United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

SIXTH COMMITTEE, 276th MEETING

Thursday, 3 January 1952, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

Chairman : Mr. Manfred LACHS (Poland).

Reservations to multilateral conventions (*continued*)

(*a*) Report of the International Law Commission covering the work of its third session (A/1858) (chapter II : Reservations to multilateral conventions)

[Item 49 (*a*)]*

(*b*) Reservations to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide : advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (A/1874)

[Item 50]*

1. Mr. COTE (Canada) said that his delegation would vote for the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.6/L.190) to the revised United States draft resolution (A/C.6/L.188/Rev.1). The Canadian delegation hoped that the practice hitherto followed in international law would be maintained. If, as was likely, the amendment was adopted by only a small majority and if the United States draft resolution as a whole was rejected, the Canadian delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution submitted by Denmark, India, Iran, Israel, Mexico, the Netherlands, Peru and Sweden (A/C.6/L.198).

2. The Canadian delegation would vote against the revised United States draft resolution. The adoption of the draft resolution would mean abandoning an established practice, the introduction of the rule of free will in the matter of reservations and the calling of a halt to the development of international law in that field.

3. The Canadian delegation had prepared a document (A/C.6/L.201) which might be useful as a working paper for the International Law Commission when it reconsidered the question.

4. In conclusion, he expressed the fear that, if the revised United States draft resolution were adopted, the problem of reservations would come up again in the General Assembly within a few years.

5. Mr. ROLING (Netherlands), commenting on the revised United States draft resolution, noted that Article 13 of the Charter did not make the General Assembly a source of international legislation; it merely authorized it to initiate studies and to make recommendations. The General Assembly could merely state the law; it could not modify or create it. It was for that reason that the draft resolution submitted by Denmark and seven other countries (A/C.6/L.198) in no way prejudged the legal effects of objections made to reservations to conventions. In the case of future conventions, the General Assembly could not do more than propose a compromise solution. Under the revised United States draft resolution, however, the objection of one State to reservations made by another State would not suffice to prevent the reserving State from becoming a party to the convention if its reservations had been accepted by the other parties. The General Assembly would thus assume the role of legislator with regard to future treaties and even treaties already concluded.

6. The last lines of sub-paragraph 2 (*b*) of the draft resolution were ambiguous. It was not clear who would leave it " to each State to draw all the legal consequences ". The Secretary-General as depositary had only administrative functions and could not determine the legal consequences of a treaty or even the legal consequence of leaving it to each State to draw the legal consequences. The draft would therefore appear to refer to the General Assembly, but the function was not one which could properly be vested in the Assembly. If sub-paragraph 2 (*b*) meant that the Secretary-General would act in a certain manner and that it would rest with each State to draw the legal consequences of that action, the Sixth Committee, in making such a recommendation, would be exceeding its terms of reference.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

7. The sense of the term " draw all the legal consequences " should be made clear. It might mean that each State would be left to apply and interpret the appropriate rules of international law. It had however been seen, even during the present session, that there was a divergency of opinion with regard to the rules themselves. The only possible interpretation was that the General Assembly would leave each State to determine what were the legal consequences of reservations and objections. Such a rule would mean the sanctification by a formula of international legal anarchy. By adopting such a rule the Assembly would be forsaking its duty and perverting its true function.

8. Mr. VAN GLABBEKE (Belgium) recalled that there were ten draft resolutions and three amendments before the Committee. As the Belgian delegation considered that the revised United States draft resolution might gain the support of the majority, it wished to suggest a number of amendments to improve the text. He had been informed, however, that the United States delegation intended to delete the last part of sub-paragraph 2 (*b*), which might alter the situation.

9. As regards the second paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution, he preferred the expression " *Noting* ", used in document A/C.6/L.188/Rev.1, to the expression previously used in document A/C.6/L.188, " *Having considered and noted* ".

10. Paragraph 1 of the operative part of the United States draft resolution was, he feared, unsatisfactory and he suggested that it be replaced by the following text:

> " *Recommends* that in the drafting of multilateral conventions the desirability of inserting a clause covering the question of reservations should be borne in mind, in the light of the nature of each particular convention ".

