

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records\*

UN LIBRARY

DEC 15 1976



UN/SA COLLECTION

SIXTH COMMITTEE

70th meeting

held on

Friday, 10 December 1976

at 3 p.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 70th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MENDOZA (Philippines)

COPY:  
DO NOT REMOVE  
FROM ROOM  
L-201 (WWPR)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 123: DRAFTING OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST THE TAKING OF HOSTAGES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 113: MEASURES TO PREVENT INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM WHICH ENDANGERS OR TAKES INNOCENT HUMAN LIVES OR JEOPARDIZES FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, AND STUDY OF THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THOSE FORMS OF TERRORISM AND ACTS OF VIOLENCE WHICH LIE IN MISERY, FRUSTRATION, GRIEVANCE AND DESPAIR AND WHICH CAUSE SOME PEOPLE TO SACRIFICE HUMAN LIVES, INCLUDING THEIR OWN, IN AN ATTEMPT TO EFFECT RADICAL CHANGES: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 109: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 112: IMPLEMENTATION BY STATES OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE VIENNA CONVENTION ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS OF 1961: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

CONCLUSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room LX-2332.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.6/31/SR.70  
14 December 1976

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 123: DRAFTING OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST THE TAKING OF HOSTAGES (A/31/242; A/C.6/31/3; A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1, L.12) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1 by consensus.

2. It was so decided.

3. Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not objected to the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the current session. The Soviet Union was opposed on principle to any manifestation of international terrorism and favoured the solution of the problems from which it stemmed. At the same time, as his delegation had emphasized in the debate on the item in the Committee, the measures to be implemented against the taking of hostages should not jeopardize the interests of peoples struggling for their freedom and independence. As his own and other delegations had emphasized, the taking of hostages was part and parcel of the over-all problem of international terrorism. There were other equally important aspects of that problem. If those aspects had been reflected in the draft, the text would have gained therefrom. However, in a spirit of compromise, his delegation had chosen to support draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1.

4. Mr. HUSSAIN (Iraq) reaffirmed the position adopted by his delegation during the discussion of the item in the Committee. The proposed convention should in no way affect the right of national liberation movements to use any means to achieve freedom and independence. The causes underlying the taking of hostages must be studied and a distinction established between such acts, according to whether they were prompted by political or criminal motives. Such a study should cover situations in which one State occupied another and in which whole peoples were treated as hostages. If draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1 had been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained.

5. Mr. BUBEN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, in a spirit of co-operation, his delegation had not objected to the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1. The taking of hostages was merely one form of international terrorism. His delegation's position on the question had been set out in document A/AC.160/1/Add.2. His delegation, while condemning acts of international terrorism, considered that the concept of international terrorism should not be interpreted so broadly as to include the acts of national liberation movements against aggressors in occupied territories or demonstrations by workers against the oppression of exploiters. In elaborating the convention against the taking of hostages, the ad hoc committee should take account of the objective political factors and the specific circumstances at the root of such criminal acts.

6. Mr. DAMDINDORJ (Mongolia) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1 on the understanding that the campaign

/...

(Mr. Damdindorj, Mongolia)

against the taking of hostages was simply part of the campaign against international terrorism as a whole. The people of Mongolia had always opposed acts of terrorism, whether they were perpetrated by States, groups or individuals. No problems could be solved by such acts. Mongolia was a party to the Geneva Convention of 1949, the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents. Furthermore, the Mongolian Penal Code provided serious penalties for acts of terrorism and the taking of hostages. The ad hoc committee on the drafting of an international convention against the taking of hostages should take account of such provisions and of the interests of national liberation movements and peoples struggling against apartheid, racism and exploitation. That committee, together with the other United Nations bodies responsible for drafting the future convention should also take account of the views expressed in the Sixth Committee. Finally, the future convention should not, on any pretext, adversely affect the rights of peoples struggling for their freedom and independence against aggression.

7. Mr. ALKAFF (Democratic Yemen) said that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1 should in no way adversely affect the rights of peoples struggling for their freedom and independence and against colonialism and racism. Nor should it affect the legitimate struggle of the national liberation movements, or their rights to resort to all means, including armed struggle, to attain self-determination. In elaborating the future convention, the ad hoc committee should take account of the views expressed by his delegation in the Sixth Committee to the effect that entire populations were living as hostages under the yoke of colonial and racist régimes.

