



Saturday, 17 November 1951, at 11 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
Draft Declaration on Rights and Duties of States : report of the Secretary-General (A/1850)	7

Chairman : Mr. Manfred LACHS (Poland).

**Draft Declaration on Rights and Duties of States :
report of the Secretary-General (A/1850)**

[Item 48]*

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the first item on its agenda, relating to the draft Declaration on Rights and Duties of States. He drew attention to the fact that the Secretary-General's report thereon (A/1850) recalled that at its fourth session the General Assembly had adopted resolution 375 (IV) on the draft prepared by the International Law Commission. After having expressed appreciation for the Commission's work, resolution 375 (IV) recommended the draft to the consideration of all Member States and transmitted it to them with the request that they should make their comments at the latest by 1 July 1950. The resolution also requested governments to give concrete replies to the following questions: whether any further action should be taken by the General Assembly on the draft Declaration; if so, the exact nature of the document to be prepared and, furthermore, the procedure to be adopted in relation to it. Further, the Secretary-General was requested to prepare and publish the suggestions and comments of Member States. At its fifth session (284th plenary meeting) the General Assembly had decided to defer the question until the present session. Since then, the Secretary-General had received only one reply from a Member State; which, with the eleven replies previously received, constituted a total of only twelve replies for sixty Member States.

2. He asked the Committee first to consider a question of procedure: it must decide whether to take new measures in the matter, and, if so, the nature of such measures. In that case, the Committee would then have to consider the substance of the question. The Chairman accordingly invited members of the Committee to comment on the preliminary question.

3. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) called attention to the fact that the replies received from Member States appeared in documents A/1338 and Add.1 and in the annex to document A/1850.

4. Mr. ESCUDERO (Ecuador) read paragraphs 3 and 4 of General Assembly resolution 375 (IV). He pointed out that a number of replies were in favour of the draft Declaration. Nevertheless, although France had described it as an excellent basis for codification, it had expressed the view that the International Law Commission was more competent to decide upon it than a political assembly. Australia, on the other hand, did not believe that there was any need to amend the draft and Israel had stated the reasons against its approval by the Sixth Committee. The Israel reply had also recommended that the question should be referred to the General Conference provided for under Article 109 of the Charter for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter.

5. Forty-eight States had not submitted any comment. Consequently, he doubted whether the General Assembly could arrive at any agreement on the question, in view of the gravity of the international situation and the divergent views held by various States. If the Committee were to decide to discuss the question, difficulties would arise, particularly in connexion with the drafting of the text relating to such rights and duties, and many reservations would be made with regard to the text adopted.

6. Many articles of the draft were contained in substance in the Charter. A positive international law therefore already existed in that respect, and the draft declaration might give rise to duplication. His Government consequently thought it better to maintain the *status quo*. That attitude would not preclude a new resolution inviting governments to submit their comments on such an admirably prepared text. It would be better to wait until a majority of States had submitted replies before discussing the document.

7. Mr. MALOLES (Philippines) believed that General Assembly resolution 375 (IV) had been intended to provide for a preliminary study, after which the Sixth Committee or the International Law Commission could proceed to a useful discussion on the subject. The fact that the replies had not been favourable did not imply that governments were opposed to the draft as such, but rather that they hoped to see it amended. The course of action suggested by the Ecuadorean representative might prevent the Sixth Committee from ever coming to an end of its work. It should study the draft, taking into

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

account the replies already received, the question of its approval by Member States arising only after that had been done.

8. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) regretted the lack of any precise rules governing the rights and duties of States. At the present time, when the adoption of the United Nations Charter had marked a salient development in the history of international relations, there should be a declaration giving legal expression to the principles it expressed. The Government of Ecuador could be proud of the initiative it had taken in 1947 and he deplored the fact that certain States sought to hinder the progress of that idea. The fact that the International Law Commission had been entrusted with the question had been a guarantee of work well done; the moment had now come, however, to pursue that task. A document of such importance called for a thorough study by Member States, which must point out any way to improve it.

