

**United Nations Conference on the Representation of States
in Their Relations with International Organizations**

Vienna, Austria
4 February - 14 March 1975

Document:-
A/CONF.67/SR.13

13th plenary meeting

Extract from Volume I of the *Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Representation of States in Their Relations with International Organizations (Summary records of the plenary meetings and of the meetings of the Committee of the Whole)*

13th plenary meeting

Thursday, 13 March 1975, at 8.55 p.m.

President: Mr. SETTE CÂMARA (Brazil).

Consideration of the question of the representation of States in their relations with international organizations in accordance with resolutions 2966 (XXVII), 3072 (XXVIII) and 3247 (XXIX) adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1972, 30 November 1973 and 29 November 1974 (concluded)

[Agenda item 11]

CONSIDERATION OF THE TITLES AND TEXTS OF ARTICLES ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (concluded) (A/CONF.67/11 and 14).

Article 2 (Scope of the present Convention) (concluded)

1. Mr. GOBBI (Argentina) said that in conventions codifying international law, it was customary to define the subject-matter of the convention, the parties to whom it applied and the conditions of entry into force, the last two usually in the final clauses. The International Law Commission (ILC) had defined the subject-matter in article 2 but the text of the article as amended by the Conference included in addition the question of the parties. That was a legal blunder. The underlying idea of the United Kingdom amendment to article 2 (A/CONF.67/C.1/L.15) should have been inserted in the final clauses.

2. He fully agreed that the convention was not applicable to any State, including a host State, without ratification by the State concerned. But all States were amply protected by articles [II] or [III] of the final clauses (see A/CONF.67/14), relating to ratification and accession, which were freely consented acts. There was thus no need for an additional provision relating to the host State in the concluding part of paragraph 1 of article 2. That provision envisaged a curious state of affairs: a multilateral convention entered into force when a given number of instruments of ratification or accession had been deposited; but even if every country in the world except the host State ratified the convention, the obligation to apply it would be divorced from its entry into force, until the condition in the concluding phrase of paragraph 1 of article 2 had been fulfilled.

3. It was perverse to say that that condition was designed simply to protect the host State; it only succeeded in preventing the application of the convention by two or more sending States which had ratified it until the host State did likewise. The provision ran counter to the concept of the sovereign equality of States, since ratification by some States parties produced a different effect from ratification by others.

4. Mr. YAÑEZ-BARNUEVO (Spain) said that he fully endorsed the comments of the Argentine representative.

5. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) also agreed with the Argentine representative. He had abstained from the vote on article 2 because he did not support the text of paragraph 1 as adopted by the Conference.

Proposal to reconsider article 60 (Inviolability of premises and property) (A/CONF.67/L.5)

6. The PRESIDENT observed that, before the Conference could proceed to discuss the seven-Power proposal to amend article 60 (A/CONF.67/L.5), it would have to decide whether or not to adopt the first part of that proposal, which was to reconsider its previous decision on the text it had adopted for article 60.

7. Mr. SYSSOEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not think it practical in view of the short time remaining, to consider further proposals to amend articles.

8. Mr. TEPAVAC (Yugoslavia) said he had difficulty in understanding the purpose of the proposal in A/CONF.67/L.5. A decision had already been taken on article 60. The amendment seemed to be designed to alter its scope by relating it to a different subject-matter. His delegation could support a separate article on the inviolability of premises and property in view of the fact that article 54 had not been adopted, but he was against the elimination of the present article 60.

9. Some delegations appeared to think that there was no need to ensure the inviolability of the private accommodation of representatives of sovereign States although the principle of inviolability of the accommodation of private persons was enshrined in the constitution of all countries. During the discussion in the Committee of the Whole and the Conference, some speakers had said that there were no existing rules relating to the inviolability of the premises and private accommodation of missions. Although it might be true that there were no provisions on the subject in the conventions on the privileges and immunities of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies or in the headquarters agreements concluded with Switzerland and the United States, all countries applied the principle in practice. It would be difficult to conceive of personal inviolability for representatives, which was the recognized basis of all diplomatic law, without inviolability of their private accommodation. If the Conference should decide to reopen consideration of article 60, he would propose a subamendment to the amendment in document A/CONF.67/L.5.

10. Mr. do NASCIMENTO E SILVA (Brazil) felt that it would be pointless to continue discussing the substance of the proposed amendment before the Conference decided whether it was prepared to reconsider its decision on article 60. He suggested that the debate should be closed and that the Conference should vote first on the question of reconsideration.

11. Mr. GOBBI (Argentina) and Mr. GÜNEY (Turkey) supported the Brazilian representative's suggestion.

12. The PRESIDENT said that if there was no objection he would put to the vote, under rule 33 of the

rules of procedure, the seven-Power proposal to reconsider article 60.

The result of the vote was 33 in favour and 27 against, with 9 abstentions.

The proposal was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

13. Mr. ZEMANEK (Austria) said he regretted that the sponsors of the proposal in document A/CONF.67/L.5 had not had an opportunity to explain the reasons why they had put it forward.

Adoption of a convention and other instruments deemed appropriate and of the Final Act of the Conference

[Agenda item 12]

ADOPTION OF THE CONVENTION (A/CONF.67/11 and Add. 1-5, A/CONF.67/14)

14. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the convention as a whole, as amended.

The result of the vote was 57 in favour and 1 against, with 15 abstentions.

The Convention as a whole, as amended, was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

15. The PRESIDENT invited delegations to make brief statements in explanation of vote.

16. Mr. VRANKEN (Belgium), explaining his delegation's vote against the Convention, said that although its preamble referred to the work of codification which had been done and the progressive development of international law in bilateral relations which had been achieved in previous Vienna conventions, the Convention just adopted constituted a retrograde step; in short, the outcome had been that representatives and their staffs in multilateral diplomacy were to be treated, without any reason, more liberally than those in bilateral diplomacy. In bilateral diplomacy, the two States concerned could easily reach agreement on the application of the Vienna Conventions dealing with diplomatic relations and with consular relations, whereas in the case of the present Convention that would not be possible because the interests of one of the three parties concerned—the host State—were simply disregarded. It was difficult to imagine a host State accepting such a convention; if a lawyer—and not a politician—examined its text he would form the opinion that the territory of the host State was treated as *res communis* or, even worse, *res nullius*. All that was necessary was to refer to the unrealistic and unworkable provisions of such articles as 2, 27, 30, 60, 67 and 69.