11. Such a clause could either permit reservations or preclude them. The question of reservations must be settled in a reasonable way without making them impossible. A clause permitting reservations should settle the question of their admissibility and also that of their scope, their effect and the time limit for their submission.

12. Paragraph 2 of the United States draft resolution prescribed certain functions for the Secretary-General; that meant that in fulfilling them the Secretary-General would have to comply with the instructions given him. The Belgian delegation considered that those instructions should relate only to future conventions concluded under United Nations auspices and for which the Secretary-General was depositary. In that connexion he recalled that he had argued at the 272nd meeting that decisions should not be retroactive, for there could be no question of impairing acquired rights.

13. The wording of operative sub-paragraph 2 (*a*) was unsatisfactory and he proposed that it be re-placed by the following: " To continue to act as depositary in connexion with the deposit of documents containing reservations or objections without passing upon the legal effect of such documents ".

14. If sub-paragraph 2 (*b*) were to stop at the words " all the legal consequences from such communications ", as he had heard suggested, there would be a serious ambiguity. On the other hand the present wording for the last clause raised new difficulties, since there was no knowing by whom reservations had already been " accepted " and moreover, as the Netherlands representative had stressed, the General Assembly was not competent to state the law; only the contracting States or the International Court of Justice were competent to do so. He therefore suggested that the sub-paragraph be re-worded as follows:

> " To communicate the text of such documents containing reservations or objections to all States concerned, leaving it to each State to draw the legal consequences from such communications; the Secretary-General shall not however for the purposes of the action which he is required to take in his capacity as depositary, regard the decision of any one State as being able to debar States formulating reservations from participation in the convention in relation to States which have accepted such reservations ".

15. In conclusion he said that if the United States draft resolution was thus amended, the Belgian delegation could support it, but that it would not consider that it was thereby prejudging the question whether the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was in force between States which had made reservations to it and those which had objected to those reservations. If the United States draft resolution were rejected, the Belgian delegation reserved the right to comment on the other draft resolutions and the amendments submitted to them.

16. Mr. HOLMBACK (Sweden), after recalling that his delegation had submitted a draft resolution (A/C.6/L.192), said that as the draft resolution submitted by Denmark and a number of other delegations (A/C.6/L.198) aimed, like the Swedish draft, at postponing a decision until the whole question of the law of treaties had been submitted to the General Assembly, the Swedish delegation had decided to withdraw its own draft resolution.

17. He criticized sub-paragraph 2 (*b*) of the revised United States draft resolution on the grounds that the General Assembly was not competent to enunciate the law, as the representatives of the Netherlands and Belgium had stressed. In his view the United States draft resolution might well plunge international law into confusion. He suggested that a small committee be set up to draft a clear text.

18. Mr. FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation would make a few verbal changes of a purely drafting nature in its amendment (A/C.6/L.190) to the original United States draft resolution at the time of the vote on the revised text. As the Canadian representative had pointed out, the United Kingdom amendment would probably be accepted by only a small majority. If the United States draft resolution was rejected the United Kingdom delegation would vote for the draft resolution submitted by Denmark and a number of other delegations.

19. On the other hand the United Kingdom delegation would vote against the revised United States draft resolution, in particular against sub-paragraph 2 (*b*), which would sanction the Pan-American system. The amendments suggested by the Belgian representative did not appear to be acceptable either, as the States making the reservations were freed from part of their treaty obligations. Even if the last part of sub-paragraph 2 (*b*) were deleted for the reasons given by the Netherlands representative, the United Kingdom delegation would be unable to support it. Its adoption would lead to anarchy, and there could be no compromise on that point.

20. Mrs. BASTID (France) said that she was in favour of the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.6/L.190) to the revised United States draft resolution. If it was rejected, the draft submitted by Denmark and other States (A/C.6/L.198) would constitute a reasonable compromise which would not prejudice the juridical effect of reservations.

21. She felt that it would be preferable if paragraph 1 of the operative part of the United States draft resolution were replaced by the text of paragraph 33 of the International Law Commission's report on the work of its third session (A/1858)[1].

22. Sub-paragraph (*a*) of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution went beyond the limits of the question before the Committee. Only reservations and objections to reservations were involved. Moreover the functions of the Secretary-General differed according to the convention concerned, and that should have been borne in mind in drafting the text.

