

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLYASSEMBLEE  
GENERALEA/AC.10/SR.13  
2 June 1947

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON THE PROGRESSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL  
LAW AND ITS CODIFICATION

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, Wednesday, 28 May 1947 at 3:00 p.m.

## Present:

Chairman:	Sir Dalip Singh	(India)
Members:	Dr. Enrique Ferrer Viqueira	(Argentina)
	Dr. W. A. Wynes	(Australia)
	Dr. Gilberto Amado	(Brazil)
	Dr. Antonio Rocha	(Colombia)
	Dr. Shuhsi Hsu	(China)
	Mr. Osman Ebeid	(Egypt)
	Prof. Henri Donnedieu de Vabres	(France)
	Dr. J. G. de Beus	(Netherlands)
	Mr. Roberto de la Guardia	(Panama)
	Prof. Alexander Rudzinski	(Poland)
	Mr. Erik Sjoborg	(Sweden)
	Prof. Dr. Vladimir Koretsky	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
	Prof. J. L. Brierly	(United Kingdom)
	Prof. P. C. Jessup	(United States of America)
	Dr. Perez Perozo	(Venezuela)
	Prof. Milan Bartos	(Yugoslavia)

The CHAIRMAN opened the meeting and continued the discussion on the American-Chinese proposal (document A/AC.10/33).

I. A. 2

It was agreed to use the words "plan of work" instead of "formulation of the problem".

I. A. 3

It was agreed to substitute "questionnaire" for "formulation".

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wanted the questionnaire to be sent to the Governments concerned with a request to send the same information as mentioned in the American-Chinese proposal under II. D (page 5) as he considered it to be of great importance for CEIL to

receive all the data in possession of those Governments. In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Prof. KORETSKY said that he had in mind the same information as was submitted to the Hague Conference of 1930, i.e., the answers to the questionnaire circulated amongst the Governments.

The CHAIRMAN then read out the paragraph with this addition:

"Circulation of a questionnaire to Governments and other bodies, understood to be tentative, with invitation to supply all the information relative to the plan of work to be transmitted within one year."

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) would prefer a less strict deadline and suggested the following words "within such time as the reference by the General Assembly would demand, but not longer than one year", as the General Assembly might require a report within shorter time.

The CHAIRMAN stated that there was general agreement on this change of wording in Point 3.

#### I. A. 4

Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) suggested to substitute "sub-committee" for "advisory group", leaving open the question how this sub-committee would be composed.

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not approve of the idea that this implied that the sub-committee might be composed of persons outside CEIL. In his opinion this would be inconsistent with the decision taken to have only a limited membership of CEIL itself. It would then be preferable to increase this membership so that sub-committees could be composed of members only. Prof. KORETSKY also had objections against the idea that the sub-committee was to work with the RAPPORTEUR. The RAPPORTEUR should not supervise the sub-committee but they should work together on a basis of equality, and the RAPPORTEUR's task would only be to summarize the opinion of the members of the sub-committee. He therefore

/suggested

suggested that the RAPPOORTEUR should be included in the sub-committee.

Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) wanted the freedom of action of the Committee and the co-operation with the RAPPOORTEUR not to be so limited.

The CHAIRMAN stated that there was general agreement that the term "work with" does not mean "work under" but there was no objection to using the term "including" instead of "to work with". It was decided to leave the wording to the RAPPOORTEUR.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote Prof. KORETSKY's proposal that membership of the sub-committee should be limited to CEIL members. Four votes were recorded in favour of this proposal, 13 against and the proposal was therefore rejected.

#### I.A.5

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not agree with this point as a matter of principle. If CEIL were to make systematic compilations of norms of international law and were to entrust this work to private experts in special fields this would mean that the work was done by outsiders. However, CEIL would be carrying out its work on the instruction of Governments and its official character should be maintained. It should consult not individuals but scientific bodies which are subject to organized public opinion. Prof. KORETSKY wanted the questionnaires to be sent to the Governments and scientific bodies. When their replies had come in, CEIL would study all of them and submit a draft to the General Assembly. Prof. KORETSKY was opposed to any influence of outsiders whose work would be beyond the control of public opinion. To broaden the basis of CEIL's work, it would be useful to consult organized bodies but not private individuals.

