



## General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/42/PV.108  
24 March 1988

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 22 March 1988, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic)

- Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country [136] (continued)
  - (a) Reports of the Secretary-General
  - (b) Draft resolution
- Programme of work

---

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 136 (continued)

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRY:

- (a) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/42/915 and Add.1-3)
- (b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/42/L.48)

Mr. PEÑALOSA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): Colombia is speaking once again from this rostrum to reiterate its defence of the principle of pacta sunt servanda, which lays down the binding nature of international agreements and their fulfilment in good faith as provided by our Charter.

It is evident that a State cannot establish domestic legislation that violates or disregards international rules. International rules establish de facto limitations upon domestic laws, and to accept the primacy of domestic laws over international laws may lead nations to become dependent upon the whims of States and their political or economic interests.

The delegation of Colombia supports the efforts of this Assembly to prevent the deterioration of the impasse that has emerged between our Organization and the host country, the United States, in the light of the interpretation of the Lake Success agreement.

The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties itself establishes that no country that is a party to an agreement may invoke the decisions of its domestic laws to justify non-compliance with an international agreement.

For all the foregoing reasons, we believe that any interpretation made concerning the interpretation and scope of the Headquarters Agreement of 1947 should be made exclusively within the framework of international jurisdiction. We

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

believe that it would be not only an error but also a dangerous precedent that would endanger the very philosophy of this Organization if a decision on so delicate a matter were to be left to the discretion of national courts or domestic jurisdiction.

We are fully convinced that this Assembly, with the assistance of the good offices of the Secretary-General and his competent assistants, will ultimately find a formulation that will enable us to prevent this delicate situation from deteriorating into a crisis that might compromise the very future of our Organization.

Ms. NORIEGA (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): Let me first of all express my delegation's satisfaction at seeing you, Sir, presiding over these meetings on the delicate question before us.

When this Assembly met three weeks ago to consider a problem which in the judgement of many delegations should never have arisen, a glimmer of hope was still visible that the universal outcry of the world community would change the course of events and ensure the victory of reason and integrity in the conduct of the party involved.

Even the representatives of the host country have in several instances acknowledged that the legislation promulgated by the United States President and adopted by the United States Congress on 22 December 1987 - legislation ordering the closing of the offices of the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in New York - is a violation of the Headquarters Agreement signed in 1947.

This represents an unscrupulous policy of faits accomplis and of disdain for deliberation and reason, for ethical and legal principles, and for the solemn tradition which for decades has been the foundation of international relations and multilateral co-operation among nations.

The host country has been unable to reconcile its domestic legislation with its international obligations freely contracted four decades ago. Indeed, it has unilaterally decided to disregard the latter, setting aside principles of universal application which require that obligations contracted in international treaties take precedence over domestic law.

This type of conflict over interpretation of the letter and spirit of the Headquarters Agreement was the subject of a number of safeguards included in section 21. That section provides the procedure for the appointment of arbitrators

(Ms. Noriega, Panama)

in disputes that cannot be settled through negotiation. It also stipulates that the International Court of Justice may be requested to hand down an advisory opinion on the legal aspects of disputes and the application of the appropriate procedure.

All of the foregoing is aimed precisely at avoiding the infringement or invalidation of the Agreement through a unilateral interpretation by the host country.

Yet this is exactly what has come to pass, and now that we are confronted with this flagrant violation we observe with amazement the persistence of the host country and its obsessive determination to act contrary to the law in all instances, regardless of whom it affects or what the consequences may be.

The precedent being established by this illegal conduct goes beyond a mere removal of the PLO from the territory of the United States or from the bodies of this Organization: it is the United Nations which has suffered the harshest blow to its integrity and to the basic principle of its authority. Its independence and ability to function have been irreparably undermined because, even if only on this occasion, it has been made subject to the whims and prejudices of the host country.

In sections 11, 12 and 13 the Agreement lays down the obligations of the host country with respect to receiving and providing facilities to those who are invited by the United Nations to participate in its work. The PLO was recognized and invited by the United Nations to participate in its deliberations by virtue of resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 24 November 1974, and as such it is covered by article IV of the Headquarters Agreement, specifically by the aforementioned articles 11, 12 and 13. Consequently the host country cannot, on the basis of its own problems and relations with those organizations that are invited by the United Nations, set up any obstacle to the access they require to United Nations Headquarters - unless it

(Ms. Noriega, Panama)

decides, as indeed it has done, to ignore the Agreement and to sap it of all elements of good faith, which, presumably, was the foundation for its signature and was to be the basis for its fulfilment.

Hence there has been a breach of the principle of pacta sunt servanda, which establishes the inviolability of treaty obligations and has for centuries served as the basis for civilized society and the community of nations.

The PLO is today the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. It maintains relations with more than 100 countries and has observer missions in more than 80 countries and international organizations. As such, its voice should be heard, and to exclude it from this world forum, the United Nations, is to deprive the Palestinian people of the elementary right of representation.

In being unable to provide a forum for the PLO, the integrity and representativity of the United Nations has been dealt a severe blow. This affects its capacity to fulfil its difficult and lofty mandate, most especially in the case of the Middle East conflict, which fundamentally is a problem concerning the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Could there be any credibility or viability to any solution in which one of the parties is not represented?

When one speaks of democracy in the Organization's host country is it mere lip service? Does it pertain only to what happens within these borders, or do other people in other parts of the planet have the same rights, including the basic democratic right to be represented and to have one's voice heard? We need hardly emphasize that a Founding Member of the United Nations - and a permanent member of the Security Council - is in duty bound to apply these concepts fairly and even-handedly.

