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

SIXTH COMMITTEE
51st meeting
held on
Tuesday, 29 November 1988
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 51st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. DENG (Sudan)

CONTENTS

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.6/43/SR.51
5 December 1988

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

88-57442 1038S (E)

15 P.

/...

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 133: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DRAFTING OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST THE RECRUITMENT, USE, FINANCING AND TRAINING OF MERCENARIES (continued) (A/C.6/43/L.13 (and programme budget implications in document A/C.6/43/L.19))

1. Mr. BAGE (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.13, which had been joined by Benin, said that the amendments to the fifth preambular paragraph proposed during informal consultations had not been accepted by some delegations. He therefore had the mandate of the sponsors to introduce the draft resolution as originally worded.

The meeting was suspended at 4.15 p.m. and resumed at 4.50 p.m.

2. The CHAIRMAN announced that a separate vote on the fifth preambular paragraph had been requested.

3. The fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.13 was adopted by 100 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.

4. The CHAIRMAN said that a vote would be taken on draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.13 as a whole.

5. Mr. SCHARIOTH (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on a point of order, said that he had wished to move that the draft resolution should be adopted on a no-objection basis.

6. The CHAIRMAN said that the motion was out of order because the voting had already begun.

7. Draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.13 was adopted by 122 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

8. Mr. ROUCOUNAS (Greece), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that the statement by the Twelve on 26 October 1988 had left no doubt as to their strong condemnation of the activities of mercenaries and their will to continue taking an active part in the Ad Hoc Committee's work aimed at the elaboration of a universally acceptable convention. In respect of the provision in the fourth preambular paragraph taken from the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, they emphasized that their approval of the resolution did not mean that they departed from the interpretation of that provision as adopted in the context of the Declaration. Moreover, in the fifth preambular paragraph, the term "threat or use of force" was broadened well beyond the meaning given to it in the Charter. With regard to the statement in the same paragraph that the activities of mercenaries were contrary to fundamental principles of international law, the

(Mr. Roucounas, Greece)

Twelve believed that the crimes of individuals acting on their own behalf, although clearly reprehensible, could not be imputed to States or, in the absence of a convention, be regarded as violations of international law. For those reasons, the Twelve had been unable to agree with the fifth preambular paragraph. They maintained their positive attitude to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, however, and were content to see the draft resolution adopted.

9. Mr. HAREL (Israel) said that his delegation considered certain substantive provisions of the draft convention to be problematic, such as those included in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee (A/43/43). At an appropriate time, his delegation would explain its position in a more detailed manner.

10. Mr. BRING (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that they had voted in favour of the draft resolution because they strongly condemned the activities of mercenaries and supported the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. At the same time, however, they were disappointed and concerned with developments in other forums. The overlapping between activities in the Economic and Social Council and the Third Committee on the one hand, and the Sixth Committee on the other hand, was unfortunate in itself and obviously also created a danger of conflict between those activities. In addition, the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was too far-reaching. The illegality of the recruitment, use, financing and training of mercenaries could not be established without taking into account the purposes which States sought to attain thereby. The Nordic States had therefore abstained in the vote on the fifth preambular paragraph.

11. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) noted that significant progress had been made in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the basis of consensus. He regretted that some delegations had chosen to depart from that basis of consensus and alter the draft resolution under consideration. His delegation had voted against the fifth preambular paragraph because it did not contain an accurate statement of the law. It was exceedingly curious that the phrase "by States" had been added, in the light of the recent use of mercenaries in Maldives, Seychelles and Guinea, by the out-of-power party rather than by States. Moreover, in the fourth preambular paragraph, the phrase from the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations had been taken wholly out of context. In that Declaration, the phrase was an undeniably accurate formulation of the meaning of Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter, and was properly formulated in the context of Article 51 of the Charter and the inherent right of self-defence. A State under attack by another State could not be deprived of the ability to resist by the use of irregular forces or armed bands, including mercenaries. His delegation would continue to try to approach the work of the Ad Hoc Committee in a spirit of co-operation. However, it was more difficult to achieve progress in an exercise not launched on the basis of consensus.