Prof. DOMEDIEU DE VAPRES (France) emphasized that great flexibility was required. CEIL would have to do scientific work and its members were not to be regarded purely as Government representatives. They should have

/the widest

the widest access to all possible material. In his opinion recourse to private experts should not be excluded. Prof. DONNEDIEU DE VABRES considered that the distinction drawn by Prof. KORETSKY between private experts and organized bodies was rather arbitrary.

Prof. BRIERLY (Rapporteur) agreed with Prof. DONNEDIEU DE VABRES. He suggested to add in Point 5 scientific bodies but did not want to exclude private experts.

Prof. RUDELSKI (Poland) thought there was some misunderstanding. As the decision taken with regard to I A 4 allowed any sub-committee not to be limited to CEIL members, which implied that outside experts could be drawn in by setting up a sub-committee. It was in his opinion, therefore, superfluous to discuss this point again.

The CHAIRMAN expressed his agreement with this point of view and considered that "et cetera" in Point 5 included scientific organizations.

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) insisted that if the Committee had taken a wrong decision on a previous point, the mistake need not be repeated. It was said that the basis of CEIL should be broadened because its members could not be experts in all fields of international law, and it was decided to appoint a small Committee of Experts. However, if CEIL could have a rapporteur, sub-committee and experts from outside, why was its membership limited to nine only? These experts might call in the aid of other experts and in this way CEIL would lose all control.

Dr. AMADO (Brazil) supported the text as it stood in document A/AC.10/33. He had voted for a membership of CEIL of nine only on the understanding that the Commission would be free to call in expert assistance in the widest sense. Dr. AMADO formally moved that a vote be taken on the text as quoted in the American-Chinese proposal.

Prof. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) observing that the Commission of Experts would

/be chosen

be chosen by the General Assembly, asked whether these Experts should really be allowed to appoint sub-committee members from outside and these in their turn private experts without any responsibility. This would result in the work of CEIL getting to be almost anonymous.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether there were any objections against wording the paragraph as follows: "consultation as desired with scientific institutions and individual experts if necessary".

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested but did not propose formally the following words "with scientific institutions only". In his opinion at this stage there should be no consultation at all: this should only take place after the drafts had been published.

On a question by Dr. ROCHA (Colombia) the CHAIRMAN replied that the need for consultation would be decided by the Commission. He thereupon put to the vote the amended text as read out by him (inclusion of scientific institutions) which was accepted by 14 votes in favour with 3 against.

#### I. A. 6

The CHAIRMAN read out the text as it would now be after the decisions taken with regard to the previous points.

On a question by Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) as to when the interim drafts envisaged in Point 6 would be prepared, Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) replied that the rapporteur and sub-committee, when working on any subject would, of course, take into consideration any ideas brought to their notice from whatever source and he suggested that in view of the decisions taken above, Point 6 could now be left out.

The CHAIRMAN stated that there was general agreement to delete Point 6. The renumbering of the next points would be left to the RAPPORTEUR.

Passing to I.A.7, Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) submitted some drafting changes in Points 7 to 14 which he had agreed on with Dr. HSU (China).

I. A. 7

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the only change from the original text in this point was that the word "Rapporteur" was deleted.

Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) observed that this change was made because the drafts would not be the sole work of the rapporteur but a joint product.

There was general agreement on this point.

I. A. 8/9

The CHAIRMAN observed that Points 8 and 9 of the original text were joined in one paragraph in the new text.

Dr. de BEUS (Netherlands) asked what had been the reason of the American-Chinese representatives for leaving out mention of consultation of Governments with a request for comment.

Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) replied that that part of 8 and 9 which had been placed between brackets would only be discussed when Items 3 (b) and (c) of the Agenda were dealt with, so that at this stage the Commission documents would obviously be sent to Governments only.