23. Sub-paragraph (*b*) of paragraph 2 had been rightly criticized by the Netherlands and United Kingdom representatives. It was ambiguous, particularly towards the end. It was not said by whom or in what manner reservations would be accepted, whether acceptance by a single State would be enough, whether tacit acceptance would be admitted, under what requirements and within what time limit. The text contained no provision regarding the number of acceptances required to overrule the objections formulated. There was no mention of the Convention on Genocide. The text therefore contradicted the opinion of the Court,[2] which stipulated that in order to be admissible, reservations must be compatible with the aim and purpose of the Convention. The fact that that opinion was noted was not equivalent to giving the Secretary-General instructions in that connexion. Even if the last lines of sub-paragraph (*b*) were deleted, the French delegation would not be able to support the text.

24. The matter should be reconsidered in the light of the discussion in the Sixth Committee; if that were not done, a decision would be taken by a small majority and the question might well arise again at the next session.

25. Mr. ZAW WIN (Burma) said that his delegation would support any decision taken by a large majority, whatever it was. Inspired by a genuine spirit of international co-operation, Burma was willing to renounce part of its national sovereign rights, should it be decided to limit the right of States to formulate reservations. On the other hand, he wished to assure the members of the Committee that if the right was retained unimpaired, Burma would not abuse it.

26. However, it seemed impossible for the time being to reach any solution which could satisfy the majority; in the circumstances, the Burmese delegation was unable to take any stand on one side or the other and would give its support solely to the draft resolution in document A/C.6/L.198, which requested the International Law Commission to examine the topic further. In order to make it possible for that draft resolution to be voted on, the Burmese delegation would be obliged to vote against all the other draft resolutions which were to be put to the vote before it, instead of abstaining as it would have wished to do. He was sure, however, that if a large majority voted in favour of any of the other draft resolutions, the Burmese delegation's negative vote would not stand in the way of their adoption.

27. The Burmese delegation reserved the right to take a stand on the question of reservations when the International Law Commission submitted its general report on the law of treaties.

28. Mr. MAKTOS (United States of America) said that according to the rules of procedure, the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.6/L.190) and not the revised United States draft resolution (A/C.6/L.188/Rev.1) should be put to the vote first.

29. Moreover, if he was not mistaken the draft resolution in document A/C.6/L.198 had been rejected at the 275th meeting; thus, a two-thirds majority decision would be needed to discuss that draft resolution again and take another vote on it. He sincerely hoped that if a proposal was made to that effect, the three groups which had lent their support to the United States draft resolution, i. e., the Soviet group, the Arab group and the Latin-American group, would vote against it.

30. He did not intend to comment in detail on the revised draft resolution submitted by his delegation. He did not regard as valid the argument of the Netherlands and Swedish representatives whereby the Assembly was not competent to determine rules of law. It might be recalled that the representatives who upheld that point of view were the very same who had recommended the adoption of the unanimity rule. The important fact was that in the past the General Assembly had always laid down precepts, for example when it had declared that genocide was a criminal act. If the General Assembly, and thus the United Nations, was denied that competence, it was hard to see any reason for the existence of the Organization.

31. Nor did he regard as valid the argument that the adoption of the United States draft resolution would lead to anarchy. It was not creating anarchy to allow each State to decide, in good faith and after a detailed consideration of the matter, whether an objection to a reservation was sufficient to prevent the author of that reservation from becoming a party to the convention, and to draw the logical conclusions regarding the entry into force of that convention.

32. Lastly, he wished to delete the phrase to which the Belgian representative had referred, at the end of sub paragraph 2 (*b*) of the draft resolution. However, certain delegations in the Arab group, the Soviet group or the Latin-American group might wish to re-introduce it into the draft resolution. Such a procedure would not raise any important difficulty, since it would always be possible in that case to take a divided vote on the draft resolution and thus vote separately on the phrase in question.

33. The CHAIRMAN and Mr. FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom) said that at its 275th meeting the Committee had rejected a proposal to give priority in the voting to the draft resolution in document A/C.6/L.198, as was shown in the summary record of that meeting. It had not taken a vote on the draft resolution itself, which therefore subsisted and would have to be voted upon in due course..

34. Mr VAN GLABBEKE (Belgium) noted that Mr. Maktos had affirmed his intention to delete the

[1] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 9*, chapter II.