12. Mr. TARUI (Japan) said that his delegation supported the content of the draft resolution in general. It had abstained in the vote, however, because it was not in a position to agree with the statements in the fifth preambular paragraph. His

(Mr. Tarui, Japan)

delegation also had serious reservations about the action taken by the Third Committee without regard for the wishes of the Sixth Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee, which could only have a negative impact on the Ad Hoc Committee's work.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that Suriname would speak on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution.

14. Mr. WERNERS (Suriname) said that the matter contained in the draft resolution was of great concern for many developing countries, including Suriname.

15. Mr. YIMER (Ethiopia), speaking on a point of order, said that an explanation of vote by one of the sponsors of a draft resolution was not allowed under the rules of procedure.

16. The CHAIRMAN said it was his understanding that the representative of Suriname was not speaking in explanation of vote.

17. Mr. WERNERS (Suriname) said that, as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, Suriname had called on all peace-loving nations to support the Ad Hoc Committee in its endeavours to discharge its mandate as soon as possible. The international community in general, and the developed countries in particular, had a moral obligation not to delay the conclusion of such a convention. The many meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee could be seen as the beginning of an international concerted action against the recruitment, use, financing and training of mercenaries. He expressed the hope that, at the next session of the General Assembly, 10 years after the inclusion of the item in the agenda, the final results of the Ad Hoc Committee's work would be seen.

18. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 133.

AGENDA ITEM 136: DEVELOPMENT AND STRENGTHENING OF GOOD-NEIGHBOURLINESS BETWEEN STATES (continued) (A/C.6/43/L.14/Rev.1, L.20)

19. Mr. LUKIANOVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.14/Rev.1 because it contained nothing of substance but was rather a decision to defer the matter until the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly. Because of a lack of willingness on the part of some delegations on the other side, no compromise solution had been found that would be acceptable to all parties concerned.

20. Mr. VOICU (Romania) said that, despite his delegation's efforts to reach a consensus, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.14/Rev.1 had shown no flexibility. Although consensus was important, no country should be silenced for the sake of achieving it. The message of the draft resolution was simple: its

(Mr. Voicu, Romania)

sponsors did not want to have a sub-committee on good-neighbourliness, not even in 1990. Such a position was not in keeping with General Assembly resolution 39/78, adopted by consensus in 1984. Draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.14/Rev.1 contained a disturbing and negative message which was unambiguous. It could only be interpreted as the first step towards the eventual removal of good-neighbourliness as an agenda item. For those reasons and many others, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

21 Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said that the remarks of the representative of Romania had been seriously misleading. The draft resolution did not prejudice the General Assembly's decision with regard to the procedural handling of the matter at the forty-fifth session. It did not contain a negative message, since it provided for the reinclusion of the item.

22. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, although it had had grave reservations about its appropriateness to the Sixth Committee from the beginning. In deference to the views of its proponents, it had kept an open mind. However, after several years of study, it had become clear that there was no legal content to the item. That inescapable conclusion, together with the breathtaking hypocrisy of the primary proponent of the item, which had been mistreating ethnic groups in its own country to an astonishing extent in the past six months, led his delegation to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.14/Rev.1 and against draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.20.

23. Mr. VOICU (Romania), speaking on a point of order, said that, out of respect for the Committee, he had not wanted to interrupt the representative of the United States, who had made gratuitous assertions which were not well-grounded and had nothing to do with the matter under discussion. It was not appropriate to discuss Third Committee matters in the Sixth Committee.

24. Mr. KATEKA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the previous speaker had failed to observe the rules of procedure. Moreover, the way in which the item under consideration had been dealt with was extremely disturbing. Even although the United Republic of Tanzania had originally intended to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.14/Rev.1, it would express its displeasure by not participating in the vote on that draft. The current situation regarding the draft and the so-called amendments thereto was very confusing, and it was unclear whether the Committee would vote on draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.20 if it had already adopted draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.14/Rev.1.