The CHAIRMAN and Dr. de BEUS (Netherlands) observed that Items 3 (b) and (c) did not relate to consultation of Governments and Prof. JESSUP replied that he had no objection to specifying that Governments should be requested for their comments, but he considered that Governments would automatically receive all United Nations documents and as a matter of course send in any comments they wished to make.

Dr. de BEUS (Netherlands) thought that all the same it might be useful to say so expressly as where new fields of international law would be studied with a view to legislation, consultation of the Governments was very desirable. He also suggested that the period of one year be changed to "a reasonable time".

The CHAIRMAN read out the text as it would be with the changes suggested: i.e. with the addition after the word "appropriate": "and circulated to

governments with the request for recommendations within a reasonable time".

Prof. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) wanted also to add some words on compulsory publication of government replies. He did not approve of the words "as CEIL considered appropriate". In his opinion the Commission should not have a discretion as to whether replies were to be published or not.

Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) expressed his agreement with Prof. BARTOS, but he considered that the publication of these replies would be a matter of course.

The CHAIRMAN suggested adding to Points 8 and 9 the following sentence: "All such comments received should be published".

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) would prefer a wording to the effect that when drafts were published, they should contain all the replies of both governments and any consulted bodies, with particular stress on the government replies.

The CHAIRMAN stated that there was general agreement on the substance but that considerable re-drafting would be required which the Committee would leave to the Rapporteur.

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized that the issue as a Commission document would mean that there would only be a limited circulation. He would prefer publication in book form which would be available to the public and all organizations and would enable the drafts to be laid before the public opinion and published in law magazines.

Prof. KORETSKY, furthermore, expressed his preference for the wording of Point 9 in the original text of document A/AC.10/33.

Dr. LIANG (Secretary) agreed with Prof. KORETSKY that publication as a Commission document would not ensure a wide distribution in the sense that it would be available to the public, but publication on a large scale would again be a matter of great expense.

After an observation by Prof. JESSUP that the Rapporteur might add words to the effect that the widest publicity was desired, it was agreed that Point 9 was generally acceptable subject to the above changes and additions.

I.A.10

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wanted to delete in the revised text the words "and Rapporteur" and Prof. RUDZINSKI (Poland) suggested the same change as to the deadline as had been decided for preceding points.

The CHAIRMAN stated that this rewording would be left to the RAPPORTEUR.

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that in Point 11 also the Rapporteur is mentioned in opposition to the Sub-Committee. He preferred to avoid anything in the text which might cause a misunderstanding. The Rapporteur was not to be a special member of the Sub-Committee but a member just like the others.

After Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) had objected to the omission of the Rapporteur from Points 10 and 11, Prof. KORETSKY withdrew his objection out of deference to the representative from the United States. The CHAIRMAN thereupon stated that there was agreement on Point 10.

I.A.11

Dr. VIEYRA (Argentina) asked whether the Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee was the same person as the Rapporteur of the Commission. There was general agreement that this conception was correct.

Dr. de BEUS (Netherlands) suggested, subject to the agreement of the representatives of China and the United States, whether in the final report Points 10 and 11 could not be combined in one paragraph as they really concerned only one phase of the procedure.

The CHAIRMAN stated that this would be left to the RAPPORTEUR.

I.A.12/13/14

The CHAIRMAN stated that no member wishing to speak on these points they were accepted unanimously.

Prof. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) called the attention of the Committee to the footnote on page 3 of document A/AC.10/33. In his opinion this matter concerned the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly.

/Prof. JESSUP

Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) explained the idea on which the subject matter in the footnote was based. The United States Government considered that the work of the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly was very extensive. In order that the drafts of CEIL should receive full attention they should not be submerged under the regular work of the Sixth Committee. On the other hand, in order not to have an entirely new Committee, the procedure as outlined in the footnote was suggested to the effect that the representatives whom the Member States wanted to represent them on the Sixth Committee should meet in advance of the session of the General Assembly. Of course Prof. JESSUP saw the difficulty that no Sub-Committee of the Sixth Committee could be convened when the Sixth Committee did not yet exist. Therefore, the suggestion of a special Committee was made which was to have the same personnel as the Sixth Committee would have. The General Assembly would presumably give instructions to CEIL and the same Committee might prepare the work for the General Assembly both with regard to the consideration of CEIL reports and for suggesting new topics for international legislation or codification.