(Ms. Noriega, Panama)

Or are different standards being applied arbitrarily to different countries, depending on the goals of the moment? If so, we have reverted, de facto, but never de jure, to the pattern of conduct of those whose only law is their own strength.

In circumstances as serious and disturbing as those now being experienced by this Organization, my delegation expresses its unqualified support for the Secretary-General's undertakings, in particular the contents of his note contained in annex I of document A/42/915/Add.3.

Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): It is most unfortunate that circumstances have made it necessary for the General Assembly to be called into session once again to resume consideration of agenda item 136, entitled "Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country", in so far as it relates to the action contemplated by the host country, the United States of America, against the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to the United Nations in New York.

The issues at stake in this problem are not confined to relations between the United States and the PLO. They go far beyond those relations: in fact, they strike at the roots of international law and at treaty obligations governing relations between the United Nations and its Member States. I have in mind the Headquarters Agreement of 26 June 1947 which the United States concluded with the United Nations.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

Acting in support of the principle of universality, it has been the practice of the United Nations General Assembly from its inception to invite to its sessions a wide range of observers, including non-member States, international organizations and national liberation movements. Such invitations are indeed encouraged by the United Nations Charter, and they are extended so that the United Nations can obtain the views and opinions of observers on matters in which they have special knowledge or as representatives of groups or peoples whose views are essential for the proper consideration of matters which directly affect their interests. By providing observers with the opportunity to exercise those rights the General Assembly is supporting the principle of universality. In return, the Assembly has gained access to documents and information that would not otherwise have been available.

As is well known, the General Assembly in 1974 accorded the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) official observer status, thus enabling it to take part in the Assembly's proceedings. The host country, in fulfilment of its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement, agreed to the PLO's establishing its presence in New York and duly recognized its status as an Observer Mission. It was recognized that the Observer Mission should have the right to maintain offices and communications so that it could discharge its role and responsibility towards the United Nations efficiently and effectively and be allowed free transit for its representatives within the territorial jurisdiction of the host country.

It was thus a matter of great disappointment and concern to all of us when the host country, the United States, announced that it would close the office of the PLO Observer Mission in New York on or about 21 March 1988. The reason given was that the Attorney General of the United States had determined that he was required to do so because of domestic legislation enacted by the United States Congress. That development has brought into conflict the international obligations assumed by



(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

the United States under the Headquarters Agreement with the United Nations and its domestic legislation. The consequences deriving from the host country's decisions could have a damaging impact on the whole concept of the United Nations role in international affairs.

Headquarters Agreements have been signed between the United Nations and many countries throughout the world where United Nations offices are established. In all cases those Agreements have worked to the satisfaction of all concerned. The role of the Organization demands that it be enabled to work independently of domestic politics and in fulfilment of its responsibilities under the Charter. It must be able to function without the host Government encroaching on its independence. Under the Headquarters Agreement the host country is obliged to ensure that the premises of Observer Missions to the United Nations are not violated and that they are not subjected to any restrictions that would affect their normal functioning.

In the view of my delegation the present dispute over the Observer Mission of the PLO should be settled under the procedures described in section 21 of the Headquarters Agreement. The United States should be persuaded to agree to the request of the Secretary-General to recognize formally that such a dispute exists and that it be resolved in accordance with the settlement procedure provided under the Headquarters Agreement.

Much time and effort has been spent on problems that need not have developed in the first place had there been scrupulous respect for honouring international obligations. In this regard I should like to pay tribute to the role being played by the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar. He has made every attempt to resolve this problem with the host country in an amicable manner within the framework of the Headquarters Agreement. Unfortunately, from his report in

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

document A/42/915/Add.2 of 11 March 1988 it would appear that the United States is determined to pursue a unilateral course of action in this matter regardless of its consequences.

It was not until 11 March 1988 that the Permanent Representative of the United States replied to the Secretary-General's letters of 14 January, 11 February and 4 March, as well as to General Assembly resolutions 42/229 A and B of 2 March 1988. While we had hoped that the delay taken in replying to those communications could imply a change in attitude on the part of the host country we find, much to our dismay, that the United States Attorney General intends to initiate legal action to close the Permanent Observer Mission of the PLO on or about 21 March 1988.

My delegation strongly supports the position taken by the Secretary-General. The facts he has presented on these issues are unassailable and accord strictly with the terms and provisions of the Agreement and with international law.

It is the view of my delegation that the Permanent Observer Mission of the PLO is covered by the Headquarters Agreement and that the PLO has entitlements and the right, under Article 105 of the Charter, to establish and maintain premises and adequate functional facilities, and that the personnel of the Mission must be enabled to enter and remain in the United States to carry out their official functions.

My delegation sincerely hopes that the host Government, as a founder Member of the Organization and having been a strong proponent of the rule of law in international relations, will abide by its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement and act in accordance with the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. PITARKA (Albania): The very fact that the forty-second session of the General Assembly has been resumed for the second time to consider the decision of the United States Congress to close down the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to the United Nations shows clearly not only the concern and preoccupation of the international community but also the resolute opposition of the overwhelming majority of Member States to that arbitrary decision.

(Mr. Pitarka, Albania)

The decision has rightly been condemned as a flagrant violation of the Headquarters Agreement, an open and dangerous intrusion into the internal affairs of the United Nations by the host country and a serious threat to the integrity and independence of this world body. The delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania fully endorses this assessment and joins the lawful protest of the majority of the Member States against this blatant violation of international law and this grave challenge to our Organization. The Albanian delegation approves of the efforts made and the position taken by the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, concerning this issue, and appreciates his protest in his last letter addressed to the Acting Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, in which he rightly points out:

"In particular, I cannot accept the statement contained in the letter that the United States may act irrespective of its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement, and I would ask you to reconsider the serious implications of this statement given the responsibilities of the United States as the host country." (A/42/915/Add.3, annex I)

In his report to the Ninth Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania, the leader of the Party and the Albanian people, comrade Ramiz Alia, stressed:

"... Violations of the sovereign rights of peoples, unrestrained aggressiveness and brutality, trampling underfoot the norms and principles of international law, and disregard for public opinion, constitute the fundamental features of the foreign policy of United States imperialism".