17. Belgium was proud of being a receiving State for thousands of diplomats but it would be a mistake to think that it could be turned into an international zone. Conscious of the principles of the sovereign equality of States, his country was not prepared to become a servant in its own house. He therefore wished to state formally that Belgium would not be in a position to sign the Convention either at the present time or in the future.

18. Mr. HAQ (Pakistan) said that it would be a pity to minimize the achievements of the Conference.

19. Mr. TAKEUCHI (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained from the vote on the Convention as a whole because unfortunately the Conference had failed to arrive at a realistic, workable and well-balanced convention in which the interests of all were safeguarded. Japan was not yet host to an international organization of a universal character, but like all other States it faced the possibility of some day finding itself in the position of a host State trying to apply the provisions of the Convention.

20. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) said that although he thought the Convention was imperfect in some respects, he had nevertheless voted for it because the codification of international law was an important and useful task. The ILC, after ten years of work based on the experience acquired from previous conventions, had submitted to the Conference a clear well-balanced text which could hardly be improved upon. It was the Conference which had introduced imperfections into the Convention. However, the majority of the States which had voted for it were young States which would be responsible for future progress in perfecting and codifying international law.

21. Mr. Smith (United States of America) said that his delegation had been reluctantly obliged to abstain from the vote on the Convention. He feared that the Conference had to some extent misused the scholarly preparatory work of the ILC and its Special Rapporteur. That was partly due to the attempt to complete consideration of the Convention in a Conference lasting only six weeks. Lack of time to discuss and negotiate at leisure had resulted in a series of inconsistent and even conflicting votes on a number of provisions. For example, the Conference had rejected proposals by his and other delegations for amendments to articles 9 and 75 designed to protect the host State from conduct which had occurred in practice, but it had eventually adopted article 101, which had an even broader provision on the subject.

22. Such votes were symptomatic of a misunderstanding of the mandate of the Conference and of an unhealthy atmosphere in contrast to that which had prevailed at previous codification conferences. They had adopted conventions in which a genuine balance of interests had been achieved, because each State participating had been both a sender and a receiver and few regarded the conventions as a cornucopia of benefits without corresponding responsibilities. In the present case, however, many delegations had considered questions only from the viewpoint of the sending State and had not appreciated that, in order to draft a successful convention, the reasonable requirements of the host State must also be taken into account. They had used their impressive majority to adopt a text, the over-all effect of which was to expand the obligations of the host State while decreasing its rights.

23. Extensive privileges and immunities had been accorded which would result in the creation of a new aristocracy quite unacceptable in the modern context. For example, there was no justification for extending in article 67 to administrative and technical staff the same privileges and immunities as to ambassadors.

Amendments restricting such privileges and immunities which had been accepted as reasonable in the Committee of the Whole had been rejected by the plenary Conference. A more reasonable spirit had prevailed in the few days of the Conference, but unfortunately only after the adoption of most of the articles. He regretted that the Conference had not taken as its guide the principles established in paragraph 2 of Article 105 of the Charter of the United Nations.

24. Mr. PINEDA (Venezuela) said that his country was one of the young States which had voted in favour of the adoption of the Convention. Some delegations had voiced pessimistic comments, and his delegation, which had actively participated in the work of the Conference, conceded that the Convention like all human acts, had its imperfections. That was generally the case with conventions codifying international law for they were the outcome of the interplay of different criteria, legal systems and interests. The Convention just adopted democratically reflected the views of the majority and he felt that it made a positive contribution to international law.

25. Mr. ZEMANEK (Austria) regretted that the present Convention was the first Vienna convention for which his delegation had been unable to vote.

26. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Convention, which represented a step forward in the codification and development of international law. The basic text of the ILC had been in harmony with the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, and the Convention would strengthen the trend towards international *détente*. Not all the provisions had been fully acceptable to his delegation but it had been ready to compromise in the interests of common sense so that the Conference could adopt provisions to regulate a complicated aspect of international relations. The Convention would contribute to the efficiency of international organizations, which had an increasingly important role to play in the modern world. One of its main achievements had been to ensure equality of treatment for observer delegations. He paid tribute to the work of the ILC and thanked the Government and people of Austria for their hospitality.

27. Mr. MUSEUX (France) regretted that the efforts at conciliation which had been made during the last stages of the Conference had come too late to bear fruit. As a result, the French delegation had unfortunately been unable to vote in favour of a convention which was not faithful to the criteria established in paragraph 2 of Article 105 of the Charter of the United Nations. It failed to take into account the legitimate interests of the host State in such matters as jurisdiction in relation to motor accidents, inviolability of the bag and prior notification of the arrival of those to whom privileges and immunities were to be accorded. That, along with the refusal of the Conference to reconsider article 60, had made it impossible for the French delegation to approve the Convention.

28. Mr. RITTER (Switzerland) said that his delegation had abstained from the vote on the Convention because although there was some good things in it, there

were also a number of unrealistic, ill-balanced provisions and some illogical and even inconsistent ones. The text was not of the same quality as that of previous Vienna Conventions, which had been generally admired by jurists and diplomats alike. One reason why the Conference had failed to achieve work comparable to its predecessors was that in the previous Vienna Conferences all States had been in the same position. In the present Conference, for the first time there had been two groups—a minority group of host States and a majority group of sending States, each with well-defined interests. The result had been that the pattern of bilateral negotiations had been reproduced in a multi-lateral context.

29. Sir Vincent EVANS (United Kingdom) said that like other representatives, he was disappointed to have been forced to abstain from the vote on the Convention. It had, however, failed on too many points to take into account existing practice and the requisite balance of interests between sending State and host State, and represented too radical a departure from the principles of paragraph 2 of Article 105 of the Charter of the United Nations.