9. He disagreed with the representative of Ecuador in that he considered that more than twelve States had indeed submitted replies in view of the fact that a far greater number of Member States had intervened during the general discussion in the Sixth Committee in 1949. Moreover, what purpose would it have served to request States to give their comments if they were not to be studied? Any other course would be contrary to the interests of the United Nations. During the fifth session of the General Assembly, a regrettable decision had prevented the work on that draft declaration from being continued. The majority of the States which had given it their support had been medium-sized States in need of legal protection in the international community. On that occasion he had spoken in favour of the continuation of the work. He did not agree with the representative of Ecuador that the atmosphere at the present time was not propitious to the study of the question. In any case, had not the present General Assembly placed it on its agenda and requested the Sixth Committee to study it? He therefore urged that the general discussion should be opened on the draft.

10. Mr. ZUÑIGA PADILLA (Nicaragua) supported the views of previous speakers and disagreed with that of the representative of Ecuador on the ground that, even if the majority of Member States had not made any comments, that in no way constituted a decisive reason for prejudging their opinion. He agreed with the Philippine representative that it was desirable to establish standards for world organization for the future.

11. Mr. ROMERO HERNANDEZ (El Salvador) stated that, as the representative of a small country, he felt considerable sympathy with the views expressed by the representatives of the Philippines and Yugoslavia. The world must be given a catechism of the rights and duties of States.

12. Mr. MAKTOS (United States of America) said that the subject was an important one, but the Committee had already done everything in its power. Any new initiative in that connexion might do more harm than good. The draft Declaration was an important contribution to the development of international law. Another debate would only serve to stress the many divergencies of views and to raise thorny questions, thus prejudicing the excellent work of the International Law Commission, to which a tribute had already been paid.

13. Mr. PESCATORE (Luxembourg) observed that the question seemed to arouse as little enthusiasm as had the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security

of Mankind, which the Assembly at its 341st plenary meeting had removed from the agenda of the present session (A/1950, paragraph 4). The referring of such drafts to the International Law Commission had resulted in a loss of valuable time for that Commission.

14. He hoped that action on the question would be deferred until at least a majority of States had sent in their comments.

15. Mr. CHAUMONT (France), while reserving his Government's position on the substance of the matter, thought that the comparison drawn by the representative of Luxembourg between the draft Declaration on Rights and Duties of States and the draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind was false. The former had already been studied two years previously, whereas the latter had only been prepared by the International Law Commission in the course of the previous few months and States had not yet had time to submit their comments. He therefore considered that the General Assembly could not be said to have shown a lack of interest in the draft.

16. Mr. SPIROPOULOS (Greece) also protested against the parallel drawn by the representative of Luxembourg. The draft Code had aroused interest and support from many governments. The sole reason for its having been referred to the International Law Commission had been the fact that the Sixth Committee had not been in a position to draw it up itself. As the French representative had pointed out, the draft Code was a necessary prerequisite for the establishment of an international criminal court. The fact that it had not been placed on the agenda of the present session did not therefore prejudice its future.

17. He recalled that he had been the only member of the International Law Commission to request that the text of the draft code should be transmitted to governments.

18. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) recalled that Egypt was one of the twelve countries which had commented on the draft Declaration on Rights and Duties of States. If some States had submitted observations, that was merely evidence of greater zeal on their part. It did not imply that other governments did not have any views on the question.

19. It was not so much a matter of establishing positive law as of publishing a declaration like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. He was surprised that some small Powers were opposed to the study of the Declaration, since it constituted in itself a guarantee of international morality. He was also surprised to find that the three great Powers were of the same mind in that respect. He regretted, however, that their agreement seemed to have been reached at the expense of the small nations, and could wish that they were in agreement in all other fields. His delegation accordingly supported the view of the Yugoslav representative.

20. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee whether it would be wise to re-open a discussion like that which had preceded the Committee's recommendation of resolution 375 (IV).

21. Mr. KOVALENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) considered that the draft declaration had not been prepared carefully enough; only twelve States had replied, either on the substance of the matter or to the definite questions asked in paragraph 4 of resolution 375 (IV).

22. Since the fifth session of the General Assembly, the grounds for adjourning discussion of the question had remained unchanged, as only one new reply, that of Australia, had been received in the interval. Further, it had not been possible for observations received from States to be studied by the International Law Commission. Yet article 22 of the Commission's statute made such study mandatory. He therefore considered that the documentary material provided on the question was incomplete and that it was thus impossible to hold a useful discussion, since the great majority of States had not expressed their views and the normal procedure had not been applied. For that reason he was submitting a draft resolution (A/C.6/L.170) which he would read to the Committee.