8. Mr. ROBINSON (Jamaica) said that the taking of hostages was a multifaceted question which could not be solved merely by paying attention to one aspect of the problem. If the convention to be drafted by the ad hoc committee was to achieve the widest degree of acceptance, it must accord equal and full treatment to all the issues involved. In his statement to the General Assembly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Jamaica had expressed concern that measures should be devised not only for the apprehension and punishment of offenders, but also for securing the release of hostages.

9. His delegation had been happy to participate in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1, since it naturally supported the broad humanitarian motives which had prompted its submission. His delegation had participated in the negotiations leading to the compromise reflected in that draft resolution and had agreed to a format whereby the draft was merely procedural, since the alternative approach might have led to a proliferation of guidelines for the ad hoc committee. If such guidelines had been given to the committee, his delegation would have insisted that it should be instructed to devise procedures consistent with the principles of international law, and particularly with the principle of the inviolability of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, for the prompt and safe release of hostages. His delegation fully expected the committee to reflect that point of view in the convention.

10. Perhaps the single most important issue which the ad hoc committee would have

(Mr. Robinson, Jamaica)

to resolve was the conflict between the competing principles of an individual's right to life, liberty and security and a State's right to sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence. The success of the committee's work would be measured by the extent to which it achieved a harmonious interaction of those conflicting principles.

11. Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) welcomed the fact that the Committee had been able to adopt draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1 by consensus. The question of the taking of hostages was extremely important, and there was no need to emphasize the constructive role played by the non-aligned countries in achieving that consensus. He wished the ad hoc committee every success and expressed the hope that, in fulfilling its mandate, it would take account of the principles of the Charter and the rights of peoples to self-determination and independence.

12. Mr. SAKO (Ivory Coast), while congratulating the Federal Republic of Germany on its timely initiative, said that the draft resolution raised a number of questions concerning national liberation movements. The rights of peoples fighting for their freedom and independence against racist régimes must be recognized. The fact that draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1 was essentially of a procedural nature should not prevent the Committee from providing a specific mandate for the ad hoc committee. His delegation had reservations with regard to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which might constitute a source of future difficulty.

13. Mr. KALILANNGWE (Madagascar) said that his delegation had participated in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1 because that revised text appeared acceptable. His delegation was not opposed to a study being conducted of the question of the taking of hostages and of the underlying causes of such acts.

14. Mr. MUSSA (Somalia) commended the Federal Republic of Germany on its initiative, which had led to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1. He also commended the non-aligned countries for their efforts in achieving a solution acceptable to all. His delegation had been able to join in the consensus because the draft resolution was simply of a procedural nature and left all substantive questions to be dealt with by the ad hoc committee.

15. The CHAIRMAN announced that Senegal had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.10/Rev.1.

AGENDA ITEM 113: MEASURES TO PREVENT INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM WHICH ENDANGERS OR TAKES INNOCENT HUMAN LIVES OR JEOPARDIZES FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, AND STUDY OF THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THOSE FORMS OF TERRORISM AND ACTS OF VIOLENCE WHICH LIE IN MISERY, FRUSTRATION, GRIEVANCE AND DESPAIR AND WHICH CAUSE SOME PEOPLE TO SACRIFICE HUMAN LIVES, INCLUDING THEIR OWN, IN AN ATTEMPT TO EFFECT RADICAL CHANGES: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM (A/9028, A/31/122, A/31/182, A/31/188, A/31/272; A/C.6/31/L.22) (continued)

16. Mr. LAVAU (Director, Budget Division) said that the estimated cost of

/...

(Mr. Lavau)

convening a meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism in New York from 14 to 25 March 1977 was \$208,000. That figure would include the cost of 100 pages of pre-session documentation, 150 pages of in-session documentation and 100 pages of post-session documentation, consisting of the Committee's report in six languages, together with the summary records of meetings.

17. Mr. GODOY (Paraguay) recalled that at the twenty-seventh session many delegations in the Sixth Committee had been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution which had subsequently become General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII), while many others had abstained. That had not been in keeping with the Sixth Committee's tradition of adopting draft resolutions by consensus and it was therefore all the more regrettable that the current draft resolution on the same item (A/C.6/31/L.22) had been circulated too late to permit real consultations or enable delegations to obtain instructions from their Governments. He wished to propose a small amendment to that draft in the hope that it would make the text more acceptable to a greater number of delegations or even lead to a consensus. The amendment would consist in replacing the words "Expresses deep concern over ..." in paragraph 1 by the words "Condemns the ...". That amendment was based on the title of the item and the intention underlying its inclusion in the agenda five years previously, which had been to prevent all acts of terrorism which might endanger innocent lives and thus truly deserved the condemnation of the international community. It was not enough to express concern over such acts, for failure to condemn them implied that they were committed only by national liberation movements, whereas in fact they were committed by many other groups and individuals, including common criminals. The latter acts had rightly been condemned by the international community. A case in point was the murder committed in 1976 in the capital of his country by a Yugoslav national who, in seeking to assassinate the Ambassador of Yugoslavia, had mistakenly killed an innocent person, the Ambassador of Uruguay. It was therefore necessary to condemn all terrorist acts which endangered or took innocent human lives, no matter who committed them, although the word "innocent" might give rise to some difficulties, as it had done in the case of the item on the drafting of a convention against the taking of hostages.