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the suggestion to have the CEIL drafts examined previous to the General Assembly by a Sub-Committee was not novel but could be found in various other proposals put before this Committee. However, it was decided to have only one Commission and he did not see that there was any necessity for setting up a Sub-Committee to prepare the work of the Sixth Committee which would be sitting for six weeks and have ample time to prepare the matter for the plenary session of the General Assembly. He asked Prof. JESSUP not to press his point and was of the opinion that no special Committee was required.

Dr. VIEYRA (Argentina) suggested that the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly should meet in advance of the opening of the General Assembly session.

/Dr. AMADO

Dr. AMADO (Brazil) expressed his entire agreement with the suggestion made in the footnote under discussion and in reply to Prof. KORTISKY he pointed out that the special Committee suggested was not actually a second codification committee but only intended to render more easy the work of the Sixth Committee and of the General Assembly.

Prof. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) thought that the matter should be laid before the Rules of Procedure Committee of the General Assembly which was going to meet one week before the General Assembly. The CHAIRMAN observed that it was not only a matter of procedure but also one of substance, and he understood the difficulty felt by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Dr. LIANG (Secretary) pointed out that from a practical point of view it could hardly be expected that the Member States which, as experience showed, constitute their delegations to the General Assembly only on the eve of the General Assembly, would send their representatives on the Sixth Committee a week in advance. Dr. LIANG made an alternative suggestion. The Secretariat and the Sixth Committee would always have a heavy load of work during the General Assembly sessions and in this respect he fully agreed with Prof. JESSUP'S point of view. However, it might be recommended that the General Assembly appoint a Sub-Committee of the Sixth Committee charged exclusively with studying the CEIL drafts and any subjects suggested to be taken up by it.

Prof. RUDZINSKI (Poland) recalled the proposal he originally made in document A/AC.10/20 under paragraph II which was somewhat similar to the one made by Dr. LIANG. Also he agreed that the task of the Sixth Committee was very heavy during the last session of the General Assembly. However, it gave far too much time to minor points and this might be corrected at the next session. The Sub-Committee now suggested would have six weeks for its task and that would surely be enough.

/Dr. AMADO

Dr. AMADO (Brazil) wanted to support the original proposal made by the representative for Poland in document A/AC.10/20 and considered that it would be useful for a special Committee, also appointed for a three years period, to follow the work of CEIL.

Prof. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) formally proposed that the Secretariat accept the suggestion made in the footnote and submit it to the Rules of Procedure Committee of the General Assembly. Of course, the setting up of a special Sub-Committee of the Sixth Committee would be entirely within the framework of the General Assembly Rules and would not have to be so submitted.

Dr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General) observed that two things should be distinguished:

(a) How should the General Assembly deal with CEIL reports and drafts; it would of course refer them to the Sixth Committee. In view of the fact that the Sixth Committee would always have an enormous agenda, Dr. KERNO entirely approved of Dr. LIANG'S idea that a special Sub-Committee be set up.

(b) The Committee desired that between sessions of the General Assembly another inter-governmental organ act as intermediary between CEIL and the General Assembly.

Dr. AMADO (Brazil) agreed with Prof. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) that the Rules of Procedure Committee of the General Assembly would have to decide on the procedural points involved but considered that the Committee could certainly put the matter before the General Assembly.

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the suggestion made by Dr. AMADO (Brazil) would lead to a revision of the decision to have only one codification commission. He expressed his support of Dr. LIANG'S (Secretary) proposal. Moreover, the suggestion made in the footnote under discussion could not be implemented to take effect before 1948.

/The CHAIRMAN,

The CHAIRMAN, in summing up the discussions, concluded that Prof. JESSUP'S (United States of America) suggestion concerned two functions of the special Committee (a) the conclusion of CEIL reports and (b) the study of new subjects to be submitted to it. If the Committee considered that a special Sub-Committee of the Sixth Committee could perform these two functions it might accept Dr. LIANG'S proposal. If not, recommendations might be made to the General Assembly to set up this special Committee envisaged by the American-Chinese proposal. Finally, there was Prof. BARTOS' (Yugoslavia) formal proposal to refer the matter to the Rules of Procedure Committee of the General Assembly.