The hegemonic policy of the United States and its incessant acts of aggression, its open interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States in many parts of the world, which constitute a flagrant violation of the Charter and of international law, the repeated refusal to accept and abide by the decisions of the United

(Mr. Pitarka, Albania)

Nations General Assembly and its organs concerning legal procedures and its refusal to respect its international obligations - these are clear evidence of that irrefutable fact. It is again proved by the decision of the United States Congress to close the PLO Mission to the United Nations, a new attempt by the United States openly to challenge our Organization, the international community, and to impose the will and diktat of a major Power. The imposition of United States domestic legislation above international law and jurisprudence cannot be considered otherwise. Before international law there are not, and can never be, big States and small States. The hegemonism and the diktat of a major Power are entirely unacceptable to the sovereign peoples and countries, which decisively reject it, and will always reject and fight against it strongly and uncompromisingly.

In the case of the present decision of the United States Congress, we are confronted with a cardinal political issue which concerns not only the integrity and the normal and independent functioning of our Organization, but also a very acute international political problem, of which the United Nations has been seized for over 40 years - the Palestinian problem and the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the return to their plundered fatherland.

The choice by the United States Congress of the political moment to compile the so-called Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987 was no accident. The law was drafted and approved precisely at a time when the whole of public opinion - Arab and international - was expressing unanimous support for a just solution of the problem of the Middle East - primarily the Palestinian problem. It was precisely the time when it was showing international support for the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, to create their own sovereign and independent State, as well as the indisputable right to participate in every process for the solution of the problem.

(Mr. Pitarka, Albania)

It is likewise no accident that the moment chosen for the announcement of the decision was the time when the Palestinian population as a whole in the occupied territories had risen up in a genuine and powerful popular revolt against the unprecedented violence and criminal actions of the Israeli occupiers. That massive popular revolt, which enjoys the wide support and backing of freedom-loving peoples and countries, is an open expression of the determination of the martyred Palestinian people to realize as soon as possible their legitimate national aspiration to the creation of their own sovereign and independent State.

At the same time, like the decision to deprive the Palestinian people of the right to be represented in our Organization, the latest so-called Middle East peace plan of the United States Administration is further clear evidence of the anti-Palestinian and anti-Arab policies of the United States, in open support for the aggressive and annexionist schemes of its instrument in the region, Israel. This new United States initiative, called a transitional agreement, deliberately fully ignores the Palestinian problem, the undeniable right of the Palestinian people to create their national independent State. It offers the Palestinians only a deceitful call to stop their revolt. That is why it has been condemned and denounced as an anti-Palestinian and anti-Arab plan and has been turned down with contempt by the Palestinian and other Arab peoples.

The many representatives of Member States who voice their concern are right when they say that the United States decision to close the PLO Permanent Observer Mission to the United Nations, in open violation of the Headquarters Agreement, constitutes a serious threat of setting a dangerous precedent for the violation of the Agreement by the host country, particularly regarding the representation in international forums of the Observers of the national liberation movements of the various peoples still fighting for freedom and independence, self-determination

(Mr. Pitarka, Albania)

and their national identity. Their representation is a legitimate and undeniable right of those peoples, a right which is supported and defended by the overwhelming majority of the international community. It is a right that was sanctioned a long time ago by the decisions of the General Assembly and by the Charter itself. It is therefore necessary that it be strongly and resolutely safeguarded by the international community, which must fight with perseverance every attempt and action that goes against the will of the majority and international law.

Historical experience has shown, and the practice of our time is confirming, that both retreating in the face of the pressures of the imperialist Powers - above all, the two super-Powers - and illusions about the possibility of correcting their policy have caused, and are causing, great damage to the peoples' freedom, sovereignty and international security. The peoples' aspirations and their interests, the cause of peace and world security, require of all sovereign and peace-loving countries their determined opposition and struggle against the aggressive policy and activities of the super-Powers, against their efforts to establish their hegemony throughout the world, to impose their will and diktat.

Mr. SUYOI (Brunei Darussalam): When we met three weeks ago in resumed session to discuss the closing of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Mission in New York, as a result of Title X of the United States Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989, the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987, the Assembly was almost unanimous in adopting the two draft resolutions, A/42/L.46 and L.47. The near unanimity with which we adopted them ought to send a strong message to the United States Government about the position of 143 member countries regarding the United States international obligation under the Headquarters Agreement.

(Mr. Suyoi, Brunei Darussalam)

The General Assembly was encouraged more than anything else by the statement of the representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Herbert Okun, who said, inter alia, that

"The United States Government will consider carefully the views expressed during this resumed session."

He further said that

"It remains the intention of [the United States] Government to find an appropriate resolution of this problem in the light of the Charter of the United Nations, the Headquarters Agreement and the laws of the United States".  
(A/42/PV.104, p. 59)

But despite those reassuring words, the Secretary-General was informed by Ambassador Okun himself, in a letter annexed to the report of the Secretary-General, the content of which is well known to us:

"that the Attorney General of the United States has determined that he is required by the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987 to close the office of the Palestine Liberation Organization Observer Mission to the United Nations in New York, irrespective of any obligations the United States may have under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations." (A/42/915/Add.2, annex I)

We are meeting today in another resumed session to remind the host country again that the Headquarters Agreement is an internationally binding treaty which must be complied with by parties to it. And once again, my delegation feels it necessary to address the Assembly on the issue of the closure of the PLO office to express our grave concern over the decision of the United States Government to proceed with this move.