18. The CHAIRMAN said that if none of the sponsors objected to the amendment, it could be considered by the Committee.

19. Mr. KATEKA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation could not accept the proposed amendment as there was no sense in condemning the increasing number of acts of terrorism rather than the acts themselves. Furthermore, the amendment was being made on the rash assumption that it would lead to a broader consensus.

20. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America), explaining his vote before the vote, recalled that his delegation had voted against General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII) in 1972 with considerable regret. Since then, however, some developments had occurred which had led it to re-examine its position.

21. First, there had been a positive development: the elaboration of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally

/...

(Mr. Rosenstock, United States)

Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents. In that connexion, he hoped that all countries which, like his own, had voted for General Assembly resolution 3166 (XXVIII), to which that Convention was annexed, and particularly those which were also sponsoring draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22, paragraph 5 of which invited States to become parties to existing international conventions on international terrorism, would join his country in becoming parties to that Convention.

22. A second development had been the total failure of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Terrorism in 1973, which had resulted from the fact that its mandate contained material irrelevant to the prevention of terrorism. His delegation was inclined to think that if the real aim of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22 had been to provide a basis for progress in the search for measures to deal with the scourge of terrorism some effort would have been made to adjust the Ad Hoc Committee's mandate and some consultations undertaken. Unfortunately, no heed had been paid to the wise suggestion of the representative of the Netherlands that time should be allowed for negotiation of a mandate offering a reasonable chance of success.

23. The draft resolution contained a number of paragraphs which were irrelevant to the subject of preventing international terrorism. The issue was not who might use force and whether there were violations of human rights in the world, but whether there were certain acts which the international community would not tolerate. The introduction of irrelevant issues might lead some to interpret the draft resolution as inciting, rather than curbing, violence, and his delegation would therefore vote against it.

24. Miss AGUTA (Nigeria) said she regretted that some delegations had not had time to hold sufficiently wide consultations on the draft resolution and that a vote would have to be taken on it at the current meeting. Draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.12 on the taking of hostages had already been adopted by consensus and it was a pity that the same could not be done in the case of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22, as both drafts concerned the search for the peace and security of the whole world.

25. The amendment proposed by the representative of Paraguay did not quite express what was required in paragraph 1, but her delegation would have no difficulty in accepting it. She hoped nevertheless that representatives would agree that the text should remain as it stood.

26. She also hoped that a spirit of compromise would be shown, especially by the United States representative, and that he would review his suggestions and co-operate in the adoption of the draft resolution so that the Committee could continue with its work.

27. Mr. FERNANDEZ BALLESTEROS (Uruguay) said he thought that the representative of Paraguay, in proposing his amendment, had been attempting to find a balance in accordance with the General Assembly's condemnation of international terrorism. He still felt that paragraph 1 should reflect the general condemnation of any act of terrorism and not merely the increasing number of such acts. Although

/...

(Mr. Fernandez Ballesteros, Uruguay)

the proposed amendment would not alter the general sense of the draft, it would reflect the general feeling that the Sixth Committee should condemn all acts of terrorism.

28. The CHAIRMAN reminded representatives that they should limit themselves to explaining their votes and not discuss a suggestion which was not before the Committee.

29. Mr. GODOY (Paraguay) said that in the light of the Chairman's remark he wondered why the representative of Nigeria had spoken and, since she was a sponsor of the draft resolution, in what capacity. He fully agreed with the statements of Uruguay and Tanzania that it was not the increasing number of acts of terrorism which should be condemned but the acts themselves.

30. Miss AGUTA (Nigeria) explained that she had intended to speak before the representative of the United States of America.

