreement specified that principal resident representatives were entitled to the same privileges and immunities as diplomatic envoys accredited to the United States. The combination of those provisions, considered in the light of the Vienna Convention (particularly the provisions regarding freedom of movement in the receiving State), would seem to limit the applicability of section 13 (d) of the Headquarters Agreement.

47. Relations between the United States and missions to the United Nations were not based on traditional bilateral arrangements. The application of the principle of reciprocity to representatives of States Members of the United Nations was unacceptable. By applying retaliatory measures to permanent missions to the United Nations as well as to the diplomatic missions accredited to it, the United States brought to bear additional pressure upon the State concerned, against which that State could not retaliate. The United States derived definite benefits from its unique position as host to the United Nations Headquarters, and its legal position vis-à-vis missions was regulated by the Charter, the General Convention and the Headquarters Agreement. No legal basis could be found in those instruments for the United States practice with regard to reciprocity and discrimination.

48. The Headquarters Agreement was the most directly relevant of the international instruments. Under section 26, the provisions of the General Convention and of the Headquarters Agreement were to be treated as complementary. Section 15 stipulated that permanent representatives "shall, whether residing inside or outside the headquarters district, be entitled in the territory of the United States to the same privileges and immunities, subject to corresponding conditions and obligations, as [the United States] accords to diplomatic envoys accredited to it." No restrictions were permissible with regard to the area in which members of permanent delegations might reside.

/...

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

49. The State Department's own legal adviser affirmed that the Charter of the United Nations did not permit the imposition of conditions of reciprocity on the granting of privileges and immunities under Article 105; the purpose of the Charter with regard to Article 105 was to provide for the unconditional granting by Member States of certain privileges and immunities to the United Nations so that it might function effectively as a world organization untrammelled in its operation by national requirements of reciprocity or national measures of retaliation among States. It had been the understanding of the Secretariat that the privileges and immunities granted should generally be those afforded to the diplomatic corps as a whole, and should not be subject to particular conditions imposed, on the basis of reciprocity, upon the diplomatic missions of particular States.

50. In an official note, the Legal Counsel of the United Nations had said that the Charter of the United Nations and the Headquarters Agreement did not permit selective treatment of the representatives of Members on the basis of reciprocity; permanent missions to the United Nations were accredited to the United Nations, not to the United States; they all had equal rights. The note had also indicated that the Secretary-General would continue to feel obligated to assert the rights and interests of the Organization on behalf of representatives of Members. It was clear that discriminatory treatment of the resident Libyan representative lacked juridical support, because there was no evidence that the Englewood residence was in a security zone. Furthermore, the travel restrictions imposed on his immediate family and staff were contrary to the applicable norms of international law.

51. On 20 September 1985, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States Federal Court had dismissed the Englewood case against Libya. The Court had ruled, inter alia, that Libya held the property solely for use by the Permanent Representative to the United Nations, for activities directly related to the purposes of the Mission, and, accordingly, that the Libyan Ambassador's residence was entitled to sovereign immunity, pursuant to both United States federal law and international law. However, the United States Government had refused to modify its position, or to lift its restrictions on the members of the Libyan Mission.

52. Libya had tried, with the assistance of the Legal Counsel of the United Nations, to negotiate a settlement of the dispute with the representatives of the host country. It had participated in three meetings, but the fourth had been cancelled by the host country without explanation. Libya had since expressed its willingness to resume negotiations, but had not received a reply. In addition to the merits of the case, the question of the appropriate forum for resolving any legal dispute or difference of views between Libya and the host country required further consideration. Indeed, the question of relations with the host country should be given serious consideration at the forty-second session of the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 135: DRAFT STANDARD RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/C.6/41/L.20)

53. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft decision A/C.6/41/L.20 without a vote.

54. It was so decided.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 123: PROGRESSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRINCIPLES AND NORMS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW RELATING TO THE NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/41/536, A/C.6/41/L.22)

55. Mr. KALINKIN (Secretary of the Committee) said that Colombia, Romania and Zambia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/41/L.22.

AGENDA ITEM 134: DRAFT BODY OF PRINCIPLES FOR THE PROTECTION OF ALL PERSONS UNDER ANY FORM OF DETENTION OR IMPRISONMENT (A/C.6/41/L.19 and L.21)

56. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that the corrections suggested by his delegation should be reflected in the report.

57. Mr. KALINKIN (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretariat would make the necessary corrections.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.