[2] See *Reservations to the Convention on Genocide, Advisory Opinion: I. C. J. Reports 1951*, page 15 *ff.*

last part of sub-paragraph 2 (*b*), and drew the attention of the members of the Committee to rule 121 of the rules of procedure. According to that rule, a motion could be withdrawn by its proposer or, presumably, a part of the motion could be withdrawn, before voting on it had commenced, provided that it had not been amended. The United States draft resolution, however, had been the subject of an amendment submitted by the Lebanese delegation (A/C.6/L.189). It would therefore appear that the United States representative was no longer in a position to withdraw the last part of sub-paragraph 2 (*b*) of his draft resolution. He emphasized that any departure from rule 121 of the rules of procedure would create a very dangerous precedent with regard to the interpretation of that rule.

35. Mr MAKTOS (United States of America) thought that the Belgian representative's comment was irrelevant in view of the fact that, on the one hand, the Lebanese amendment was to the unrevised text of the United States draft resolution (A/C.6/L.188) and, on the other, that the phrase which it was proposed to delete had not been the subject of any amendment. He felt, however, that it would be preferable to discuss that point when it came to the vote.

36. Mr VAN GLABBEKE (Belgium) said that in view of Mr Maktos' reply, two further subsidiary questions, apart from the question of the interpretation of rule 121, should be cleared up: first, would any revised draft resolution and the original resolution be separate documents? If so, the revised text should be given a different number from that of the original. Secondly, should rule 121 not be interpreted as prohibiting the withdrawal of part of a draft resolution which had been amended, even if the amendment did not relate to the part in question?

37. Mr MAKTOS (United States of America) stated that he would not delete the last clause of his draft resolution, so as to avoid a lengthy discussion on the interpretation of rule 121 of the rules of procedure.

38. Mr VAN GLABBEKE (Belgium) said that, in that case, he would not press for an answer to his questions.

39. Mr ALI (Pakistan) pointed out that the general discussion on the subject of reservations had revealed a wide divergence of views which still persisted after the Christmas recess. In those circumstances, he felt it would be unwise to force the issue and to adopt a patched resolution by a very small majority, especially as the question was extremely complex and the decision taken by the Committee was bound to have far-reaching effects. Accordingly, his delegation would abstain from voting. The representatives of the Netherlands, Belgium and Sweden had already thrown ample light on the United States draft resolution. He only wished to add that, in his view, paragraphs 1 and 2 (*b*) of the operative part were not happily worded and, if adopted as they stood, would hardly redound to the credit of the Sixth Committee as a body of jurists who were supposed to be skilled in drafting. As he intended to abstain from voting it was not for him to suggest any improvements.

40. Mr KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) stated that the Secretary-General desired to carry out his duties as depositary to the satisfaction of all States. Whatever decision the Sixth Committee might take, the Secretary-General would endeavour to implement it to the best of his ability. Nevertheless, it was clearly understood that any instructions issued to the Secretary-General in his capacity of depositary would be supplementary instructions, applicable solely to future conventions concluded under United Nations auspices and not containing special clauses on reservations.

41. Furthermore, whether the Committee adopted a special draft resolution relating to the Convention on Genocide or whether it merely took note of the Court's advisory opinion as the revised United States draft resolution proposed, he understood that the Sixth Committee wished the Secretary-General to act in conformity with the Court's opinion in respect of that Convention.

42. Lastly, he shared the view of the representatives who had stressed the need for improvement in the wording of the United States draft resolution. In his opinion, it would probably be advisable to adopt the French representative's suggestion and replace paragraph 1 of the draft resolution by paragraph 33 of the International Law Commission's report, the terms of which had received careful study. He too believed that sub-paragraph 2 (*a*) touched upon questions, such as ratification, accession or signature, which were not directly connected with that of reservations and which would give rise to problems apart from that question. It would therefore be better to refer in that paragraph only to reservations and objections thereto.

43. Mr BUNGE (Argentina) stated that, when the United States representative had stated his intention to delete the last part of his revised draft resolution, he had decided to submit an amendment to that resolution. Since the United States representative had not carried out that intention, he would not submit the amendment, but he wished to state the reasons that had prompted it.