31. Mr. FUENTES IDANEZ (Bolivia) said that, draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22 did not fully satisfy expectations, in the light of the preceding discussions and the five-year delay. It tended to subordinate the consideration of measures to prevent international terrorism to the examination of its causes; it contained only an expression of deep concern, rather than a condemnation. It was the very substance of the evil which should be dealt with and although his delegation did not oppose the consideration of its causes, it seemed that the draft resolution sought to justify some forms of terrorism. In that connexion, he recalled that his country had recently been the victim of two acts of international terrorism: its Ambassador to France had been assassinated in Paris, and a former President of Bolivia had been murdered in Buenos Aires. His delegation could not agree with the text as it stood and, since the proposed amendment by the representative of Paraguay had not been accepted, he would abstain from voting.

32. Mr. FERNANDEZ BALLESTEROS (Uruguay), said that, even though the amendment proposed by the representative of Paraguay had not been accepted, he would vote in favour of the draft resolution, because he thought that the Ad Hoc Committee should continue its work. Nevertheless he had reservations about paragraphs 1 and 4; paragraph 1 should condemn the acts of international terrorism in question.

33. Mr. GODOY (Paraguay) said that he did not understand the discussion; as in his view, the correct procedure for rejection of an amendment was to put it to the vote, not to consult the sponsors of the draft resolution. He confirmed that he wished formally to submit an amendment and have it put to the vote.

34. The CHAIRMAN expressed regret that there had been a misunderstanding and asked the representative of Paraguay to repeat his amendment.

35. Mr. ABADA (Algeria), speaking on a point of order, said that the voting had already begun and it was his understanding that it was therefore too late to consider an amendment.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that under rule 128 of the rules of procedure, after the Chairman had announced the beginning of voting no representative might interrupt



(The Chairman)

the voting except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting; he therefore ruled that the Paraguayan amendment could not be considered.

37. Mr. GODOY (Paraguay) said that he naturally had no intention of objecting to the Chairman's ruling, but he had indeed proposed an amendment in his first statement and it was not his fault if he had been incorrectly interpreted.

38. At the request of the representative of Zaire, the vote was taken by roll-call.

39. Zaire, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

40. Draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22, as orally revised, was adopted by 86 votes to 8, with 24 abstentions.

41. Mr. BOSCO (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his country was, of course, opposed to acts of international terrorism and had participated actively in United Nations efforts to combat terrorism. It had therefore studied draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22 with the greatest attention even though there had



(Mr. Bosco, Italy)

been little time to do so. However, since the fourth preambular paragraph contained an inaccurate statement and paragraphs 3 and 4 were irrelevant, it had had to abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

42. Mr. STANFORD (Canada) said that his delegation had, with considerable regret, voted against draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22 for essentially the same reason which had led it to vote against General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII). His delegation condemned terrorist activities regardless of where or by whom they were committed and regretted that the draft resolution just adopted did not do the same. Although his Government had joined, and would continue to join, in the efforts of the international community to remove the causes of injustice and oppression in the world, it did not believe that the means used to that end could include the taking of innocent lives through acts of indiscriminate terrorism.

43. His delegation's misgivings at the lack of precision in the mandate given to the Ad Hoc Committee had proved well founded. The discussions in that Committee about the causes invoked by terrorists in justification of their violent acts had tended to crowd out discussion of the principal purpose of the Committee, namely the identification of specific measures to prevent and punish international terrorism. His delegation would continue to support any proposals aimed at the attainment of that objective, in particular the drafting of a convention on measures to prevent international terrorism. It would also, as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, continue to strive for a successful outcome of the work of that Committee.

44. Mr. HOFSTEE (Netherlands) said he regretted that draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22 had been submitted only on the preceding day and that a vote had to be taken on it at the Committee's final meeting. A resolution on such an important question should have been subject to consultations and delegations should have been given time to consider it. The text of the draft resolution closely followed that of resolution 3034 (XXVII) and, surprisingly, took no account of developments since 1972. It was unlikely to be of any help in preventing terrorism. Since his delegation did not feel that the chances of the Ad Hoc Committee's achieving results were any better at the current stage than they had been in the past, it had been compelled to vote against the draft resolution. It would very much have preferred to consider a draft resolution at the following session, when an attempt could have been made to devise a better means for the United Nations to combat terrorism.

45. Mr. FIFOOT (United Kingdom) said that the Committee's customary practice of holding consultations and attempting to reach agreement had unfortunately not been followed in the current case. Much remained to be done to promote human rights and combat international terrorism and, although the underlying causes deserved serious study, he did not think that the elaboration of measures to combat terrorism should wait on the completion of such a study. In addition, his delegation did not have confidence in the Ad Hoc Committee as a means of moving forward. That was confirmed by the programme of work outlined by that Committee. For those reasons, his country had voted against draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22. At the same time, however, it wished to state that it would co-operate with other countries in attempting to adopt appropriate measures to combat terrorism.