(Mr. Suyoi, Brunei Darussalam)

There is no doubt in our mind - or in the minds of all other delegations present here - that the United States move to close the PLO office is in violation of the Headquarters Agreement. If it is implemented, as the Attorney General has indicated it will be, it will have grave consequences not only for the status of the United Nations Headquarters Agreement signed between the United States and the United Nations, but also for the viability of the United Nations itself.

Virtually all delegations have expressed that concern and have appealed to the United States Government to reconsider its decision. It is still not too late to do something about it, and the international community expects the United States to respect its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement, among which is the obligation to ensure that the United Nations be allowed to function without impediment from the host country.

Many delegations have also voiced the fear that while it is the PLO office which is subject to closure the ramifications of such an action are far-reaching and could be damaging to the very institution the United States helped found.

We wish to reiterate our position on this matter. The PLO is an invitee of the United Nations by virtue of resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974, and as has been categorically stated it is not accredited to the United States. It therefore does not fall under United States jurisdiction. The international community has decided that a realistic solution to the Palestinian question must include the participation of the PLO since it represents the Palestinian people. Its presence here in the United Nations is therefore of fundamental importance. The Headquarters Agreement states clearly that the United States as host country is under an international obligation to facilitate the discharge of duties by Permanent Missions and Permanent Observer Missions alike, without impediment. Indeed, adherence to that obligation by the host country since the Headquarters

(Mr. Suyoi, Brunei Darussalam)

Agreement came into effect in 1947 has enabled the United Nations to function in the manner intended by its founders, among which, incidentally, was the United States. It would be difficult to envision how this body would have functioned had it not until recently enjoyed the full support, co-operation and generosity of the Government of the United States as host country.

Just as the United Nations is strengthened by the support, co-operation and contribution of the United States, the United Nations could also be weakened by the withdrawal of such support. As a small country, Brunei Darussalam views the United Nations and what it stands for as a source of strength. My delegation therefore views with serious concern any weakening of the United Nations by any country, especially by a super-Power such as the United States.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to express its strong support for the Secretary-General in his unceasing effort to find a just solution to the present difficult situation in order to protect the integrity of the United Nations. My delegation continues to hope that the United States Government will respond positively to views expressed by delegations at this resumed session. We would like to believe that it is not the intention of the United States Government to weaken this world body by its unilateral decision to ignore its international obligations. We would like to believe that the United States Government in its infinite wisdom will find that the closing of the PLO office in New York would undermine any meaningful effort to seek a peaceful solution to the Palestinian problem. Last but not least, we would like to believe that the United States Government will realize that its proposed action is contrary to what it itself believes in and stands for.

Mr. HOHENFELLNER (Austria): On 1 March 1988, during the previous resumption of the forty-second session of the General Assembly, Austria expressed the hope that the question before us would be settled in accordance with existing obligations under international law.

Although three weeks have passed since then, we have to note with regret today that the question of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Observer Mission has not yet been resolved in accordance with resolution 42/229 A of 2 March 1988.

Austria would like to reiterate once again that it shares the Secretary-General's view that the members of the Observer Mission of the PLO are by virtue of resolution 3237 (XXIX) invitees of the United Nations and have to be treated in accordance with section 11 of the Headquarters Agreement of 1947. Taking further into account sections 12 and 13 of the Agreement, as well as Articles 104 and 105 of the Charter of the United Nations, we believe that the PLO must be permitted to maintain its Observer Mission at the United Nations in order to be able to carry out its official functions. We therefore deplore the decision made by the host country in this matter.

I should also like to re-emphasize our regret that the Secretary-General's consultations have not led to a satisfactory resolution of these problems. We are therefore of the opinion that a dispute exists between the United Nations and the host country, which should be settled in accordance with section 21 of the Headquarters Agreement. The dispute-settlement procedure should therefore be entered into by both parties, the United Nations and the host country. In the meantime, however, the PLO Observer Mission should be allowed to carry out its functions fully, as it has over the past 13 years.

Allow me in conclusion to express our hope that the Secretary-General and the host country will find appropriate ways and means to solve this issue in a satisfactory manner, and that they will settle it in full accordance with the obligations existing under international law.

Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): We are happy to see you amongst us once again presiding over our deliberations and giving them a positive impetus, although we would have preferred this to occur in more normal, more favourable circumstances.

My delegation refrained from participating in the first part of this debate, not out of any lack of interest - since that would have been inconsistent with our political and diplomatic support for the Palestine Liberation Organization, our commitments as a non-aligned country and a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and our concerns as a Member of the United Nations - but because at the beginning of the month we were still under the impression that the United States Government would honour its assurances of last year stemming from legal rationale in keeping with international practice. We truly believed that the Government of the host country, our interlocutor - we stress, our sole interlocutor - would, before 21 March, have come to an arrangement with the United States Congress to safeguard the integrity of the Headquarters Agreement. Legally, and in this particular case, nothing should exclude the search for, and the reaching of, a compromise formula between the Congress and Government, particularly since they had received satisfaction when, despite violations of freedom of information and expression, the PLO office in Washington was closed.

We felt even further reinforced in our position when the Acting Permanent Representative of the United States said that his Government would give careful consideration to opinions stated during the resumed session - which all stressed: the applicability of the Headquarters Agreement to the Permanent Observer Mission of the PLO to the United Nations; the existence of a dispute between the host country and the United Nations following the signing by the United States President of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act on 22 December 1987; and recourse to international arbitration once other methods of settlement had been exhausted.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

So, to our knowledge and, generally speaking, those were the positions that were defended in the past by the State Department, and when the United States Acting Permanent Representative stated, on 2 March, that

"It remains the intention of this Government to find an appropriate resolution of this problem in the light of the Charter of the United Nations, the

Headquarters Agreement and the laws of the United States", (A/42/PV.104, p. 59)

we thought that that enumeration of legal instruments was explicit recognition of the primacy of the Charter over the Agreement, and of the primacy of the Agreement over the domestic laws of the host country. That was our hope.