23. Mr. WYNES (Australia) recalled that his Government, in the letter which it had sent to the Secretary-General (A/1850, annex) in response to resolution 375 (IV), had already, made its views known on the matter with which the Committee was dealing; those views remained unchanged. He believed, like the United States representative, that if it continued to study the matter the Committee would risk doing more harm than good. It was difficult to decide immediately what kind of document should be produced. Should it be a code of the rights and duties of States, a simple guide to that field, or again, a multilateral convention? Long discussion would be necessary to reach unanimity on the definitive text of a declaration. Only twelve governments had replied to the questions in resolution 375 (IV), and therefore the point of view of the other forty-eight Member States was not known. As a result, he considered that it would be profitless to pursue discussion of the question.

24. Mr. FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom) was of the same opinion. However, his reasons were not those which the Egyptian representative attributed to what he called the "great Powers", but were directly contrary. It was the wish of the United Kingdom delegation to preserve the value which the Declaration possessed in its present form, and from which a detailed discussion could only detract. In 1949 the Assembly had hesitated between a number of measures and had decided to take note of the draft Declaration and to submit it to governments without referring the matter to the International Law Commission, a step which, as Mr. Spiropoulos had demonstrated at the time, would have been entirely unprofitable. The situation was still unchanged. Furthermore, whereas the declaration as such was excellent, it would have to be greatly modified in order to be converted into a convention. It was therefore better to stop at an impartial declaration, which would be the work of jurists and technicians, rather than to produce a political instrument the intrinsic value of which would necessarily be less.

25. Mr. GOYTISOLO (Peru) agreed with the representatives of Ecuador, the United States of America and the United Kingdom that it would be better not to undertake an immediate discussion on the substance of the question. It would be better to repeat the request to governments to submit their comments.

26. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) drew the Committee's attention to the fact that, by virtue of paragraph 3 of resolution 375 (IV), Member States had received the draft declaration together with all the documentary material produced on the subject at the fourth session of the General Assembly. That material included the points of view expressed during the discussions by many governments, and it was therefore not correct to say that only

twelve States had made their position known, since many others had already stated their views.

27. Referring to the many suggestions which had just been submitted to the Committee, he observed that wide differences of opinion had already come to light, and they affected not only procedure, but the substance of the question. He therefore believed that a mere procedural discussion was not sufficient and that the Committee should study the matter thoroughly.

28. Mr. HERRERA BAEZ (Dominican Republic) reserved the right, assuming that the discussion were continued, to state his delegation's point of view at a later stage. For the moment, he would confine himself to stating that he shared the views of the representatives of Ecuador and Peru concerning the procedure to be followed.

29. Mr. MAKOTOS (United States of America) was pleased to note that a large number of countries which keenly desired that the United Nations should draw up a solemn declaration on the rights and duties of States none the less realized that the Assembly was not at present in a position to take measures other than those already taken in 1949. It could only declare, as it had done at that time in resolution 375 (IV), that the draft Declaration, which had no legal force, constituted "a notable and substantial contribution towards the progressive development of international law and its codification".

30. Mr. CORTINA (Cuba) recalled that his country had always expressed itself in favour of a declaration of the rights and duties of States. His delegation believed that it was of the greatest importance for the Committee to make a careful study of the question, and it had always been in favour of including the item in the agenda. Some delegations stressed the fact that a declaration had no mandatory character. He, however, believed that one should not underestimate the importance of a declaration of that kind, which would make a notable contribution to the progress of international law. An attempt should therefore be made to convert the present draft into a solemn declaration. Only twelve States had offered their views, but that did not mean that other States were not interested in the subject; on the contrary, it was perhaps a proof that they desired to weigh the terms of their replies carefully, believing that the subject was of capital importance. At all events, the Committee should not shelve the question on the pretext that it was difficult but should, on the contrary, proceed to a thorough discussion of it.