46. Mr. HELLNERS (Sweden) said there should be no doubt that his country attached great importance to all effective measures to combat international terrorism. However, draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22 was deficient in several respects. In it, the General Assembly only expressed concern over increasing acts of international terrorism, whereas the facts called for condemnation. Furthermore, the lack of precision in the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee would not be conducive to fruitful work. Certain fears his delegation had expressed concerning resolution 3034 (XXVII) had proved not unfounded. On the basis of the Ad Hoc Committee's work, he did not think that a renewal of its mandate without clearer terms of reference would make it easy for that body to proceed with its task. His delegation had therefore abstained from voting. Since the draft resolution had been adopted, he expressed the hope that the Ad Hoc Committee would be able to reach common ground and attain tangible results.

47. Mr. IKOUEBE (Congo) said that his delegation had been absent during the voting. Had it been present, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22.

48. Mr. BLUM (Israel) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution, for the reasons it had explained in great detail during the debate on the item.

49. Mr. LANG (Austria) said that his delegation had abstained from voting. It regretted that the sponsors had not considered it appropriate to consult all members of the Ad Hoc Committee in order to arrive at a solution acceptable to a considerable number of countries. In addition, it was his delegation's firm conviction that the Ad Hoc Committee could carry out its task only if it was given specific guidance by the General Assembly. That was not the case in the draft resolution just adopted. All delegations, particularly those which were members of the Ad Hoc Committee, could see that for want of a precise mandate that Committee had not been able to function properly. As had been the case in 1972, the draft resolution before the Sixth Committee implied at least to a certain extent that the end justified the means, a concept which his delegation could not accept. His country had been the victim of several acts of terrorism and was prepared to join in any meaningful effort to fight international terrorism. The world community must not allow representative Governments to be replaced by the dictatorship of terrorism. For those reasons, his delegation had been one of the original sponsors of the draft resolution on the taking of hostages.

50. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Those countries which had opposed the draft resolution had thereby contradicted their repeated statements that action should be taken to prevent acts of terrorism, particularly since they had not suggested any alternative to the Ad Hoc Committee. Although he was aware of the difficulties facing the Ad Hoc Committee, he felt that progress could be made if a step-by-step approach was taken.

51. Mr. PRIETO (Chile) said that his delegation wished to see the Ad Hoc Committee continue its work and would have been happy to vote in favour of the draft resolution if it had condemned all forms of international terrorism. Since the draft resolution did not do so, and since the amendment proposed by

(Mr. Prieto, Chile)

the representative of Paraguay had not been accepted, his delegation had preferred to abstain.

52. Mr. REID (Australia) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution just adopted because it was particularly concerned about the inappropriate guidelines and priorities established in paragraphs 3 and 4. It also had reservations about paragraph 7. His delegation had serious doubts as to the value of continuing the work of the Ad Hoc Committee unless it showed a willingness to grapple with the essentials of the problem and refrain from being diverted into purely political polemics. It was also concerned that the duration proposed for the next session of the Ad Hoc Committee represented far too brief a period for any constructive results to be achieved.

53. His country's opposition to the resolution as a whole should not be interpreted as showing any lack of concern over acts of terrorism, any disinclination to devote attention to finding just and peaceful solutions to the underlying causes of terrorism or any reluctance to encourage wider participation in the relevant conventions. Neither did its vote indicate any lack of determination by his Government to take all necessary measures at the national level to prevent acts of international terrorism.

54. Mr. GAVIRIA (Colombia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but wished to make a reservation concerning paragraph 4, since it felt that all acts of terrorism should be condemned, particularly when they jeopardized innocent lives.

55. Mr. ALVARADO (Nicaragua) said that his delegation had had to abstain since the draft resolution did not take account of many aspects of the problem. Although the draft resolution was unlikely to bring about any great changes, the Paraguayan amendment would have made it more acceptable. His delegation felt that paragraph 6 was constructive and hoped that the Ad Hoc Committee would pursue its work to solve the problem. His country would continue to co-operate with all other countries in efforts to prevent international terrorism.

56. Mr. ALVAREZ TABIO (Cuba) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution since it considered it to be generally very constructive, particularly paragraphs 3 and 4. It had reservations concerning paragraph 5, however, for the reasons which it had made clear in the general debate on the item.