Our optimism was short-lived and our illusions were shattered by the publication of addenda 2 and 3 of the report of the Secretary-General. We pay tribute to him for the firm, unambiguous language he used, although some would have tried, for understandable reasons, to tone it down.

It is not a question of the United Nations interfering in the internal affairs of a Member State. It is not up to us to say who is right and who is wrong - the Justice Department, the State Department, or the Congress. But at the centre of this confusion, which is perhaps being deliberately maintained for political reasons, there is one objective fact: that the United States Government, in this particular case, does not intend, or is not in a position to comply with its international obligations. That is the first conclusion we draw from reading the letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the Acting Permanent Representative of the United States dated 11 March 1988. It may seem categorical, but it is based on our commitment to two practices of international law which some schools have established as principles: the imposition by a State of a limitation on sovereign rights when it becomes party to a treaty, a convention, an agreement or a contract

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

and the primacy, in case of dispute, of the provisions of international law over those of domestic law, which is a corollary to the foregoing.

The recent action by the United States Department of Justice seems to challenge these two points, perhaps because of the absolute but theoretical right of a State to independence, which is sometimes called the external manifestation of sovereignty. In practice, to disregard obligations of the Headquarters Agreement is tantamount to denouncing all or part of it in order to recover sovereignty which cannot be restricted. This situation is extremely serious for the United Nations since the Headquarters Agreement could be superseded by the successive enactment of domestic laws. Thus its whole essence -

"to enable the United Nations at its Headquarters in the United States, fully and efficiently, to discharge its responsibilities and fulfil its purposes" -

(General Assembly resolution 169 (II), section 27)

could be obscured.

How long ago, it seems, since the House of Representatives and the United States Senate unanimously invited the United Nations to establish its permanent Headquarters in the United States. And how soon may we have to act out the classical drama of Tite et Bérénice, in which Titus was compelled to send Bérénice away, despite what either of them wished?

The second conclusion that we draw from the communication of the United States Mission is that the United States Government does not wish to submit the dispute between it and the United Nations to arbitration, despite the existence of an arbitration clause in the Headquarters Agreement. The ambiguity maintained by disregard for constitutional law and United States legislative law has given time to play with the terms "promulgation", "signing" and "application" and to deny the existence of a dispute. This ambiguity has now been removed, because it is clear

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

that the opinions of the United Nations and the United States clearly differ on at least two points: the first is the applicability of Title X of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act to the Permanent Mission of the PLO; the second is mandatory recourse to arbitration in a dispute, which is one of the general principles of law recognized by so-called civilized nations.

It was not our intention to preempt the advisory opinion that will be handed down by the International Court of Justice. However, the letter sent by the Acting Permanent Representative of the United States and that sent by the United States Attorney General brings us to the conclusion that the United States wants to resolve this twofold dispute by its own methods. This indefensible notion cannot fail to lead to a reductio ad absurdum and to the conclusion that only arbitration is valid, particularly since the Headquarters Agreement has not been denounced.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

This is another aspect of the problem that leaves us perplexed: We are told that the Department of Justice of the United States intends to take action in a United States federal court to ensure that the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) complies with the provisions of the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987. There are three reasons for our perplexity.

First, why turn the question of the compatibility of the Headquarters Agreement with the so-called Act - to the extent that it is applicable to the PLO - into a question of the duty of the PLO to comply with that Act? That manoeuvre can only create confusion and seriously harm the Organization.

Secondly, let us suppose that a federal court rules that the PLO must comply with the provisions of that Act and yield to its injunctions. Would the United States Government, in the light of its international obligations, appeal to the Supreme Court? Conversely, if a federal court were to rule that there was no reason why the PLO should comply with the Act, as regards the maintenance of the Permanent Mission to the United Nations, would the Department of Justice, which is responsible for enforcing the Act, appeal that decision to the Supreme Court? Very contradictory hypotheses are possible, in so far as the conclusions that each of us can draw from them shed light on the true intentions of the host country.

Finally, we wonder whether the outcome of the court case would be confined to the taking of a decision by the federal court or would be subject to recourse to another instance, either national or international.

At this stage, we must have clear information if we want the Secretary-General to be able to plead effectively on behalf of the Organization. For, in the final analysis, even if the PLO is the primary victim, even if we all feel concerned, the



(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

fact is that the Organization, whose legal responsibility is engaged, must act so that its credibility and rights are not further damaged.

We are aware of the existence of several contradictions. We know that, whatever the outcome of the question we are now considering, a bitter aftertaste will be left, especially in the mouths of those who, like us, cannot accept a situation in which attempts to eliminate the Palestinian people on the ground are accompanied by efforts to reduce its sole, legitimate representative to a non-entity at the diplomatic level - whether what is involved is its participation in an international conference or merely its representation at the United Nations.

We believe that the search for a compromise, in the legal meaning of that word, is preferable to the maintenance of an intransigent attitude, however valid it may appear ideologically to its advocates. Whichever way we look, the only reasonable and legal way to resolve this "unfortunate business" is by recourse to international arbitration - unless a third party comes forward, even at this late hour, to initiate a procedure of conciliation.