25. Mr. DELON (France) said that it was understandable that the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had taken the position just stated. Nevertheless, France intended to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.14/Rev.1.

26. Mr. HOMOUD (Jordan) said that he wished to explain his delegation's position on both of the draft resolutions before the Committee. The concept of good-neighbourliness was elusive and did not lend itself to detailed formulations. Moreover, it cut across a number of other legal concepts that had been elaborated

(Mr. Homoud, Jordan)

in a more substantive way and could yield clearer rights and obligations for States. Among such concepts was that of the fundamental rights and duties of States, as well as the concepts dealt with by the International Law Commission under the topics of the law of the non-navigational uses of international watercourses and international liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law. Jordan would therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.20. It would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.14/Rev.1, subject to the reservations just entered, which applied in particular to the third preambular paragraph of that draft.

27. Draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.14/Rev.1 was adopted by 28 votes to 20, with 64 abstentions.

28. Mr. AL-SABEEH (Kuwait), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution just adopted because the draft did not contain any reference to the preparation of an international instrument to strengthen good-neighbourliness.

29. Mr. KIRSCH (Canada) said that, under rule 131 of the rules of procedure, he wished to move that the Committee should not take a decision on draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.20.

30. Mr. VOICU (Romania) said that he strongly objected to the Canadian motion.

31. The Canadian motion was rejected by 88 votes to 23, with 11 abstentions.

32. Mr. AUST (United Kingdom) requested separate votes on the last preambular paragraph and paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.20.

33. The last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.20 was adopted by 98 votes to 21, with 7 abstentions.

34. Paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.20 was adopted by 97 votes to 21, with 8 abstentions.

35. Draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.20 as a whole was adopted by 100 votes to 9, with 18 abstentions.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus completed its consideration of agenda item 186.

AGENDA ITEM 137: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRY (continued) (A/43/26, A/43/215-S/19616, A/43/217-S/19623, A/43/273-S/19720, A/43/319-S/19806, A/43/393-S/19930, A/43/667-S/20212, A/43/709, A/43/716-S/20231, A/43/744-S/20238; A/C.6/43/3, A/C.6/43/6, A/C.6/43/L.23)

37. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus), speaking as Chairman of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, introduced that Committee's report (A/43/26). In the reporting period, the Committee had continued its efforts to resolve with the

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

United States various questions of common interest and concern to the United Nations diplomatic community in the host country. It had held nine meetings, and its officers had met twice. The report, which followed the format of previous reports, consisted of a brief introduction, three further sections and an annex.

38. The topics dealt with in the period under review were covered in section III. The Committee on Relations with the Host Country had, inter alia, continued consideration of questions relating to the security of missions and the safety of their personnel, and to the privileges and immunities of the United Nations and missions accredited to it. A considerable amount of time had been devoted to discussion of the travel restrictions imposed by the host country on the personnel of a number of missions and on Secretariat staff members of certain nationalities. One of the topics actively discussed had been the question of the issuance of entry visas by the host country.

39. The recommendations and conclusions approved by the Committee at its 134th meeting were set forth in section IV of the report. The Committee inter alia urged the host country to take all necessary measures in order to prevent any criminal acts, so as to ensure the normal functioning of all missions. In the light of its consideration of the host country's travel regulations, it also urged the host country to continue to honour its obligations to facilitate the functioning of the United Nations and the missions accredited to the United Nations. Furthermore, it reiterated its request to the parties concerned to hold consultations with a view to achieving solutions regarding the host country's request that the size of certain Member States' missions to the United Nations should be reduced and regarding action taken by the host country in that connection.

40. As in previous years, the list of documents issued in connection with and relating to the deliberations of the Committee was annexed to the report.

41. The Committee on Relations with the Host Country provided a necessary and useful forum for the exchange of views on questions of significant importance to the United Nations community. All its deliberations had been conducted in a business-like atmosphere and in a spirit of co-operation.