30. Mr. SOBHAN (Bangladesh) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Convention and could therefore not agree with those delegations which had expressed pessimism about the document, particularly as the relationship between sending and host States was bound to change in future. The unfortunate divisions of opinion which had been obvious during the entire Conference might be avoided at future conferences when more sending States became host States. Moreover, the Convention, as adopted, would promote the close association of countries in their relations with international organizations and contribute to the implementation of Article 105 of the Charter.

31. Mr. SOGBETUN (Nigeria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Convention because it had been prepared with the greatest care and took into account the legitimate interests of both sending States and host States. In that connexion, he noted that some States which were not satisfied with the Convention, as adopted, still had to learn that the world had not been made only for them and that they must sometimes bow to majority rule. Progress, by definition, could not stand still, and the Convention represented a further step in the codification and progressive development of international law.

32. Mr. MARESCA (Italy) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Convention as a whole in a spirit of compromise and conciliation. That vote did not, however, represent a commitment for the Government and constitutional authorities of Italy, who would have to take the final decision concerning ratification of the Convention. His delegation was not fully satisfied with the final document and during the discussions, had tried to convince the Committee and the Conference of the dangers of crushing the minority and of trying to impose unsatisfactory methods of negotiation. Whatever its limitations, however, the Convention would be judged by the way in which it was applied and only then would it be possible to determine how

useful the work of the Conference had been. His delegation considered that the Convention was a step forward in the codification and progressive development of international law and that it represented an improvement of an imperfect situation.

33. Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) said that his delegation had voted in favour of adopting the Convention after having appealed, throughout the Conference, to all delegations to take into account the interests of host and sending States alike. He had listened with great interest to the statements just made in explanation of vote by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Austria, France and the United States of America, whose delegations had abstained from voting on the Convention. He was, however, convinced that, even if those countries, which were host States, did not ratify the Convention, it would still be possible fully to implement it. Again, his delegation had voted for the Convention because it was aware that countries which were now sending States might also become host States and the Convention would help to ensure the success of their future efforts for the promotion of international co-operation.

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE CONFERENCE

Observer status of national and liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or by the League of Arab States (concluded) (A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1).

34. The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to continue its consideration of the draft resolution contained in document A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1, which had been introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the previous meeting.

35. Mr. SURENA (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said his delegation thought that it was inappropriate for the Conference to consider draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1. He therefore requested the President or the Expert Consultant to explain whether the subject-matter of the draft resolution came within the terms of reference of the Conference. His delegation recalled that the General Assembly had requested the Conference to examine only the draft articles prepared by the ILC. It seemed to him therefore that the draft resolution did not come within the terms of reference of the Conference.

36. Again, his delegation wished to know whether the Conference had the authority to request the General Assembly to undertake the task proposed in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, since the General Assembly had authorized the Conference only to consider the draft articles prepared by the ILC. His delegation had some doubts as to the appropriateness of the wording of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution since it had already been stated that any resolutions adopted by the Conference would be annexed to the Final Act. Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution was therefore unnecessary.

37. Mr. SUY (Legal Counsel of the United Nations), replying to the questions asked by the representative of the United States, said that, in inviting States to take

part in the Conference, the General Assembly had stated that it would be the task of the Conference to prepare a convention on the representation of States in their relations with international organizations. The subject-matter of the draft resolution was therefore not within the precise terms of reference of the Conference, but he considered that the Conference was competent to take its own decisions and to determine its methods of work. Referring to the question of the authority of the Conference to request the General Assembly to consider a matter not within its terms of reference, he pointed out that a precedent for such a request had been established during the 1969 United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, when a resolution was adopted entitled "Declaration on Universal Participation in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties"¹ in which the General Assembly had been requested to consider the matter of universal participation in that Conference. Referring to the last question raised by the representative of the United States, he said that resolutions adopted by a conference were in fact usually annexed to the final act, but the Conference could decide otherwise because it was the master of its own procedure.

38. Mr. SURENA (United States of America) said that, in the absence of a ruling by the President that the draft resolution in question was out of order and that the Conference was not competent to consider it, he felt that the Conference should vote, in accordance with rule 31 of the rules of procedure, on the question whether it was competent to consider the draft resolution.

39. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) said that his delegation had taken note with satisfaction of the statement made by the Legal Counsel and that it was of the opinion that the representative of the United States should have requested the sponsors of the draft resolution to answer his second and third questions.

40. Mr. DORON (Israel) said that his delegation shared the view of the representative of the United States that the terms of reference of the Conference did not enable it to consider draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1. Since the beginning of the Conference, certain delegations had attempted to disrupt its work by introducing matters which had nothing to do with the subject-matter of the Convention. Thus, at the 35th and 46th meetings of the Committee of the Whole and at the 12th meeting of the Conference, the Egyptian delegation had attempted to prevent the Conference from completing the task for which it had been convened, namely, the preparation of a convention on the representation of States—and he stressed the word "States"—in their relations with international organizations. The draft resolution was therefore completely outside the terms of reference of the Conference, which, having been convened in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3072 (XXVIII), was limited to one particular kind of work and could not deal with topics

¹ See United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, 1968 and 1969, *Official Records* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.70.V.5), document A/CONF.39/26, annex, p. 285.

which did not come within the scope of the General Assembly resolution that was binding upon it. The references made in the draft resolution to other General Assembly resolutions were of no relevance to the scope of the work or to the competence of the Conference and had been included in order to mislead and confuse delegations.

41. Moreover, the ILC had considered the matter of the representation by observer delegations of States which were not members of an international organization and had dealt with it in an annex to the convention. Neither the annex nor any mention of observers in the draft articles, however, opened the way for the introduction of the draft resolution because the only representation dealt with by the ILC was the representation of States either by permanent missions or by observers. It was therefore out of order for the Conference to deal with the draft resolution; it should refuse to consider the matter because it was a conference of a diplomatic and legal nature and ought not to discuss political matters simply because certain delegations wished to use the opportunity for their own ulterior political aims. His delegation therefore proposed that the Conference should decide that it was not competent to deal with the draft resolution.