57. Mr. Le GOURRIEREC (France) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution, for the same reasons for which it had abstained in 1972.

58. Mr. YAMADA (Japan) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. It had always taken the firm position that acts of terrorism should be condemned in the strongest terms, regardless of motives. Draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22 did not even condemn acts of international terrorism and would only confuse the issue. Since the draft resolution had been adopted, however, he hoped that the future meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee would be more productive in devising effective measures to combat international terrorism.

/...

59. Mr. KAPETANOVIC (Yugoslavia), referring to the tragic event mentioned by the representative of Paraguay, namely the killing of the Uruguayan Ambassador by a member of a Fascist organization, said that the killer had been expelled from many European countries on account of his Fascist activities. Such acts should be prohibited and punished.

60. Mr. Le GOURRIEREC (France) said that the French authorities deeply deplored the serious event in the French capital mentioned by the representative of Bolivia, had taken action on the matter and would continue to act with all due diligence.

61. The CHAIRMAN announced that Lesotho had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.22.

AGENDA ITEM 109: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRY (A/31/26; A/C.6/31/6; A/C.6/31/L.20, L.21, L.23, L.24) (continued)

62. Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) introduced draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.23 on behalf of the sponsors. The draft resolution was the result of lengthy negotiations and she hoped it would be acceptable so that the Sixth Committee could adopt a single draft resolution on the item, as it had always done in the past.

63. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus), Chairman of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, said he was pleased to introduce draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.24. The draft resolution was simple and concise and he hoped it would be adopted by consensus.

64. Mr. MAKAREVICH (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, since draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.24 represented a compromise achieved after intensive consultations and since he understood that the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.6/31/L.21 and L.23 would withdraw their texts, in a spirit of compromise the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.20 would not press their draft resolution to a vote.

65. Mr. FIFOOT (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.21, congratulated the representative of Cyprus on the text of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.24. That draft, which he understood had achieved a wide measure of acceptance, was acceptable to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.21. Consequently, they did not wish draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.21 to be proposed for adoption.

66. Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that, in view of the fact that draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.24 had met with the necessary acceptance, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.23 did not wish to press for the adoption of that draft. She congratulated the representative of Cyprus on having achieved a consensus.

67. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.24 by consensus.

68. It was so decided.

/...

69. Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation categorically condemned the acts of terrorism and hooliganism perpetrated against the Soviet Mission to the United Nations by Zionist and other hostile elements. As a result of such acts, which were in flagrant violation of the norms of international law, the personnel of the Soviet Mission were subjected to intolerable conditions. The situation which existed testified to the fact that the host country authorities were clearly failing to ensure the security of missions accredited to the United Nations and the safety of their personnel. Even as the Committee had been adopting draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.24, he had been informed that the Soviet Mission had again been attacked by hooligans. The host country authorities must make a specific commitment concerning measures for the protection of missions and their personnel.

70. Mr. PEDAUYE (Spain) said that his delegation, which had co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.23, was most gratified at the spirit of compromise which had led to the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.24.

71. Mr. SOBER (United States of America) congratulated the representative of Cyprus on having achieved a consensus on draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.24. He reaffirmed that the United States regarded its position as the host country to the United Nations as both an honour and a very serious responsibility. He wished to reiterate his Government's assurances that measures would be taken to ensure the safety of missions and their personnel and expressed once again his Government's regrets regarding the violence directed against certain missions and their personnel. He was gratified that the Sixth Committee had seen fit to accept the recommendation contained in paragraph 65, subparagraph (1) of the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. His delegation deplored and condemned the acts of violence perpetrated against the Soviet Mission. In that connexion, he recalled that several members of the organization involved had been formally charged by the United States authorities, and that a number of them had pleaded guilty to those charges. That fact demonstrated clearly the host country's determination to carry out its obligations. He was convinced that the consensus achieved in the Committee would facilitate the task of the host country in seeking, in full co-operation with the permanent missions, to provide the conditions essential for their proper functioning.

AGENDA ITEM 112: IMPLEMENTATION BY STATES OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE VIENNA CONVENTION ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS OF 1961: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/31/145 and Add.1; A/C.6/31/L.16/Rev.1) (continued)

72. The CHAIRMAN announced that Iran had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.6/31/L.16/Rev.1.

#### CONCLUSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

73. After an exchange of courtesies, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Sixth Committee had completed its work for the thirty-first session.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.