31. Mr. SETTE CAMARA FILHO (Brazil) called attention to paragraph 4, sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), in resolution 375 (IV), which clearly showed that the Assembly had not only desired supplementary information from States, but also had wished to know at the outset whether the draft Declaration called for new measures on its part. The majority of States had thus far been silent on the point and the Assembly should therefore wait until the replies had been received.

32. The Committee should, therefore, consider the adoption of a resolution reminding States that they should make their views known in accordance with the request which they had received.

33. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) recalled that, although his Government had not yet submitted a written reply, it had stated in 1949 that it approved of the draft Declaration. In agreement with the Yugoslav representative,

he believed that the Committee should immediately resume detailed study of the question.

34. Mr. VAN GLABBEKE (Belgium) thought that the moment had come to take a definite position regarding the matter. There were, in fact, three alternative groups of proposals: (a) to open a broad discussion on the substance of the problem; (b) not to undertake at present any new discussion of the question; (c) on the basis of an intermediate solution, as proposed by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR, not to proceed to a discussion of the substance, but to refer the question to the International Law Commission. He believed that the draft Declaration prepared by the International Law Commission had remarkable merits; it was better in accordance with the principle of leaving well alone to keep to that text. It should be pointed out that States would doubtless agree to sign a solemn declaration of the rights and duties of States, but would hesitate to bind themselves by a treaty.

35. Only twelve governments had sent written replies; however, as the Yugoslav representative had appositely pointed out, the Committee knew the point of view of a large number of other countries. An examination of the twelve replies received showed that the majority of them were merely polite formulas and not constructive. His delegation believed it desirable to give those governments which had not so far taken a position the opportunity to do so; such a solution would have the advantage of leaving the Assembly free not to study the substance of the question at such a particularly inconvenient moment.

36. Mr. ABDON (Iran) followed the Egyptian representative in stressing that the Declaration held great significance for small and medium-sized Powers. Nevertheless, he doubted whether such a declaration would enable tangible results to be achieved. There were already important instruments in existence in the same field, such as the United Nations Charter. Article 9 of the draft Declaration reproduced almost literally the terms of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. By the terms of that Article, Members of the United Nations had undertaken to refrain in their international relations from the use of force. Nevertheless, a number of States had not refrained from the use of force, and a new declaration on the subject would not have any greater effect in preventing them from using it. What was important was that everyone should show goodwill and act in good faith. The production of a new instrument would not provide any further guarantee of the security of small Powers but would make them entertain dangerous illusions.

37. After requesting States to make their points of view known, the Committee could, therefore, defer discussion of the question to the next session of the General Assembly.

38. Mr. COTE (Canada) said that he had been impressed by the Brazilian representative's arguments. The Assembly had decided in 1949 to consult Member States and there was no reason to amend that decision, nor was it necessary to issue a fresh invitation to governments to make their views known. He hoped (as had been suggested by the representative of Luxembourg) that the matter would be deferred until a substantial number of comments had been received.

39. Mr. ROMERO HERNANDEZ (El Salvador) expressed surprise that many representatives should consider that the Committee should postpone examina-

tion of the question because few replies had been received. He recalled the terms of Article 1, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which stated that the United Nations should be "a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of... common ends". The members of the Committee, who had been given full powers by their Governments, should therefore work together to find a solution to the problem with which they were faced.

40. In reply to those representatives who were afraid to weaken with amendments the text submitted by the International Law Commission, he pointed out that conventions were always first drafted by jurists and then adopted by political assemblies, which alone gave them validity.

41. He was therefore prepared to vote in favour of the immediate discussion of the question, since he deemed it essential, at a time when the threats to small countries were greater than ever, to strengthen the guarantees of their security. It was unnecessary to raise the question of the nature of the text to be drafted—to decide whether it was to be a declaration, a convention or a multilateral treaty. International law was progressing towards an integration which would transform it into the law of the interdependence of States, and that development had to be anticipated.

42. Mr. ITURRALDE (Bolivia) thought that two basic but contradictory points of view had emerged from the discussion. Some representatives proposed deferring the question until a greater number of replies had been received from governments, while others stressed the need for an immediate discussion on the substance of the question. The Bolivian delegation supported the latter view for reasons which he proposed to outline.