Mrs. OSODE (Liberia): For the second time in one month, Sir, you are presiding over the General Assembly. This unprecedented occurrence, bespeaking the troubled times through which the international community is passing, affords Liberia the opportunity to continue, through you, to contribute to the cause of peace by helping, in the words of the Charter, to establish conditions under which justice and respect for obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained. Your vast experience and proven diplomatic skills assure my delegation that you will continue to guide the work of this resumed session of the General Assembly to productive results.

Despite the setbacks it has suffered, the United Nations holds out great promise that the prejudices, hatred and greed which brought about two world wars,

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

with the attendant consequences, can be tamed by the shared earnest commitment of all nations to promote international co-operation, peace and social progress. And today mankind's increasing interdependence makes it more imperative to adhere to the universal call for peaceful coexistence and international goodwill. These fundamental concepts, which embody the *raison d'être* of the United Nations, cannot be subserved by transient political expediences.

Puzzled exasperation was the reaction of my delegation to the recent letter from Ambassador Herbert S. Okun addressed to the Secretary-General, which stated that the Attorney General of the United States was determined to close the office of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)

"irrespective of any obligation the United States may have under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations". (A/42/915/Add.2, annex I)

This letter, together with that from the Attorney General of the United States of America resorting to an ultimatum, was a precise threat, with a time limit which has produced deep apprehension and gloom in the Assembly. It is all the more disappointing because it is the United States of America, a magnanimous country, which has created this dangerous precedent, amounting to what most speakers view as disrespect for legality.

The decision by the United States, the host country of our Organization, to expel from its territory the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations does not accord with the Headquarters Agreement signed between the United States and the United Nations on 26 June 1947. Hence, the applicability to the PLO of sections 11, 12 and 13 of that Agreement cannot be determined unilaterally.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

What has been significant in this debate has been the fact that nearly all the participants in it have spoken energetically in defence of a principle which, if abandoned, would put into serious question the credibility of our Organization. And, also, this debate has enabled the main lines of the controversy and the underlying attitudes of those on either side to be clearly seen. What emerges increasingly is that it is a dispute involving the role of the United Nations in international relations.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

If that is the case, then it follows that the dispute settlement procedure under section 21 of the Headquarters Agreement should be invoked formally in order to preserve the integrity and viability of our Organization. In this connection, my delegation supports the Secretary-General's nomination of Mr. Eduardo Jimenez de Arechaga as arbitrator.

My delegation strongly believes that in bringing this urgent matter before this body Member States had no intention to subject the foreign or domestic policy of the host country to majority decisions of the United Nations. Such action has been made necessary because the United States Government is not unaware that a body of rules designed to give direction to an institution amounts to nothing if its promulgators do not respect and promise the application thereof, irrespective of the strength and power of those to whom it is addressed. The United Nations Headquarters Agreement is no exception. We believe that the United States Government finds itself in accord with this view.

My delegation would like to express its appreciation to the Secretary-General, who has continued to carry out that part of his mandate with courage, irrespective of the strength and power of those to whom it is addressed. The United Nations Headquarters Agreement is no exception. Because the Secretary-General continues to uphold the principles of the Charter and the Headquarters Agreement, among other things, thus ensuring the interests of our Organization, its Member States, non-member States as well as invitees, he has put his stamp upon the minds of those who fight for peace, justice and dignity.

Finally, my delegation entertains the hope that the same spirit and dreams which inspired President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his contemporaries to conceive the idea of a body of nations devoted to serving the purpose of international

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

co-operation, peace and security will permeate the minds of decision-makers in Washington and engender a rethinking of Title X of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1988-1989 as it relates to the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): This is the first time in the history of the United Nations that the General Assembly has had two resumed sessions within a period of scarcely three months since the suspension of the forty-second session to consider one specific item that was in fact already taken up at that time. This fact reflects the seriousness of the matter we are now discussing and shows the general awareness of all Member States of the repercussions this question can have on the future of the United Nations, its independence and effectiveness.

The decision by the United States to close the office of the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PIO) to the United Nations is a flagrant violation of the Headquarters Agreement. This is the first time that that Agreement has been so sorely tested. The unanimity of objection to that decision shows the acute danger that exists with regard to the future of our Organization and the question of its universality that has been enshrined in our Organization over the last 40 years. Although we are all aware that the problem before us represents more than a mere legal issue and that it reflects a United States political position hostile to the Palestinian people, my delegation cannot but agree with the views expressed by previous speakers who have dealt with the legal aspects of the problem.

By its decision the United States has set a very dangerous precedent for relations between a host country and international organizations, in refusing to abide by the arbitration procedures provided for in section 21 of the Headquarters

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

Agreement and to appear before the International Court of Justice. Given the apparent differences of opinion between the United States Congress and the United States Administration, we believe that it is possible for the Administration to counter the action of the Congress, if it wishes to do so. However, the position of the United States Administration giving precedence to domestic law over international law leaves us with some misgivings. The United States Administration could have at least gone to the American courts to obtain a decision on this question.

In conclusion, since the offices of the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations may in fact be closed, international law may perhaps be violated and the credibility of the United Nations and its future may be undermined. Nevertheless, we are certain that the Palestinian people will not be reduced to silence and that its rights will not be infringed by that decision; its resistance will not be weakened so long as it has not secured its inalienable national rights through its sole, legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): Before calling on the next speaker, I invite the representative of Tunisia to introduce the draft resolution in document A/42/L.48.