Dr. LIANG (Secretary) pointed out that it would seem premature to submit this matter now to the Rules of Procedure Committee as it would be part of the whole report of this Committee and action could only be taken on any part of it after the General Assembly had approved of the report. Moreover, the Rules of Procedure Committee was only dealing with the improvement of the Rules of Procedure now in use and would not be competent to deal with this matter. It would only be after the General Assembly had adopted this Committee's report, inclusive of the subject now under discussion, that the matter could be submitted to the Rules of Procedure Committee to determine whether a revision of the Rules of Procedure was necessary.

Dr. HSU (China) asked whether the vote about to be taken would be on the setting up of a special Committee or on that of a Sub-Committee of the Sixth Committee. As this Committee could only make recommendations to the General Assembly it seemed merely to be a matter of secondary importance as of course the Members could not be forced to follow up the recommendations.

In reply to a question by the CHAIRMAN whether the representatives for the United States and China insisted on their proposal, Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) stated that he considered the proposal by Dr. LIANG (Secretary) as an amendment to theirs and asked that it be voted on first.

Dr. AMADO (Brazil) on a point of order, formally proposed that the suggestion laid down in the footnote should be voted on first.

Dr. LIANG (Secretary) pointed out that if a special Committee were appointed this would not prevent the Sixth Committee from setting up a special Sub-Committee for examination of CEIL drafts and reports, etc., and feared duplication of machinery.

Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) warned that if a special Committee and a special Sub-Committee were set up, it would mean that four organs were in subsequent stages to deal with codification: CEIL, the Special Committee, the Special Sub-Committee of the Sixth Committee, and the General Assembly.

Prof. DONNEDIEU DE VABRES (France) also insisted that Dr. LIANG'S proposal be voted on first.

The CHAIRMAN complied with this request and Dr. LIANG'S proposal that the Sixth Committee should be recommended to set up a special Sub-Committee was carried unanimously. As this decision did not exclude the possibility of also recommending a Special Committee as suggested by Prof. JESSUP and Dr. HSU a vote was taken on the latter's proposal which was lost by 7 votes in favour, 8 against and 2 abstentions.

B. (Page 4 of Document A/AC.10/33), Proposals and Draft Conventions Recommended by Governments, etc.

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) objected to the proposal made under this heading. He could not agree that drafts should be submitted to CEIL by single governments, specialized agencies and other organizations. Article 13 of the Charter expressly wanted the task of codification to be carried out by the General Assembly and CEIL would be a General Assembly Commission. It would therefore be for the General Assembly to issue instructions to CEIL and to choose the topics where rules of international law were needed. CEIL would not only have to take note of what the law is but codification should be understood to include the systematization of international law. For this important task the

General Assembly should have sole responsibility. This Committee should not recommend that other bodies may make suggestions to CEIL. International organizations interested in international law were increasing constantly. The small Commission of Experts should not be burdened by all suggestions which such organizations wanted to put before it, either directly or through the Secretariat. Prof. KORETSKY recalled that the Government of Panama when introducing their declaration on the rights and duties of states also submitted it to the General Assembly and this referred the matter to the present Committee. In his opinion that was the correct procedure. There was no article in the Charter allowing such organizations the right envisaged here. Prof. KORETSKY reminded the Committee that only the Philippine delegation had wanted to turn the Assembly into a legislative body. In Prof. KORETSKY'S opinion this Committee would not only go beyond the Charter in allowing this procedure but also for practicable reasons it was undesirable, as CEIL would be submerged by a flood of drafts and requests from single governments, specialized agencies and organizations. Prof. KORETSKY formally proposed deletion of I.B.

Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) considered that the wording of this Chapter had led to misapprehensions. Of course it was not the idea that CEIL should act as an advisory body to the whole world. Likewise, it would also be only the General Assembly which could ask CEIL to prepare new international legislation. However, the intention of this chapter was that, in the future as in the past, any of the bodies referred to in this chapter would undoubtedly have suggestions with regard to international law and it seemed appropriate that the General Assembly would want CEIL to study such ideas and report back to it. CEIL however would always be acting under the instructions of the General Assembly. As to Point 1 (d) of Chapter B, regarding consultation with bodies concerned, this was put in, as it was the procedure laid down by the General Assembly with regard to genocide.

/Prof. KORETSKY

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not understand the explanation given by Prof. JESSUP. CEIL would be composed of experts not politicians. However, every draft must first be considered from the political aspect. If approved from this point of view, then only could it be handed to CEIL. The Draft Declaration on the Rights and Duties of States proposed by Panama was also first submitted to the First (Political) Committee of the General Assembly and then only to the present Committee. In his opinion every draft or subject should first be examined by the political body. If that was also Prof. JESSUP'S opinion, it should be made more clear in the text.

The CHAIRMAN stated that as Prof. KORETSKY'S objections were merely negative in wanting to delete the whole of Chapter B, he would put Prof. JESSUP'S proposal to the vote which was carried by 12 votes in favour, with 3 against and 2 abstentions.

In consequence of this vote, Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he would not participate in voting on the single items of Chapter B as he disapproved of the whole of this chapter.

Prof. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) also declared that he would abstain from taking part in the discussions of the Committee on the points of Chapter I B of document A/AC.10/33 as the Committee had taken a decision in flagrant violation of the Charter. The Charter had expressly laid down the procedure for placing an item on the agenda of the General Assembly. However, by the decision which had just been taken, the Committee had opened the way for governments and certain organizations and bodies (not so authorized by the Charter) to place items on the agenda of the General Assembly through the back door of the Codification Commission to be set up, which was an inadmissible manipulation from a constitutional point of view. He therefore reserved the right to raise this point again on behalf of the Delegation of his Government before the General Assembly.

/I.B.1 (a)

I.B.1 (a) was accepted without discussions. In I.B.1 (b) the term "six months period" was substituted by "within reasonable time". In I.B.1 (b) the word "questionnaire" was substituted for the word "formulation". I.B.1 (c) and (d) were accepted without discussion. With reference to the note under this sub-heading, Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) pointed out that if a questionnaire had already been circulated, this would be sufficient.

Regarding I.B.2 (a) the CHAIRMAN asked whether the representatives for Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia also objected to the points dealt with under this sub-heading. Prof. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) replied that he also considered these points unconstitutional. Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized that he would refrain from voting on the whole of Chapter B, but not from discussions. Prof. KORETSKY asked for a clarification concerning Sub-headings 2 and 3. Did the members of this Committee seriously wish that the Commission of Experts would become a kind of brain trust for all organizations gravitating around the United Nations?

Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) observed that Chapter B dealt with provisions and draft conventions divided into three categories. The draft conventions were divided into those signed and those not yet signed. For example, a convention, drawn up by the Economic and Social Council but not yet signed, might be referred to CEIL for study for comparison with other conventions or texts and for report to the General Assembly (Sub-heading 2). Sub-heading 3 related to matters already regulated.

Prof. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked, with regard to Sub-heading 3, whether it would then be the task of CEIL to criticize the conventions signed. This would amount to a criticism of the signatory governments. Prof. JESSUP (United States of America) pointed out that the cross reference mentioned in Sub-heading 3 was to the

/Secretariat

Secretariat memorandum where it dealt with procedures for encouraging the ratification and accession to conventions. The CHAIRMAN returned to Sub-heading 2 (a) and its various points.

Dr. VIEYRA (Argentina) supported by Mr. SJOBOG (Sweden) wanted to combine in Sub-heading 2 the point of 1 (b), a circulation of questionnaires to all governments as the Secretariat under the present provision would only send the documents in question to the governments directly concerned in any convention. It was agreed to leave this point to the RAPPORTEUR. Sub-heading 3 already discussed above was agreed to without further discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 o'clock.

-----