43. In the first place, it should not be forgotten that the question of drafting a declaration on rights and duties of States had been under consideration for four years. He recalled in that connexion that it was the group of Latin American States which in 1947 had sponsored the proposal that a declaration should be drafted by the International Law Commission. The fact that only twelve governments had submitted comments on the draft of which the General Assembly had taken note in resolution 375 (IV), should not be taken to mean that a number of governments dissociated themselves from the question or, certainly, that the draft which had been prepared did not meet with their approval: on the contrary, the absence of a reply could be taken as equivalent to tacit acceptance. Hence, in the absence of any strong opposition, the natural thing would seem to be to resume consideration of the draft declaration, which was undoubtedly one of the most important items of the Committee's agenda.

44. Secondly, the argument that there would be no point in drafting a declaration on rights and duties of States, certain articles of which would inevitably, and in the same terms, reproduce the Articles of the United Nations Charter was untenable, since the very establishment of the United Nations had marked the beginning of a new order based upon certain fundamental principles accepted and respected by all States. The declaration on rights and duties of States would therefore constitute a sort of synoptic table of the principles and rules which should regulate relations between States, just as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights regulated relations between individuals. The declaration would perhaps reproduce some of the Articles of the Charter or certain articles of other international instruments, but

the principles thus re-affirmed would not thereby lose their value: on the contrary, they would gain renewed force as principles regulating conditions of life in the international community and, embodied in a single text which would take the form of a declaration of that kind, they would acquire fresh coercive force *vis à vis* all States.

45. Lastly, the drafting of such a declaration was of vital importance for the small and medium Powers which did not dispose, as did the great Powers, of armed forces and did not have the advantages which the latter enjoyed as directors, so to speak, of the new order to which he had just referred. The small States needed the introduction of a sort of catechism for the use of the great Powers which would assure the former the guarantees they sought, and the violation of which would place any country whatsoever outside the pale of the civilized community.

46. For all those reasons, his delegation considered that the Committee could not defer consideration of the question any longer. It should re-examine the draft Declaration submitted by the International Law Commission, together with the replies of governments, and then, in the light of the discussions, adopt a decision for submission to the General Assembly, which would then draft a resolution for consideration by Member States.

47. Mr. CHAVES (Paraguay) said he had not been convinced by certain of the arguments put forward by representatives who advocated immediate resumption of discussion on the substance of the question.

48. The fact that only a few States had replied to the questionnaire submitted to them was a decisive factor whose importance could not be denied. The silence of the majority of Member States should not be interpreted as showing a lack of interest in the question, but rather as indicating a desire to consider the matter closely before expressing an opinion. As a number of delegations had pointed out, all governments had had an opportunity to state their views at the previous sessions of the Sixth Committee and they had all recognized the need to draft a declaration on rights and duties of States. Much uncertainty had been noted, however, and many differences of opinion had emerged with regard to the nature and possible content of that declaration. It would therefore appear that although all delegations supported the progressive development of international law, the time was not ripe for agreement to be reached on the actual text of a declaration on rights and duties of States.

49. He also agreed with a number of other representatives that from the political point of view it was not a suitable moment to open a discussion on a problem of such difficulty.

50. For those reasons, his delegation was in favour of not adopting a decision and of merely thanking the International Law Commission for its excellent work, which represented an important contribution in the field of international law.

51. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) was sorry to note that the great Powers appeared to concur in recommending that discussion of the question should be deferred, not to say buried. The matter was of special importance for the small Powers, whose interests should not be overshadowed, and he again stressed the need to resume its discussion.

52. He did not wish to bring up once more the argument based upon the fact that the majority of States had not replied to the questionnaire: it was a futile argument

in view of the fact that States generally preferred not to reply in writing and made their views known in the course of discussions. On the other hand, he wished to refer to two other arguments which had been put forward.

53. First, it had been said that the question was difficult and delicate; but the solving of difficulties was precisely the task of members of the Committee. The reply submitted by his Government (A/1338) was one of the constructive replies to which reference had been made; he did not believe that the delegation of Egypt harboured any illusions on that score, as the Iranian representative had implied. He agreed with the latter, however, that good faith was essential; good faith was the basis of the Sixth Committee's work.

54. Secondly, it had been said that the present was not the time to take a decision. He, on the contrary, felt that the moment was very opportune to appeal, as it were, to the conscience of States, and to draft a catechism of international morality, as the representative of Bolivia had called it.