42. Mr. SYSSOEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation was of the opinion that the Conference was competent to deal with the subject-matter contained in the draft resolution and suggested that that question should be put to the vote immediately.

43. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the question whether the Conference deemed itself competent to consider draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1.

The Conference decided that it was competent to consider draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1 by 47 votes to 10, with 13 abstentions.

44. Mr. WARNOCK (Ireland), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the delegations of countries of the European Communities, said that they had voted against the proposal relating to the competence of the Conference not as an expression of a political view, but because they considered that the Conference was not the right forum for the discussion of such a matter.

45. Mr. HADDAD (Lebanon), speaking as a sponsor of the draft resolution, said that the working paper in document A/CONF.67/L.1 and Add.1 referred to the resolutions by which the national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or by the League of Arab States had been invited to participate as observers in the work of various international organizations. Moreover, those resolutions were based on the fundamental principles embodied in Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations, which had been developed and given shape during the three decades of activity of the United Nations. In sponsoring the working paper and the draft resolution, his delegation had manifested its attachment to the rule of international law that independent nations had the right to self-determination and sovereignty and the right to acquire the international status enabling them to affirm and safeguard their sovereignty, and it

reiterated its support for the principles embodied in General Assembly resolutions 3237 (XXIX) and 3247 (XXIX).

46. Mr. RAOELINA (Madagascar), speaking as a sponsor of draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1, said that ever since it had adopted resolution 1514 (XV), the General Assembly had recognized and affirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples for freedom and self-determination. Accordingly, national liberation movements in Africa had repeatedly been invited to appear before the Committee of 24 and the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly to describe their hopes and aspirations for self-determination and independence, and, by General Assembly resolution 3247 (XXIX), they had been invited to participate as observers in the work of international conferences. Moreover, the General Assembly had recently invited the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the work of its twenty-ninth session (resolution 3210 (XXIX)) and the presence of representatives of national liberation movements at the current Conference proved that the General Assembly had considered it time for those representatives to take part in international conferences so that they might become acquainted with the many problems they would encounter as full participants in future conferences. The Convention contained general provisions relating to non-discrimination as between States and those provisions also applied to observer delegations. The Conference could not apply a double standard with regard to observer delegations, including those representing national liberation movements, and should therefore adopt the draft resolution which requested the General Assembly to examine the question of the observer status of such movements at its thirtieth session.

47. Mr. DORON (Israel) said that before commenting on the draft resolution in document A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1, he wished to reject the allegations made by the Egyptian representative at the previous meeting when he had spoken of the vestiges of colonialism in the Middle East. Those baseless allegations had been made in a transparent attempt to link the Arab terror organizations with real national liberation movements, with which the Arab groupings had nothing in common.

48. Reverting to the draft resolution he said that the General Assembly of the United Nations needed no suggestions or recommendations from the Conference on how to continue to pamper such organizations as the so-called Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) and assist it in carrying out its infamous criminal activities on the international scene. As had been pointed out by the Government of Israel following the most recent attack by members of that organization on innocent civilians in a hotel in Tel Aviv, the United Nations General Assembly had, for two years, avoided dealing with the subject of international terrorism. On the contrary, through its resolutions on the Palestine question, it had encouraged the PLO to continue its heinous activities. Instead of dealing firmly with the question of international terrorism, the United Nations had camouflaged and twisted the problem out of all

recognition. The paradoxical situation had reached its apotheosis in the notorious personal appearance at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly of the embodiment of international terrorism, who had been accorded almost regal honours by the President of the General Assembly.

49. The fact that the present Conference had suggested to the General Assembly and to States that they should consider giving diplomatic privileges and immunities to a group such as the PLO would cause it to go down in diplomatic history as a conference which had allowed itself to be diverted from its proper course and duties and which had done something it had no power or right to do. Surely, to invoke international law and to make use of a diplomatic-legal conference for the purpose of aiding and abetting international terrorism was the height of cynicism and hypocrisy. The General Assembly of the United Nations would do whatever it saw fit: it was a political body and did not care for legal niceties. The present conference of legal experts should, however, be spared the everlasting shame of adopting a resolution such as that in document A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1.

50. The dastardly outrage committed against innocent people on the night of 5/6 March 1975 had not been denounced in Arab capitals. On the contrary, it had been greeted in those capitals with joy and praise. Draft resolutions such as that in document A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1 only encouraged the PLO to commit further murderous outrages. He hoped and trusted that the present conference of legal experts would not allow itself to be used to encourage international terrorism and murder, and urged members to reject the draft resolution. He requested a roll-call vote on the draft resolution.

51. Mr. GANA (Tunisia), speaking as a sponsor of draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1, recalled the General Assembly resolutions which granted to the national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and the League of Arab States the status of observers and invited them to take part in the work of various conferences of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The adoption of those resolutions would not have served any purpose at all if, at the diplomatic level, the international community refused to give to the representatives of national liberation movements assistance in the form of the privileges and immunities necessary for the performance of their functions at meetings of organs or at conferences. It had, of course, been argued that the representatives of national liberation movements did not represent States and could therefore not benefit from diplomatic privileges and immunities, but he stressed that the draft resolution under consideration did not propose that specific provisions should be included in the Convention concerning the diplomatic status of the representatives of national liberation movements. It merely requested the General Assembly to examine that question at its thirtieth session and recommended to the States concerned to accord to delegations of national liberation movements which had been granted observer status by the international organization concerned the facili-

ties, privileges and immunities necessary for the performance of their tasks, in accordance with the provisions relating to other observer delegations covered by the Convention. A refusal to grant such privileges and immunities would be discriminatory and quite abnormal and his delegation therefore urged the adoption of the draft resolution.

52. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he supported the draft resolution. The principle of self-determination was enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and had been confirmed by resolutions in many United Nations forums. Representatives of national liberation movements had been invited to attend the present Conference and he welcomed their co-operation in its work. The PLO was a major national liberation movement whose inalienable rights had been recognized by the United Nations General Assembly and whose representatives enjoyed the status of permanent observer mission. The organization had also been recognized by the League of Arab States as the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The PLO therefore had a legitimate right to a political platform for its struggle. One speaker had discussed terrorism, but the representative of a State which committed inhuman acts against the Arab people had no right to attend the Conference and appeal to justice and equity.