42. An addendum to the report would be issued to cover the 135th and 136th meetings, as well as the statement that he had made in his capacity as Chairman at the 136th meeting. In that statement he had indicated that, at its 135th and 136th meetings, the Committee had heard statements by its members, observers for Member States, the Observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and the Legal Counsel of the United Nations concerning the determination by the Secretary of State of the United States denying the visa application made by Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the PLO, in order to enable him to attend and participate in the forty-third session of the General Assembly. Taking into account the statements heard, in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country he had summed up in the following terms: (i) the vast majority of speakers had been of the opinion that the denial of Mr. Arafat's visa application was a violation of United States obligations under

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations. In that regard, those speakers had concurred with the statements issued by the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly; (ii) the United States had restated its position that its actions were fully consistent with the facts of the situation, with its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement and with existing practice; (iii) the vast majority of those who had spoken had been of the opinion that the host country should be asked urgently to review and reverse the decision taken with respect to Mr. Arafat, so as to enable him to participate in the General Assembly debate as scheduled.

43. He wished to introduce draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.23 on the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, which followed the pattern of corresponding resolutions in previous years. He hoped that the Sixth Committee would be able to adopt it by consensus.

44. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates) said that he wished to request that the statement made by the Legal Counsel at the 136th meeting of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, to which the Chairman of that Committee had just referred, should be issued in extenso.

45. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said that he by no means objected to the request just made by the representative of the United Arab Emirates. However, he wished to ask the Secretariat to look into the matter of the financial implications of the request before the Committee took a decision.

46. Mr. KALINKIN (Secretary of the Committee) said that he had been informed by the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance that the financial implications would be approximately $5,200, which could be absorbed in the existing budget of the Department of Conference Services. Accordingly, the circulation of the statement in question in the six official languages would not entail any additional cost to the United Nations.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished the statement by the Legal Counsel to be circulated as a document of the Sixth Committee.

48. It was so decided.

49. Mr. AL-KHASAWNEH (Jordan), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25 on behalf of the members of the League of Arab States, announced that the sponsors had been joined by Brunei Darussalam, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

50. The draft resolution, after recalling the relevant legal instruments and the fact that the PLO had been invited by the General Assembly to participate in its work in the capacity of observer, affirmed, in the third preambular paragraph, the right of Member States and observers to designate freely the members of their

(Mr. Al-Khasawneh, Jordan)

delegations to the Assembly. That statement could arouse no misgivings. The fifth preambular paragraph conveyed the view of the sponsors that the decision of the host country to deny an entry visa to Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO, was in violation of its international legal obligations and the sixth endorsed the opinion rendered by the Legal Counsel on the matter.

51. For the sake of greater logical coherence, paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution were to be transposed. Thus, new paragraph 2 would embody the reaction of the General Assembly to the establishment of a precedent that might affect any of its members. By new paragraph 3, the Assembly would consider that the decision by the Government of the host country constituted a violation of its international legal obligations under the Headquarters Agreement.

52. Paragraph 4 conveyed the general feeling expressed in other committees in urging the host country to abide scrupulously by the provisions of the Agreement and to reconsider and reverse its decision.

53. In requesting the Secretary-General to submit a report on developments in the matter, paragraph 5 would allow the General Assembly to establish an appropriate date in December 1988 for the submission of that report.

54. The matter was one of extreme urgency, since, if the host country found it impossible to reconsider its decision, the General Assembly would have to adopt alternative measures in order to enable Mr. Arafat, at a historical moment, to contribute to breaking the long deadlock on the question of Palestine. That consideration required that the Committee should take constructive action in order to enable the General Assembly to perform its functions quickly and effectively. It was to be hoped that, if the draft resolution was adopted by the Committee, it would be referred to the General Assembly with the greatest urgency.

55. Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia) paid tribute to the Chairman of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country for his skilful leadership of that Committee and his lucid introduction of its report.

56. The Committee on Relations with the Host Country had just faced the serious problem of the host country's denial of the visa application of Mr. Arafat. The statement regarding that issue made on 28 November 1988 by the Legal Counsel was clear and convincing, leading to the unambiguous conclusion that the host country had been and was under an obligation to grant the visa request of the Chairman of the PLO.