55. Mr. MALOLES (Philippines) said that the time-limit laid down in General Assembly resolution 375 (IV) for replies to questionnaires had not been adhered to. If it was now decided to postpone examination of the question until further replies had been received, there was no reason to suppose that such further replies would in fact reach the Secretary-General. Even if other governments replied, it was not certain that the International Law Commission, to which the matter was to be referred, would then see fit to modify its views in accordance with the new comments. The International Law Commission had already studied the question thoroughly and there seemed no point, particularly when it was remembered that the present international tension demanded immediate measures, in the Committee's losing still more time only to find itself back where it started.

56. The representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States had stressed the importance of the question. It was precisely because the question was of capital importance that its examination and solution could not be postponed indefinitely.

57. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation did not share the fears expressed by a number of representatives that discussion of the draft Declaration would necessarily be dangerous. In his opinion that would only be the case if every delegation were to submit proposals prejudicial to international co-operation. It could not be said *a priori* that that would happen. During the discussion some delegations would not fail to submit proposals which would promote international co-operation. None the less, for practical reasons he would support the draft resolution submitted by the Ukrainian SSR (A/C.6/L.170).

58. At the present stage, a general discussion would not, in his opinion, lead to practical results. There had been a prolonged debate at the fourth session of the General Assembly, and the decision finally taken had been similar to that now proposed by the Ukrainian representative. It was not the Sixth Committee's function to disseminate legal science, nor could it merely discuss the question, highly interesting though the statements of a committee made up of legal experts might be. A committee's discussions should always be directed towards a precise goal.

59. The text submitted by the International Law Commission was not in fact a draft properly so-called; it was

still in the raw material stage, and could not serve as a working basis for the Sixth Committee until it had been reviewed by the International Law Commission in the light of the comments submitted both orally and in writing by governments. As the second paragraph of the Ukrainian draft resolution pointed out, the International Law Commission, despite the provisions of articles 22 and 23 of its Statute, had not studied the comments from governments. But the rule requiring the International Law Commission to take the comments of governments into consideration was not merely formal; it was a wise measure designed to enable satisfactory texts to be drafted on a basis of genuine international co-operation. The fact that the rule had not been observed in the last few years did not mean that it had lost its value, and it was still not too late to comply with it.

60. He therefore did not agree with the representative of the Philippines that, if the Sixth Committee referred the problem to the International Law Commission, it would find itself, at a subsequent session of the General Assembly, back where it started. Consequently, he considered that the Ukrainian draft resolution offered the best possible way out. He hoped that it would be acceptable to all delegations, whatever their point of view, since it did not prejudice the question of what further steps, if any, the General Assembly would take to consider the problem after the International Law Commission had submitted recommendations.

61. For those reasons the USSR delegation supported the Ukrainian draft resolution.

62. Mr. RÖLING (Netherlands) said that the matter under discussion was of special interest to his country, which was one of the few States which had replied to the questionnaire. Nevertheless, the Netherlands delegation felt that it would be premature to take a final decision

on the subject, since the information available was not adequate. He would, therefore, be in favour of any proposal to invite governments to send fuller replies and postpone a decision until receipt of the anticipated comments.

63. Mr. ROBINSON (Israel) said that before voting on a very complex question, delegations should be given the opportunity of studying it in detail. He therefore proposed the closure of the debate on the procedure for that item of the agenda, which would give delegations the time to submit proposals in writing.

64. Mr. CHAUMONT (France) said that he was unable to accept the Israel representative's proposal, since a number of delegations had not yet been able to express their views, even on the question of procedure.

65. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) proposed that the meeting should be adjourned.

66. Before putting the motion for adjournment to the vote, the CHAIRMAN urged members of the Committee to submit in writing any proposals they might wish to make on items on the Committee's agenda.

67. In reply to a question by Mr. FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom), the CHAIRMAN said that members of the Committee would of course be entirely free during the next meeting to submit comments and observations on written proposals submitted.

68. The CHAIRMAN put the motion for adjournment submitted by the representative of Yugoslavia to the vote.

*The motion for adjournment was adopted unanimously,
with 1 abstention.*

The meeting rose at 2 p.m.