53. Mr. ESSY (Ivory Coast) said that he agreed with the views expressed earlier by the Swiss representative about observer missions to the United Nations.

54. In that connexion, it could not be doubted that national liberation movements had a claim to participate in international organizations on the same footing as member States. It was therefore only just that they should be given a place in the Convention which had just been adopted. Delegations should adopt a positive attitude towards national liberation movements in general, whatever their views in a particular case might be, because those movements could not be dissociated from the common efforts towards progress and peace in pursuance of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In order to ensure future stability, members of such movements should be given an opportunity to gain experience of international activities by following work such as that of the Conference. In the past, African States had had no opportunity to participate in the formulation of the rules which they were called upon to apply. He therefore hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted.

55. Mr. HAQ (Pakistan) thought that the adoption of the draft resolution constituted the minimum gesture which the Conference could make to the PLO, which had been accorded observer status by the General Assembly. His delegation was wholly committed to seeing justice done to the Arabs and looked forward to the Palestine Liberation Organization's becoming the spokesman of a full-fledged State enjoying delegation rather than observer status.

56. Mr. MALANDU (Zimbabwe African People's Union), speaking at the invitation of the President on behalf of the liberation movements represented at the Conference, said that they were grateful for having

been invited to participate as observers in the Conference. He hoped that their late arrival and late participation in the discussions would not be interpreted as indifference to the proceedings. Analysis of the draft articles prepared by the ILC had led the movements to the conclusion that they were intended to apply to observer delegations of the liberation movements of Africa and the Middle East. The adoption by the Committee of the Whole of those articles, and the signing by the Conference of documents providing that liberation movements could participate fully in the work of international organizations would have wider implications than was, perhaps, realized. Close examination of the trend in the struggle of colonial peoples to achieve the right to self-determination and independence revealed a change in the *status quo*, which was fully supported by the Charter of the United Nations. Liberation movements were bound by the same code of international law and practice as were independent States. They felt, therefore, that when the proposals adopted by the Conference were eventually codified, the common application of international law and practice to liberation movements would greatly facilitate the easing of international tensions in areas of struggle, speed up the process of decolonization and strengthen international security and peace.

57. He said that the liberation movements for which he was speaking appreciated the adoption by the Committee of the Whole of the articles which applied to observer delegations. They urged the Conference to give favourable consideration to the proposal in document A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1.

58. Mr. AL-GHADAMSI (Libyan Arab Republic) said that national liberation movements were engaged in a just struggle which had won the respect of world opinion and recognition by the General Assembly. The granting by the United Nations General Assembly and by specialized agencies such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization of observer status to such movements had strengthened the efforts of the international community towards co-operation and stability. The Conference had an opportunity to make a contribution towards ensuring that the provisions relating to observers in the Convention just adopted would be extended to national liberation movements. He regarded the adoption of the draft resolution as a procedural question.

59. Mr. SURENA (United States of America) said that invitations to national liberation movements to participate in the activities of the United Nations had not changed the fact that granting their representatives privileges and immunities was a departure from existing practice. Privileges and immunities were not necessary to enable observers on behalf of national liberation movements to carry out their duties; they merely enhanced the claims of such movements to be treated as States and that would create problems for States faced with insurgent movements. He noted that the national liberation movements referred to in the draft resolution were specified as those recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or by the League of Arab States and he wondered whether the sponsors of the draft

resolution would be prepared to endorse national liberation movements without such a qualification, which in fact was not appropriate in a legal document like the draft resolution.

60. The Conference had been instructed to consider the representation of States, not of other entities, and it was clear from the answer of the Legal Counsel that the subject-matter of the draft resolution did not fall within its terms of reference. The General Assembly was itself dealing with the question of the involvement of national liberation movements in United Nations activities, and the Conference should not presume to offer advice to the General Assembly on that highly controversial issue. Nor should it make recommendations to host States on the subject.

61. As was clear from the statements of the sponsors, the draft resolution was a substantive proposal, which required approval by a two-thirds majority. He therefore requested a ruling from the President in accordance with rule 36 of the rules of procedure.

62. Mr. MAAS GEESTERANUS (Netherlands) said his delegation was of the opinion that the status of the representatives of national liberation movements invited to participate in conferences convened by the United Nations and the specialized agencies should be the subject of further studies, which could best be carried out by the ILC. For that reason, it wished to propose an oral amendment to replace the concluding part of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, after the words "United Nations", by the words "when dealing at its thirtieth session with the report of the ILC, to refer this matter to the ILC for examination of this question without delay". That amendment was also intended to ensure that the representatives of national liberation movements would be given certain privileges and immunities, although not necessarily the same privileges and immunities as representatives of sovereign States.

63. His delegation was of the opinion that operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was legally unacceptable because it proposed that the representatives of entities other than States should be given the same treatment as representatives of States. It therefore requested that a separate vote should be taken on that paragraph.

64. Mr. FODHA (Oman) said his delegation was of the opinion that the draft resolution under consideration was legally and technically acceptable and it fully supported those delegations which had stated that the representatives of national liberation movements should be allowed to participate as observers in the work of international conferences, which could provide the best kind of education for those who had the task of ensuring the future development of their countries. It also agreed with the representative of Italy that international law must always be consistent with previous resolutions and decisions, and, for that reason, considered that the draft resolution would fill a gap by establishing an effective procedure for the implementation of resolutions already adopted by the United Nations.

65. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation fully supported the draft resolution, which took

account of the realities of the development of international life. He recalled that General Assembly resolution 3247 (XXIX) provided that the representatives of national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or the League of Arab States should be invited to participate as observers in international conferences in accordance with United Nations practice. In accordance with that resolution, representatives of national liberation movements had been invited to the current Conferences and would also be present at future conferences. The draft resolution was thus fully justified and modest in scope and he appealed to all delegations to support it.