57. His delegation fully shared the Legal Counsel's view that Mr. Arafat's request fell under sections 11, 12 and 13 of the Headquarters Agreement, according to which invitees of the United Nations should not be impeded in their access to the Headquarters district. He also greatly appreciated the Counsel's legal analysis showing that the host country's decision was inconsistent even with its own relevant laws.

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

58. His delegation could not accept the United States reference to the abstract concept of "national security" as a justification for that country's unwillingness to honour its international obligations. In general, his country was reluctant to accept the continuous attempts by the host country to call those international obligations into question, using the pretext of national interest. International law provided the only grounds for just solutions to problems of that nature, taking into account the interest of all parties concerned and that of the international community as a whole.

59. He rejected the attempt by the host country to use the alleged acquiescence of the United Nations and its Member States on similar occasions in the past as a justification for its action in the current matter. Such an argument was not valid with respect to the denial of visa applications or any other matter covered by the Headquarters Agreement and by other relevant international instruments.

60. His delegation fully supported the appeal made on 28 November by the Chairman of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country for the host country to reconsider its decision regarding Mr. Arafat's visa application and to proceed in strict observance of its international obligations.

61. His country reserved its right to speak at a later time on specific chapters of the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country.

The meeting was suspended at 6.25 p.m. and resumed at 6.45 p.m.

62. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations to present their views on draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25.

63. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) emphasized that his delegation wished to have the opportunity to speak on the substance of the item under consideration, namely, the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, at the end of the debate on that item. If the Committee was now turning its attention to draft resolutions A/C.6/43/L.23 and L.25, his delegation was prepared to participate. However, it felt that the most orderly procedure would be to consider draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.23 first, since it had been available to delegations longer, and then take up the other draft resolution.

64. The CHAIRMAN said that the United States delegation would have the opportunity to speak at the end of the debate on the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country.

65. He recalled that the representative of Jordan had requested that draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25 be considered first as a matter of priority.

66. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said that if the Committee was engaged in a debate on the substance of the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, then it had not yet reached the stage at which it could adopt draft resolutions on the item. Once the Committee had reached that stage,

(Mr. Rosenstock, United States)

his delegation would not object to considering the draft resolutions in the order proposed by the representative of Jordan.

67. The CHAIRMAN said that the subject dealt with in draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25 fell within the context of the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country.

68. Mr. JESUS (Cape Verde) said that since the representative of Jordan had proposed, and the Committee had agreed, to accord priority to draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25, it should now proceed with the general debate on the item dealt with in that draft resolution, followed by consideration of the draft resolution itself, the vote thereon and explanations of vote. The Committee could then turn its attention to the debate on the remainder of the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, and then to the remaining relevant draft resolutions.

69. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that once the Committee had agreed to accord priority to an issue, the Committee was required to proceed accordingly.

70. Mr. CASTROVIEJO (Spain) said that his delegation understood the desire of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25 to accord that document priority and saw merit in the proposal by the representative of Cape Verde.

71. However, his delegation, which was a member of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, recalled that the Chairman of that Committee had stated that the section of the Committee's report dealing with the issue covered in draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25 was not yet available. Accordingly, his delegation felt that the Sixth Committee could not consider the draft resolution in question until it had before it the relevant section of the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country.

72. Mr. AL-KHASAWNEH (Jordan) insisted that a discussion in the Sixth Committee of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25 was not contingent on having the relevant part of the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country at hand. The draft resolution was not directly related to that section of the report. He reiterated his delegation's desire that the draft resolution should be considered promptly.

73. Mr. OULD EL-GAOUTH (Mauritania) endorsed the remarks by the representative of Jordan.

74. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation too agreed with the statement made by the representative of Jordan. It was time to take action on draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25 without any further filibustering.

75. Mr. CASTROVIEJO (Spain) said that his delegation had no objection to considering draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25 as long as it was not assumed that the Committee was examining the part of the report addressing that subject.

76. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said his delegation regretted any suggestion that attempts were being made to filibuster or to delay matters. Those delegations which had contributed to the debate, including his own and those of Spain and Cape Verde, had done so with the purpose of ensuring orderly discussion of the important matter under consideration, in accordance with the Committee's normal careful way of working. His delegation had raised no objection to the reversal of the normal priority of consideration with respect to draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.23 and A/C.6/43/L.25. However, his delegation did regret that the excellent suggestion made by the representative of Cape Verde had not been followed. Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that the section of the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country dealing with the matter currently under consideration was not yet available to the Sixth Committee.

77. His country had always taken seriously its responsibilities as host country to the United Nations and would continue to do so. It had issued thousands of visas over the years to persons coming to the United Nations who otherwise could not, under United States laws, have entered the country.

78. His country acknowledged that the 1947 Headquarters Agreement and the 1974 United Nations invitation to the PLO to participate as an observer at the General Assembly obligated it to accord entry, transit and residence to PLO observers. Accordingly, visa waivers had been issued as a routine matter to PLO members for official business at the United Nations and a PLO observer mission had been operating at the United Nations since 1975, notwithstanding any policy differences between the United States and the PLO. His country had not and would not deny a visa solely on the grounds of policy differences with an invitee of the United Nations. It had therefore been scrupulous in its respect for its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement.

79. On rare occasions, his country had denied visa applications. Aside from existing specific provisions on the matter on which his country's acceptance of the Headquarters Agreement had been conditioned, it was widely recognized that the United States, or any host country, had the right to protect its national security. Therefore, his country could not accept language suggesting that any invitee had the right to send whichever representative it chose, irrespective of the circumstances. Furthermore, United Nations practice confirmed that the host country was not expected to accept entry of every individual to the Headquarters district, but retained the right to exclude entry of individuals in certain limited cases. That principle had been established as early as 1954, when the United States, with the acquiescence of the United Nations, had denied a visa to Mr. Eskandary, convicted of conspiring to kill the Shah of Iran. The principle had also been confirmed in recent United Nations practice: the Organization had made no objections when it had been informed on several occasions in recent years that the United States would not accept the presence of individuals who had played a prominent role in the hostage incidents and other acts of aggression against United States citizens which were clear violations of international law.

80. In the case currently under consideration, his country had convincing evidence that PLO elements had engaged in terrorism against United States citizens and

(Mr. Rosenstock, United States)

others, including a series of operations undertaken by the Force 17 and Hawari organisations after the PLO had claimed to foreswear the use of terrorism in the 1985 Cairo Declaration. As Chairman of the PLO, Mr. Arafat was responsible for the actions of those organisations, which were units of Fatah, an element of the PLO which was under his control. Having found that Mr. Arafat had known of, condoned and lent support to terrorism against its citizens, the United States had concluded that he was an accessory to such terrorism and had accordingly denied the visa.

81. That decision was consistent not only with the United States security reservation to the Headquarters Agreement, but also with the right of the United States, confirmed by United Nations practice, to exclude individuals responsible for terrorism or other acts of aggression against United States citizens which constituted clear violations of international law. Lastly, his Government believed that it had acted on the basis of established precedent in denying the visa to Mr. Arafat and it had granted visas to other members of the PLO, thus ensuring that their views would be heard before the United Nations.

82. Mr. TERZI (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said that as the United States representative had repeated the lengthy statement already made the previous day to the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, the Legal Counsel should respond, just as he had after the first statement by the United States representative.

83. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations to explain their votes before the vote.

84. Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said he wished to make it clear that in the view of his Government, Mr. Arafat should have been allowed to come to United Nations Headquarters. That was a legal obligation of the United States. His delegation endorsed the opinion given on that matter by the Legal Counsel the previous day.

85. But just as the United States should show respect for the United Nations, the United Nations should show respect for the United States, and that should have been reflected in the language of draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25. His delegation had taken the trouble to work out such language which, without affecting the substance of the draft, would have enabled the United Kingdom to vote for it. Unfortunately, the authors of the draft had not been ready to accept the United Kingdom's suggestions, and his delegation would therefore abstain.