Mr. GHEZAL (Tunisia) (interpretation from Arabic): On the basis of our conviction of the need to provide guarantees for the preservation of the inviolability of the United Nations, its Charter, its Members and observer staff and the Headquarters Agreement, and to safeguard its independence and freedom of action, and taking into consideration the pioneering role of the United Nations as an irreplaceable framework for the maintenance of international peace and security, for resolving regional and international disputes and in defence of the just causes

(Mr. Ghezal, Tunisia)

of peoples, and on the basis of the principles of international law governing relations between States and international organizations and the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and the provisions of the Headquarters Agreement concluded between the United Nations and the host country, I have the honour to introduce to the General Assembly the draft resolution in document A/42/L.48 on behalf of my own delegation - the delegation of Tunisia - and the delegations of the following Member States:

(Mr. Ghezal, Tunisia)

Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Comoros, the Congo - which was not a sponsor of resolution 42/229 of 2 March for technical reasons beyond the control of the Congolese delegation - Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierre Leone, Somalia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Arab Emirates, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The General Assembly has been convened in accordance with its resolution 42/229 A, which provides for keeping the question under agenda item 136 of the forty-second session under active review, and its decision 42/461 of 2 March 1988, and following issuance of the Secretary-General's reports in documents A/42/915/Add.2 of 11 March 1988 and A/42/915/Add.3 of 16 March 1988, since the Government of the host country, the United States of America, decided to implement the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987 providing for the closing of the office of the Permanent Observer Mission of the PLO to the United Nations in New York,

"irrespective of any obligations the United States may have under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations". (A/42/915/Add.2, annex I)

This reflects the host country's disregard of its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement, into which it entered freely with the United Nations, and its rejection of the legal procedure provided for in the Agreement for any dispute arising between the two parties.



(Mr. Ghezal, Tunisia)

The draft resolution before the General Assembly is being introduced in light of the failure of the host country's Government to respond to the repeated efforts of the Secretary-General to resolve the dispute between the host country and the United Nations on the basis of section 21 of the Headquarters Agreement and in light of the host country's failure to respond positively to the relevant General Assembly resolutions, especially resolution 42/229 A, at its meeting of 2 March 1988, in which it affirmed that the application of the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987 "would be contrary to the international legal obligations of the host country under the Headquarters Agreement". (para. 3)

The General Assembly then called upon the host country "to abide by its treaty obligations under the Agreement and to provide assurances that no action will be taken that would infringe on the current arrangements for the official functions of the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations in New York". (para. 5)

Hence draft resolution A/42/L.48 includes in its operative part the following:

"Strongly supports the position taken by the Secretary-General and expresses its great appreciation for his reports;

"Reaffirms that the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations in New York is covered by the provisions of the Agreement ... and that the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) has the right to establish and maintain premises and adequate functional facilities and that the personnel of the Mission should be enabled to enter and remain in the United States to carry out their official functions;

"Affirms the crucial importance of the Agreement ...;

(Mr. Ghezal, Tunisia)

"Determines that the application ... of Title X of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 ... is contrary to the international legal obligations of the host country under the Headquarters Agreement;

"Reaffirms that a dispute exists between the United Nations and the United States of America, the host country, concerning the interpretation or application of the Headquarters Agreement, and that the dispute settlement procedure provided for under section 21 of the Agreement, which constitutes the only legal remedy to solve the dispute, should be set in operation, and requests the host country to name its arbitrator to the arbitral tribunal;

(Mr. Ghezal, Tunisia)

"Deplores the failure of the host country to comply with its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement;

"Urges the host country to abide by its international legal obligations ...;

"Requests the Secretary-General to take adequate measures on a preliminary basis, if necessary, in order to ensure the discharge of the official functions of the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations in New York;

"Requests the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to ensure the proper constitution of the arbitral tribunal ...;

"Further requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly without delay on developments in this matter;

"Decides to keep the matter under active review."

At this late hour we hope that the host country will respond positively to the position of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General and rely upon the legal solution provided in section 21 of the Headquarters Agreement, since that is the only means to solve the dispute legally and definitively. In so doing, we will have preserved the inviolability of the United Nations and the immunity of international law and we will have renewed our commitment to respect for the principles and spirit of the United Nations Charter.

Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community.

The Twelve have repeatedly stated that the host country is under an obligation, in accordance with the Headquarters Agreement, to permit Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Observer Mission personnel to enter and to remain in

(Count York von Wartenburg,  
Federal Republic of Germany)

the United States to carry out their official functions at United Nations Headquarters. The Twelve therefore supported General Assembly resolution 42/229 A, which reaffirms that the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations in New York should be enabled to establish and maintain premises and adequate functional facilities.

A series of consultations and efforts have been undertaken on this matter, particularly by the Secretary-General, whom we fully support. Unfortunately, no satisfactory solution to the problem has so far been found and the situation seems to have become even more difficult.

The Twelve are concerned about the latest decision taken by the Attorney General of the United States to close the office of the PLO Observer Mission to the United Nations in New York pursuant to the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987, irrespective of the agreement between the United Nations and the United States regarding the United Nations Headquarters.

Provisions of internal law can never be invoked as justification for not performing treaty obligations, including, of course, those arising from the Headquarters Agreement. That Agreement is of great importance for the proper functioning of the United Nations and, accordingly, it must be observed with the utmost care if the world Organization is not to suffer serious damage.

In the view of the Twelve this dispute should be resolved through the dispute settlement procedure provided for in the Headquarters Agreement. Therefore, the Twelve urge that the arbitration procedure referred to in section 21 of the Headquarters Agreement should be commenced, with the participation of the host country.

(Count York von Wartenburg,  
Federal Republic of Germany)

The Twelve hope that this matter can still be resolved in a way consistent with the Headquarters Agreement and which allows the PLO to maintain its facilities and enables its personnel to carry out all official functions as Observer to the United Nations.

Mr. TANASIE (Romania): Like other countries Romania has followed with deep concern the latest developments in the dispute between the United Nations and the United States over the applicability of the provisions of the Headquarters Agreement of 26 June 1947 to the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). In that respect we wish to associate ourselves with those delegations that have expressed their full support to the Secretary-General for his continuous actions to guarantee full compliance with the Headquarters Agreement between the United Nations and the host country.