66. The PRESIDENT said that the Conference had to decide on the proposals made by the representative of Yugoslavia and the Netherlands.

67. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) recalled that his delegation had proposed that the draft resolution should be adopted by a simple majority.

68. Mr. DORON (Israel) said that, in accordance with rule 36, paragraph 3, of the rules of procedure, it was for the President to decide whether a matter was procedural or substantive in nature.

69. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) said that he supported the proposal made by the representative of Egypt that a decision on the draft resolution should be taken by a simple majority.

70. Mr. DORON (Israel), speaking on a point of order, said that it was certainly true that the Conference could alter its rules of procedure but it was equally true that no proposal to change those rules had ever been made. The position therefore was simply that the rules of procedure as adopted by the Conference at its 1st plenary meeting (A/CONF.67/8 and Corr.1), continued to apply; and rule 36, paragraph 3 stated in perfectly clear terms that, "If the question arises whether a matter is one of procedure or of substance, the President of the Conference shall rule on the question".

71. He therefore formally asked for a ruling from the President on the question whether the matter under discussion was one of procedure or substance.

72. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) said that no amount of discussion could alter the fact that, in accordance with the rule just quoted, the point at issue would ultimately be decided by a simple "majority of the representatives present and voting", as clearly stated in the second sentence of the same paragraph of rule 36.

73. The PRESIDENT said that, since the representative of Israel had pressed the point, he could not but give a ruling in accordance with the first sentence of paragraph 3 of rule 36 of the rules of procedure. That ruling could, of course, be challenged by any representative in accordance with the second sentence of the same paragraph and it would then have to be immediately put to the vote and decided upon by the Conference by a majority of the representatives present and voting.

74. The draft resolution in document A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1, in its operative paragraph 1, merely requested the General Assembly of the United Nations

to examine a certain question. Operative paragraph 2 of the same draft resolution contained a recommendation to States which was not binding upon them. States were free to carry out that recommendation or not as they wished. The only decision proposed in the draft resolution was that contained in operative paragraph 3, namely, "to include the present resolution in the Final Act of the Conference".

75. His ruling thereon was that the proposed decision constituted a procedural matter for the Conference.

76. Mr. SURENA (United States of America) said that, for the reasons given by his delegation during the discussion, he regretted to find himself compelled to appeal against the ruling just given by the President.

77. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the appeal against his ruling.

The appeal was rejected by 52 votes to 12, with 7 abstentions.

78. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) said that, now that the preliminary procedural issue had been disposed of, he wished to state in the strongest terms that his delegation was opposed to the Netherlands oral amendment which would introduce into operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution a reference to the ILC. That Commission was purely and simply an organ of the General Assembly of the United Nations and it was open to the Assembly to entrust the ILC with the matter or to deal with it in any other manner it saw fit.

79. For those reasons, he urged the Conference to reject the Netherlands oral amendment and to maintain operative paragraph 1 as it stood, so as not to prejudice the decision which the General Assembly would take.

80. For similar reasons, his delegation objected to the motion for a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 made by the Netherlands representative.

81. Mr. HAQ (Pakistan) strongly supported the views of the Egyptian representative. The Netherlands proposals were nothing more than a diversionary move, intended to prevent the Conference from focusing its attention on the real problem involved. Those proposals should be rejected outright.

82. Mr. GANA (Tunisia) also expressed support for the views of the Egyptian representative.

83. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the oral amendment submitted by the Netherlands representative to replace the concluding words of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, after the words "United Nations", by the following words: "when dealing at its thirtieth regular session with the report of the International Law Commission, to refer this matter to the International Law Commission for examination without delay".

The amendment was rejected by 50 votes to 4, with 17 abstentions.

84. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Netherlands motion for division relating to operative paragraph 2.

The motion was rejected by 44 votes to 5, with 21 abstentions.

85. The PRESIDENT put to a vote the draft resolution in document A/CONF.67/L.2 and Add.1.

At the request of the representative of Israel, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Pakistan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Viet-Nam, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Israel.

Abstaining: Republic of Korea, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway.

The result of the vote was 53 in favour and 5 against, with 15 abstentions.

The draft resolution was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

86. Mr. NETTEL (Austria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had supported the resolution just adopted because that resolution was only the logical consequence of the relevant resolution adopted by the General Assembly, a resolution in favour of which the Austrian Government had voted in that Assembly.

87. In voting in favour of the resolution, his delegation had taken note particularly of its operative paragraph 2, which referred to facilities, privileges and immunities "necessary" for the performance of the "tasks" of the organizations concerned.

88. Such a status had already been granted by the Austrian Government to the observers represented at the present Conference by way of the agreement concluded with the United Nations concerning the present Conference.

89. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada), explaining his vote, said that the General Assembly had decided, by its resolution 2966 (XXVII) to convene the present Conference "to consider the draft articles on the representation of States in their relations with international organizations". The present Conference had therefore no mandate to consider the representation, immunities or privileges of observer delegations representing entities which were not States. The Canadian delegation therefore, considered that the sponsors of the resolution should have taken their proposals to the General Assembly and not to the present Conference.

90. As to the substance of the resolution just adopted, his delegation had been instructed to state that the Canadian Government was opposed to the idea of granting to observer delegations of national liberation movements or of any other entities that were not States, the privileges and immunities conferred by the present Convention to observer delegations of States. His delegation, however, recognized that it was for the General Assembly to examine that question. For that reason, his delegation had abstained in both votes: the vote on the competence of the Conference and the vote on the resolution.

91. Mr. PLANNA (Philippines), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution bearing in mind that it referred to national liberation movements which had been endorsed by responsible regional organizations. It had also taken into consideration the broad measure of support which the resolution had received from participants in the Conference.

92. Mr. SOGBETUN (Nigeria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had been one of the sponsors of the resolution because it believed in the ideals embodied in that resolution. All men were by nature born free and the colonialists should read the writing on the wall; what each liberation movement was saying to the colonialist Power could be paraphrased by: "Let my people go".