86. Mr. HAREL (Israel) said he wondered whether the Chairman was purposely omitting the word "distinguished" when referring to the Israeli delegation.

87. Since 1964, his Government had regarded the PLO as a terrorist organization whose covenant and actions were in contradiction with the Charter of the United Nations.

88. The CHAIRMAN asked the delegation of Israel not to engage in name-calling with regard to an organization having observer status in the United Nations.

89. Mr. HAREL (Israel), resuming his statement, said that his delegation was not engaging in name-calling, but was expressing the opinion of its Government, which regarded the PLO as a terrorist organization because of both its views and its actions. Israel had strongly objected to the granting of observer status to the PLO. The position of his Government had not changed, and, accordingly, his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25.

90. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that his Government regretted the host country's decision to refuse a visa to Mr. Arafat, an action which violated its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement, as had been confirmed by the Legal Counsel. India urged the United States to reconsider its decision.

91. Mr. RIANOM (Indonesia) said that his delegation was dismayed by the United States decision to deny a visa to Mr. Arafat, Chairman of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, who had been scheduled to address the General Assembly during its consideration of the question of Palestine. Indonesia concurred with the Secretary-General that that decision constituted a unilateral action incompatible with the obligation of the host country under the 1947 Headquarters Agreement and thus posed a serious challenge to the authority and credibility of the United Nations itself.

92. Coming as it did in the wake of the proclamation of an independent Palestinian State by the Palestine National Council and the sustained popular uprising in the territories illegally occupied by Israel since 1967, two events that Indonesia strongly supported, that decision could hardly contribute to a just and peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict. Rather, it would only further encourage Israeli intransigence on the convening of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East in conformity with General Assembly resolution 38/58 C and deepen the understandable frustration and resentment of the Palestinians, thereby exacerbating the crisis in the occupied territories and heightening tensions in the region as a whole.

93. There was still time for the United States to reconsider its position, which it could do by complying with the Headquarters Agreement, and particularly the provisions contained in section 11 prohibiting the host country from imposing any impediments on access to the United Nations for anyone invited by the Organization. It was with that objective in mind that Indonesia was co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.6/42/L.25.

94. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25, as orally revised.

95. Draft resolution A/C.6/43/L.25, as orally revised, was adopted by 121 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

96. Mr. BOREHAM (Australia), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and agreed with the principles expressed in it, it would have preferred it if the word "Deplores" in paragraph 2 had been replaced by "Regrets". It also had reservations about the appropriateness of the language used in the fifth preambular paragraph and in paragraph 3 with regard to the interpretation of the Headquarters Agreement.

97. Mr. KIRSCH (Canada) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to register its concern at the decision taken by the host country. Canada's first priority was to determine whether the United States would reconsider its decision.

98. His delegation had reservations concerning the language used in the resolution, particularly in paragraphs 2 and 3, which could have been formulated more constructively.

99. Ms. HIGGIE (New Zealand) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which embodied an important point of principle with regard to obligations undertaken under international law. But her delegation would have preferred the draft resolution, and especially paragraph 3, to be couched in more moderate language.

100. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) said that the draft resolution sent a clear message to the United States to reconsider its decision, and he hoped that that message would be taken to heart.

101. Mr. ROUCOUNAS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that the Twelve had noted with concern the refusal of the United States Government to grant a visa to Mr. Arafat. They believed that Mr. Arafat should be allowed to address the General Assembly in New York, in accordance with the Headquarters Agreement and the opinion of the Legal Counsel. The Twelve were also firmly of the opinion that at the current critical stage of the situation regarding the Middle East, it was important not to hinder the United Nations from playing its role as a forum in which a leader of a party to the dispute could express his views. Moreover, the Twelve felt that it was necessary to maintain and encourage the momentum created by the recent decisions of the Palestine National Council. The Twelve called upon the United States Government to review the legal arguments and reconsider its decision.

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.