44. The last part of the United States draft resolution had enabled the delegations submitting the amendment contained in document A/C.6/L.191 to withdraw it (275th meeting) and endorse the United States draft resolution. That draft had, at that time, represented a compromise wording acceptable to the majority, who seemed to have decided against the League of Nations system.

45. After hearing the Belgian representative's remarks, he was ready to support any proposal that might be made by him on the lines indicated in this statement.

46. The draft resolution in document A/C.6/L.198 should be rejected precisely in order to avoid the anarchy mentioned by the Netherlands and United Kingdom representatives. It was stressed in paragraph 5 of the operative part of that draft resolution that the legal effects of objections to reservations to conventions would not be prejudiced, and there could be no doubt that such a system would give rise to the greatest confusion as regards the legal effects of the said objections.

47. Lastly, the question under consideration was not that of legislation by the General-Assembly, but of establishing certain rules for the guidance of the Secretary-General. It might also be pointed out that, as the League of Nations had been competent to lay down a unanimity rule, the United Nations was equally competent to lay down a different rule in that field.

48. Mr ABDOH (Iran) briefly recalled his delegation's view that the International Law Commission should re-examine the question of reservations in connexion with its study of the whole question of treaty law. He thought that, even if the draft resolution to be adopted

by the Sixth Committee did not expressly call on the International Law Commission to take such action, the Commission should nevertheless do so under its statute, which required it to codify treaty law, of which the question of reservations was a part. In doing so, it should take account of the discussions within the Sixth Committee.

49. He wished also to speak as RAPPORTEUR, quite independently of his views on the matter, in connexion with the very pertinent remarks of the French representative, which the Assistant Secretary-General had supported, on the wording of the United States draft resolution. He asked the United States representative and all concerned in the drafting of the revised text to accept the following suggestions of a purely drafting nature : first, the substitution of paragraph 33 of the International Law Commission's report for paragraph 1 of the operative part; second, the deletion of the words : " ratifications, accessions or " from sub-paragraph 2 (*a*) of the operative part.

50. Mr. MAJID ABBAS (Iraq) recalled that his delegation had associated itself with the amendments embodied in the revised text of the United States draft resolution. Without giving its opinion on the substance of the matter, his delegation had wanted to indicate the procedure which the Secretary-General should follow, in his capacity as depositary, in connexion with the question of reservations. As the Argentine representative had said, the phrase added to the original United States draft resolution, " without the decision of any one State being sufficient to prevent the participation in the convention of a State whose reservations have been accepted ", implied in effect the adoption of the Pan-American system. That being so, he would vote against the paragraph in question and would abstain on the draft resolution as a whole. He would be unable to vote for the draft resolution unless that phrase were either deleted or worded as follows : " without the decision of any one State being sufficient to prevent the participation in the convention of a State whose reservations have been accepted by other States ".

51. Mr. MALEK (Lebanon), referring to the suggestion made by the French representative and taken up by Mr. Kerno, could see no reason why the text of his amendment, which had been incorporated in the revised United States draft resolution, should not repeat the wording of paragraph 33 of the report of the International Law Commission.

52. Mr. BERNSTEIN (Chile) had been surprised to hear allusions to a joint draft of the Soviet, Arab and American groups. The Latin-American group had not decided to sponsor any particular draft. The countries of that group had held an unofficial meeting and had discussed the possibility of doing so, but they had agreed to allow each country entire freedom of action. It was thus that Chile and Brazil had adopted a different attitude from that of the other Latin-American countries and that Mexico and Peru had joined in sponsoring a draft resolution which did not advocate the Pan-American system (A/C.6/L.198). Moreover, it was not the Latin-American countries which had cited a decision by the Latin-American group, but representatives of countries which did not belong to that group. In his opinion the Latin-American countries should act in concert only in matters affecting the defence of their regional system. That was not the case at the present time, since no Pan-American doctrine was at stake.

53. Certain Latin-American countries were striving, not to defend any Pan-American doctrine but to obtain the adoption of a solution which they considered would be satisfactory. He would have hesitated to oppose a draft resolution submitted by countries belonging to the Latin-American group, but he would certainly vote against the revised United States draft, which embodied the amendments proposed by the Arab countries and the Soviet countries, went much further than the Pan-American system, and even replaced the freedom which characterized that system by a nihilism originating in eastern Europe. He wished to bring that point to the attention of the Latin-American countries which were prepared to vote for the revised United States draft resolution.

