



At the outset, my Delegation would like to express our appreciation to the International Law Commission for its laudable achievements in continuing its important contribution to the promotion of the progressive development of international law and its codification. I would also like to express my appreciation to the Chairman of the ILC, Mr. Kirill Gevorgian, for his presentation on the work of the Commission during its 66th session.

Allow me now to make a few comments and observations on several issues contained in the report.

First: expulsion of aliens.

With regard to the work of the Commission on expulsion of aliens, Indonesia welcome with appreciation the adoption of a set of 31 draft articles, together with commentaries thereto. We would also commend the Special Rapporteur, Mr. Maurice Kamto, for his outstanding efforts and excellent work.

This topic touches on sensitive issues, including State sovereignty; the rights of aliens; whether the draft articles reflect codification or progressive development of international law; and whether the draft

disasters, effective response, rehabilitation and reconstruction; information on disaster relief activities; and administration of national and/or international aid relief. Recognizing the importance

Indeed, in dealing with the protection of persons in the event of disasters, we must recognize the fact that disasters occur in the territory of a sovereign State. Therefore respect for the basic

where a State had refused external assistance. It is therefore necessary for the Commission in its second reading to make the necessary amendments to Draft Article 13 so as to ensure that seeking external assistance to the extent that a disaster exceeds its national response capacity, is not an obligation, but rather a **commendatio non obligat**(recommendation that is not binding) addressed to the affected State.

We support the inclusion of Draft Article 18 on the obligation to protect disaster relief personnel and their equipment and goods. The nature of such obligation is indeed an obligation of conduct and not of result. Such a characterization means that preventive measures should be adopted by the affected State, as an attempt to avoid the commission of criminal activities that is harmful to the relief of personnel and their goods and equipment. Obligation that requires result will indeed constitute an onerous burden to the affected states. Furthermore, failure to achieve the desired effect of the obligation could incur state responsibility of the affected state.

Before I conclude, ,

My delegation wishes to reiterate the view that in order to