The information provided by the Secretary-General in his reports (A/42/915/Add.2 and 3) and the statements of the United States representatives show that the host country is not willing to abide by its treaty obligations and to provide assurance that no action will be taken that would infringe on the current arrangements for the official functions of the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations in New York.

We consider that the decision to close the office of the PLO Observer Mission to the United Nations in New York is a flagrant violation of the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations. Such an action is incompatible with the international treaty obligations of the United States towards the United Nations.

Romania has always supported United Nations resolutions calling upon the host country to do its utmost to guarantee the normal functioning of all permanent

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

missions, in particular by taking adequate measures to prohibit illegal activities of persons, groups and organizations that encourage, instigate, organize or engage in the perpetration of acts and activities against the security and safety of missions and representatives.

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

It is generally recognized that the Permanent Observer Mission of the PLO is covered by the provisions of the Headquarters Agreement of 1947; consequently, it should be able to establish and maintain appropriate premises and facilities, and the Mission's personnel should be able to enter and remain in the United States in order to carry out their official duties.

The delegation of Romania believes that the position stated by the Secretary-General in his report (A/42/915/Add.3) of 16 March 1988 is perfectly well founded from a legal point of view. We share the opinion that the statement made by the United States about the closing of the office of the PLO Observer Mission is unacceptable. We also join the Secretary-General in asking the United States to reconsider the serious implications of the statement, given the responsibilities of the host country under the Headquarters Agreement.

Certainly, even at this stage of the dispute between the United States and the United Nations, the answer to the question how to solve it is given by the relevant provisions of the Headquarters Agreement, which stipulates that any dispute between the two parties should be referred for final decision to arbitration. We believe that submission of the dispute to arbitration would serve a very useful purpose. Meanwhile, the host country should refrain from taking any measure to close the office of the PLO Permanent Mission. There is no doubt that any measure which would prevent the mission from discharging its official functions would be not only contrary to the Headquarters Agreement and to relevant United Nations resolutions, but also a serious violation of the United Nations Charter itself. That could have unpredictable consequences for the normal functioning of the world Organization as a whole.

It should be emphasized that any act to prevent the PLO from carrying out its activities at the United Nations would have a negative impact on the present efforts

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

to find a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the Middle East conflict. What is crucially and urgently needed now is recognition by all States of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and the prompt convening of an international conference under United Nations auspices.

In the light of that major requirement, the delegation of Romania joins other delegations in appealing once again to the United States to desist from taking any action which would be detrimental to the normal functioning of the Permanent Observer Mission of the PLO in New York. We encourage the Secretary-General to continue his efforts for the proper establishment of the arbitral tribunal provided for in the Headquarters Agreement.

We fully support the draft resolution. At the same time, we reiterate Romania's conviction that strict compliance with international law and the implementation in good faith of obligations assumed by States are of paramount importance for the maintenance of international peace and security, the observance of the purposes and principles of the United Nations and the promotion of friendly relations and co-operation among all members of the international community.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): In accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974, I now call on the Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization to give some additional information.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)): Today we have received the following hand-delivered letter from Edwin Meese III, United States Attorney General, from the office of the Attorney General, Washington, D.C. The letter is addressed to



(Mr. Terzi, Palestine Liberation  
Organization)

"Mr. Zuhdi Lahib Terzi" -

that is myself -

"Palestine Liberation Organization  
Observer Mission to the United Nations  
115 East 65th Street  
New York, New York"

and reads:

"Dear Mr. Terzi:

"This will acknowledge your letter of 14 March 1988.

"I am aware of your position that requiring closure of the Palestine Liberation Organization ('PLO') Observer Mission violates our obligations under the United Nations ('UN') Headquarters Agreement and, thus, international law. However, among a number of grounds in support of our action, the United States Supreme Court has held for more than a century that Congress has the authority to override treaties and, thus, international law for the purpose of domestic law. Here Congress has chosen, irrespective of international law, to ban the presence of all PLO offices in this country, including the presence of the PLO Observer Mission to the U.N. In discharging my obligation to enforce the law, the only responsible course available to me is to respect and follow that decision.

"Moreover, you should note that the Anti-Terrorism Act contains provisions in addition to the prohibition on the establishment or maintenance of an office by the PLO within the jurisdiction of the United States. In particular, I direct your attention to subsections 1003(a) and (b), which prohibit anyone from receiving or expending any monies from the PLO or its

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine Liberation  
Organization)

agents to further the interests of the PLO or its agents. All provisions of the Act become applicable on March 21, 1988.

"As we have previously informed you, the Department of Justice intends to take action, if necessary, in United States federal court to ensure your compliance with the requirements of the Act.

"If you have any further questions concerning this matter, you may contact the Department of Justice at (202) 633-2051.

Sincerely,

Edwin Meese III"

I thought the sending of such a letter at this juncture, when the General Assembly and the International Court of Justice are seized of the matter, speaks exactly for the respect the host country shows for its international legal obligations, as if neither the Assembly nor the Court, nor all the Members, had existed here or had expressed an opinion. We trust - indeed, we are sure - that the General Assembly will live up to its responsibilities and will take the proper action to defend and protect the Agreement, under which the PLO Mission to the United Nations will be safeguarded.

#### PROGRAMME OF WORK

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): Before adjourning, I should like to inform Members about our programme of work.

We still have one speaker for this item. Furthermore, a draft resolution on the item is now before the Assembly (A/42/L.48). We shall therefore hold a meeting tomorrow, Wednesday, 23 March, at 10.30 a.m. to conclude the debate and to take a decision on the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.