54. The Chilean delegation would not vote for the United Kingdom amendment either (A/C.6/L.190), because it did not wish to take sides in the matter. On the other hand, it would vote for the joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.198), which would enable the International Law Commission to continue studying the question of reservations.

55. Mr. P. D. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the Assistant Secretary-General's remarks, was anxious that the members of the Committee should not think that the Secretary-General or any other official, in the absence of specific decisions by the General Assembly, would be able to interpret such a silence in his own way and subsequently to base his arguments on that interpretation on the ground that there had been no objections to it. The Secretary-General's obligations were the result of explicit decisions by the General Assembly; he should not take action on the basis of interpretations or comments relating to decisions which had not yet been taken. Mr. Kerno's statement on the interpretation of decisions taken by the Committee had no legal validity.

56. With regard to the Chilean representative's remarks he stated that his delegation could not entirely support the Pan-American system in view of the alteration made in it by the decision of the Governing Board of the Pan-American Union on 4 May 1932.

57. Mr. MACHOWSKI (Poland) proposed that the words " by another State " should be added to the last sentence of the United States draft resolution.

58. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of Belgium, Argentina and Egypt had just submitted an amendment (A/C.6/L.202) to the United States draft resolution. The Committee therefore had before it four draft resolutions, in the following order : first, the United States draft resolution (A/C.6/L.188/Rev.1) with the United Kingdom (A/C.6/L.190) and Venezuelan (A/C.6/L.197/Rev.1) amendments, as well as amendments from Belgium, Argentina and Egypt, and the amendment just submitted orally by Poland; second, the Israel draft resolutions (A/C.6/L.193 and Rev.1 and A/C.6/L.194) with the amendment submitted by Iran (A/C.6/L.195); third, the Indonesian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.196) and fourth, the joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.198).

59. Mr. ABDOH (Iran), who had suggested certain drafting changes in the United States draft resolution, submitted a formal amendment (A/C.6/L.203) to that effect.

60. Mr. MAJID ABBAS (Iraq) thought that the Lebanese amendment (A/C.6/L.189) was incorporated in the

revised United States text. If that was not the case, he would like certain points to be elucidated.

61. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) explained that the amendment submitted by Lebanon alone (A/C.6/189) had been incorporated in the revised text at the same time as the amendment submitted by Syria, Lebanon and five other countries (A/C.6/L.200). The Committee thus had only the revised text to consider.

62. Mr. MAKTOS (United States of America), Mr. MALEK (Lebanon) and Mr. MAJID ABBAS (Iraq) agreed with the Syrian representative.

63. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) thought that, as it was already late, it would be better to adjourn the meeting.

64. The CHAIRMAN said that that was in fact his intention, but before doing so he wanted to announce that the discussion of the various draft resolutions was closed, and that the members of the Committee would proceed to vote at the begining of the next meeting.

65. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia), speaking on a point of order, thought that such a procedure would constitute an infringement of the rights of delegations. He reserved the right to state his views at the following meeting, on the amendments submitted in the course of the current meeting.

66. The CHAIRMAN assured the meeting that he had no intention of infringing the rights of delegations, and pointed out that the only amendments which had been submitted during the meeting were first, that of Poland, secondly that of Belgium, Argentina and Egypt and finally, the Iranian amendment. He suggested that the next day's meeting should be spent in voting on the various draft resolutions in the order he had given; the Yugoslav representative could, of course, make a formal proposal to the effect that the debate on those draft resolutions should be continued the following day.

67. Mr. ROLING (Netherlands) wanted an explanation of one point in the amendment submitted by the Polish representative : what exactly did he mean by " another State " ? Did he mean a signatory State, a State which had ratified the convention, or a State which had adhered to it ?

68. Mr. VAN GLABBEKE (Belgium) speaking on a point of order, pointed out that no decision or vote had been taken on the movement for adjournment tabled by the Egyptian representative. The rules of procedure should be observed and he formally proposed the adjournment of the meeting, if that were necessary.

That proposal was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

Printed in France A—93500—February 1952—3,600