93. Mr. JALICHANDRA (Thailand), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation supported General Assembly resolution 3247 (XXIX) inviting national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or by the League of Arab States in their respective regions to participate in the present Conference as observers.

94. He had nevertheless abstained from the vote on the resolution which had just been adopted because its operative paragraph 2 referred to provisions in the Convention just adopted by the Conference; it would be recalled that his delegation had opposed both in the Committee of the Whole and in the Conference some of the provisions included in the Convention. His delegation's abstention should not be interpreted as meaning that his delegation was opposed in any way to the other elements of the resolution.

95. Mr. MITIĆ (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the resolution just adopted, expressed his gratitude to all the delegations which had voted for the resolution. Theirs was a modest but important contribution to the endeavour of the peoples represented by the respective movements to rid themselves of their discriminatory status of step-children of the international community.

96. Mr. PINEDA (Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained from voting but that that abstention should not be construed as a negative attitude towards national liberation movements.

97. His delegation had voted in favour of the question being discussed by the Conference because it considered the Conference competent to deal with it. The fact that, for formal reasons of foreign policy, his delegation had

had to abstain from voting on the substance of the resolution should be construed as a reflection of the spirit of peace and justice underlying the foreign policy of his country, which was in full sympathy with the national liberation movements that were striving for freedom and independence.

98. Mr. MAAS GEESTERANUS (Netherlands), exercising his right of reply, expressed regret at the manner in which the representative of Pakistan had impugned the motives of the Netherlands delegation in connexion with its proposals concerning the resolution just adopted. He wished to emphasize that the Netherlands proposals had been made in the same spirit as all its earlier proposals during the Conference, namely, in a spirit of conciliation and with the aim of arriving at generally acceptable solutions. Surely, after the experience of six weeks of working together with his delegation, that of Pakistan should have realized that the Netherlands delegation had no ulterior motives.

99. Mr. HAQ (Pakistan) expressed sincere regret if he had created any misunderstanding. He had not wished to impugn the motives of the Netherlands representative, for whose competence and integrity he had the utmost respect.

100. During the discussion, statements had unfortunately been made to the effect that certain host States might not be prepared to accept the Convention because of the inclusion of one or other provision. It was a matter for satisfaction, however, that it had nevertheless been possible for the Conference to produce a meaningful international instrument and to adopt an important resolution on the national liberation movements.

101. Mr. CABEZAS-MOLINA (Ecuador) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution because the Conference had decided that it was appropriate to discuss the resolution and because it considered that the question should be carefully examined by the General Assembly. His vote in favour of the resolution, however, was without prejudice to the position his delegation would adopt when the matter was considered by the General Assembly. His Government had a clear and precise idea of its anti-colonialist policy and always fought against the hegemony of a dominating Power. It firmly believed in the right to self-determination and supported the struggle of peoples to achieve political and economic independence. It believed in the contribution international organizations could make towards achievement of those goals and had therefore played its part in elaborating the present important Convention.

102. He agreed with the representative of the United States that the resolution was restrictive in that it did not relate to all liberation movements.

103. He expressed his delegation's solidarity with the President's ruling.

104. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) said that, being one of the sponsors of the resolution just adopted and having spoken earlier on it, there was no need to add anything in explaining his vote in favour of the resolution. He preferred to look towards the future and to express the hope that such regional bodies as the Organization of African Unity, the Organization of American States

and the European Economic Community would be entitled to send observers to all international meetings.

105. Mr. ATTAYIGA (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the cause of liberation movements was the cause of peace as well as of freedom. He expressed his warm appreciation for the support given by so many delegations to the resolution just adopted.

106. Mr. MARESCA (Italy), explaining his delegation's vote, said that he had abstained from the vote on the resolution on strictly legal grounds, because the Conference had been convened to prepare a convention on the specific subject of "the representation of States" in their relations with international organizations. Questions which did not relate to the representation of States fell outside the Conference's competence.

107. Mr. DONS (Norway), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the resolution because it felt that more time was needed to study the question which it raised. That abstention did not detract in any way from Norway's traditionally positive attitude towards national liberation movements. The question of those movements was one that had to be dealt with at the proper time and place after study of all its aspects.

Information concerning ratification of, or accession to, the Convention (A/CONF.67/L.3)

108. Mr. DO NASCIMENTO E SILVA (Brazil), introducing on behalf of the ten sponsoring Latin American countries draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.3, began his statement by announcing that the sponsors had decided to amend it by eliminating the concluding eight words "and whether they have entered reservations to it". They hoped thereby to make it acceptable to certain other delegations which had privately expressed misgivings about some of the wording.

109. It was felt that in future, States wishing to be hosts to international organizations or to meetings or conferences would use ratification of the Convention as an argument in favour of their candidature. No State was obliged to accept the seat of an international organization on its territory or to receive a conference. States interested in playing such a role would normally accept the Convention which, in the form in which it had been adopted, was a well-balanced instrument.

110. The International Law Commission's draft articles had constituted a satisfactory body of rules and, in his view, the majority of the participants at the present Conference would have gladly agreed to transform them into a Convention as they stood.

111. In a spirit of compromise, however, many of them had accepted amendments to parts I, II and III which were designed to benefit host States. Thus whereas article 9 had been adopted as drafted by the ILC, article 101 had been modified so as to include a new and important safeguard for host States. His delegation and others had been anxious to make provision for the inviolability of the premises of the delegation but had bowed to the will of the majority on that point.

112. As for some of the comparisons that had been made with earlier codification conferences, he well re-

called the considerable difficulties which had been experienced by the 1961 and 1963 Vienna Conferences, at both of which he had represented his country. Both of them had been on the point of failing and had been saved by last-minute compromise solutions.

113. He appealed to all representatives to support draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.3, the adoption of which would speed up the process of ratification by States, since an increasing number of States were likely in the future to wish to act as hosts to international conferences and meetings.

114. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) said that in its broad lines the Convention which had just been adopted reflected very well the progress that had taken place in the past thirty years in the development of precise rules to cover relations between host States and sending States. Those States which had accepted at an early stage the role of host States with generosity and, it should be added, not without courage, had made a substantial contribution to the development of multilateral diplomacy. He expressed the hope that the Convention just adopted would soon receive the necessary number of ratifications to enter into force.

115. Mr. SMITH (United States of America) said that he realized that the information envisaged in the draft resolution was of interest to certain States. Unfortunately, the text of the draft resolution would create practical and substantive problems. In the first place, it should be remembered that it would be some time before the Convention just adopted entered into force, whereas the draft resolution contemplated immediate action on it.

116. The draft resolution also raised a question of definition. It would be necessary to determine at what point a State could be regarded as having asked to be the host of a future international organization of a universal character or of a conference convened by such an organization. A State could express a willingness to act as host, or it might be approached with a view to its acting as host. Situations of that kind were not as clearly defined as the draft resolution appeared to suggest.

117. Mr. CABEZAS-MOLINA (Ecuador) moved the closure of the debate under rule 26 of the rules of procedure.

118. The PRESIDENT said that if no delegation requested to speak against the motion for closure and he heard no other objection, he would take it that the Conference agreed to close the debate on draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.3.

It was so decided.

119. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.3, as revised by the Brazilian representative on behalf of its sponsors.

The result of the vote was 48 in favour and 10 against, with 10 abstentions.

The draft resolution was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

Tribute to the Expert Consultant (A/CONF.67/L.8)

120. Mr. GOBBI (Argentina) said that it was a great

honour for him to introduce draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.8 on behalf of its sponsors—which included Oman and the United Republic of Cameroon, in addition to the seven countries indicated on the document as issued.

121. As Special Rapporteur for the topic of the representation of States in their relations with international organizations, and as Expert Consultant to the Conference, Mr. El-Erian had made a significant contribution to the codification of international law and its progressive development. He had always been at hand to give advice on delicate and complicated problems, and the best tribute to his work was that implicitly contained in the summary records of the Conference and its Committee of the Whole, which reflected his acute legal sensitivity, profound scholarship and wise judgement. The draft resolution which he now commended to the participants would represent but a modest tribute to him by a grateful Conference.

122. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada), speaking on behalf of the Group of Western European and other countries, said that his delegation had been particularly pleased to be one of the sponsors of the draft resolution paying tribute to the Expert Consultant. He had met Mr. El-Erian at many legal conferences and had learned to appreciate his profound scholarship, his integrity and his wisdom.

123. The votes which his delegation had cast in the Conference did not detract in any way from the high regard in which it held the Expert Consultant and the value which it attached to the help which the Expert Consultant had given to all delegations in the course of the deliberations of the Conference.

124. Mr. SOGBETUN (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the African group of countries, associated himself with the tribute paid to the Expert Consultant.

125. Mr. HAQ (Pakistan), Mr. RITTER (Switzerland), Mr. PINEDA (Venezuela), Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria), Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece), Mr. RAJU (India), Mr. GÜNEY (Turkey), Mr. MAR-ESCA (Italy), Mr. GANA (Tunisia), Mr. KWON (Republic of Korea) and Mr. MITIĆ (Yugoslavia) associated themselves with the tributes paid to the Expert Consultant.

Draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.8 was adopted by acclamation.

126. Mr. EL-ERIAN (Expert Consultant) said that for once at the present Conference he was at a loss for words to thank the previous speakers for their expressions of appreciation for his work as Special Rapporteur and Expert Consultant. He was grateful to the representatives for their generous appreciation of his replies to their questions and wished to thank many of them for having as often as possible given him early notice of the questions they intended to ask. He had found his work as Expert Consultant to the Conference very rewarding and wished to express to the participants his sincere gratitude for their unflinching kindness to him.

*Tribute to the International Law Commission
(A/CONF.67/L.6)*

127. The PRESIDENT announced that Oman and Tunisia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.6.

128. Mr. PASZKOWSKI (Poland), introducing the draft resolution paying tribute to the International Law Commission (A/CONF.67/L.6), said that the Commission had provided an excellent basic text for the work of the Conference.

Draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.6 was adopted.

*Tribute to the Federal Government and people of the
Republic of Austria (A/CONF.67/L.7)*

129. The PRESIDENT announced that Brazil, Morocco, Oman and Tunisia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.7.

130. Mr. MUSEUX (France), introducing the draft resolution paying tribute to the Federal Republic and people of Austria (A/CONF.67/L.7), said that the fact that the Conference had succeeded in adopting a Convention in such a short time was in no small measure due to the excellent facilities provided by the Government of Austria as host. Discussion about the extension of privileges and immunities seemed pointless in the face of an invariable courtesy which made them all superfluous.

131. Mr. DO NASCIMENTO E SILVA (Brazil) endorsed the remarks of the French representative.

Draft resolution A/CONF.67/L.7 was adopted by acclamation.

132. Mr. NETTEL (Austria) said that his delegation was deeply touched by the gesture of the Conference

and would not fail to convey the contents of the resolution to its Government, which together with the people of Austria enjoyed seeing representatives of many lands meeting and working together on its soil. He was happy to know that the delegations to the Conference had been able to benefit from all the facilities necessary for their work, even without a convention.

**ADOPTION OF THE FINAL ACT (A/CONF.67/13
AND ADD.1)**

133. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Conference was prepared to adopt the Final Act (A/CONF.67/13 and Add.1).

The Final Act of the Conference was adopted.

134. Mr. SMITH (United States of America) on behalf of the Western countries said that everyone had been impressed by the wisdom, fairness and dignity with which the President had discharged his duties.

135. Mr. GOBBI (Argentina), on behalf of the Latin American countries, Mr. RAJU (India) on behalf of the Asian countries, Mr. SOGBETUN (Nigeria), on behalf of the African countries and Mr. KUZNETZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) on behalf of the Socialist countries, endorsed the statement of the United States representative.

136. The PRESIDENT, after a further expression of courtesies on behalf of many other delegations, declared that the work of the United Nations Conference on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations had been concluded.

The meeting rose at 2.25 a.m. Friday, 14 March.