*United Nations*
**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**
**THIRTY-SECOND SESSION**
*Official Records* *



SIXTH COMMITTEE
30th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 26 October 1977
at 3 p.m.
New York

# SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 30th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GAVIRIA (Colombia)

CONTENTS





77-57483

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.6/32/SR.30
1 November 1977
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 116: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND ON THE STRENGTHENING OF THE ROLE OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued) (A/32/33, A/32/58 and Add.1 and 2, A/32/133, A/32/235; A/C.6/32/L.2 and L.3)

1. Mr. ADJAHI (Benin) offered his delegation's support and full co-operation to the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization and expressed his gratification at the large number of delegations which had supported draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.2, of which his delegation was a sponsor.

2. His delegation was convinced that the United Nations continued to be a very useful forum in which to settle the problems of the international community; time had merely served to confirm the strength and validity of the principles contained in the Charter. Nevertheless, those principles did not direct the Organization's activities as they should, for the very simple reason that the machinery controlling the functioning of those principles was not adapted to current realities. That machinery should take account of the new forces that had emerged in the international community and which required, in the name of the principle of the sovereign equality of States, that the maintenance of international peace and security should be a collective undertaking and not the preserve of a limited number of Member States.

3. The strengthening of the role of the Organization called for a modification in the machinery to adapt it to the course of history. Such adaptation entailed the revision of the Charter, and particularly the abolition of the right of veto. No demonstration was required of the fact that the United Nations had always been powerless to prevent a local crisis or conflict, that peace-keeping operations had only a limited effect and that the non-implementation of resolutions after their adoption did great harm to the credibility of the Organization. Bearing all that in mind, his delegation thought that draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.2 constituted a minimum programme which should meet with the approval of all the States members of the Sixth Committee. With regard to the amendment submitted by Cyprus (A/C.6/32/L.3), he considered that its adoption would deprive the draft resolution of meaning.

4. In conclusion, he said that his delegation was open to any constructive suggestion which took account of the legitimate aspirations of the new forces that had emerged in the international arena.

5. Mr. CAMARA (Guinea) said that the solution of the complex problems currently facing mankind required that all States should participate actively in international life, whatever their size or social system. Bearing in mind those considerations, the Republic of Guinea had always supported an improvement of United Nations activities and, at the appropriate time, had submitted a document containing the Government's suggestions and observations (A/31/51/Add.1); for that reason he would confine himself to a few brief remarks.

6. Although, since 1945, the United Nations had played a positive role and had contributed to the development of co-operation among States, a whole series of gaps

in the Organization's activities had become apparent. In order to remedy those deficiencies, the Charter provided for a review procedure, but some States, when it came to recognizing the rights of others, hastened to say that any revision would disturb peace and security. His delegation was opposed to that negative attitude, since the interests of mankind demanded not the elimination or diminution of the role of the United Nations but the continued improvement of its activities and strengthening of its authority.

7. It was absolutely essential to expand United Nations organs to ensure greater participation in its activities by the dozens of States that had achieved their independence and were showing increasing determination to assert their positions and participate actively in international life. For that reason, and recognizing the importance of the role of the Security Council, he observed with regret that that body was a puppet in the hands of the great Powers through the much abused right of veto. It had been proved that the ineffectiveness of the United Nations stemmed from the fact that some members used the veto to oppose the implementation of the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. There was no need to look further afield for the reasons for the Organization's ineffectiveness. The lack of political will on the part of the great Powers, which was reflected in their use of the veto, always blocked United Nations machinery and made it possible for Smith and Vorster to laugh at its decisions.

8. It was abnormal and illogical that certain provisions of the Charter gave some States the possibility of evading the obligations imposed by the Charter itself. For that reason, his delegation, after requesting for a considerable time the abolition of the right of veto, demanded that two representatives from each geographical region should enjoy, in rotation, the same right as the current permanent members of the Security Council. The General Assembly should also be given greater powers. If it took steps in that direction, the United Nations could play an important role in discussing and solving the main problems of the contemporary world.

9. Mr. OSMAN (Somalia) said that the Special Committee had done an excellent job in completing its examination of the analytical study prepared by the Secretary-General (A/AC.182/L.2). However, since it had been unable to complete the mandate given to it, it should be authorized to continue its work. For that reason, his delegation was one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.2.

10. In accordance with its mandate, the Special Committee had considered and submitted positive and forward-looking proposals on some important aspects related to the strengthening of the Organization, notably those referring to the structuring and functioning of the Security Council, peace-keeping operations and relations between the Security Council and the General Assembly.

11. On the question of the structure and functioning of the Security Council, there had been forceful arguments in favour of abolishing the right of veto, or alternatively, extending that prerogative to other important areas of the international community. There was general dissatisfaction with the undemocratic prerogative of the veto, the indiscriminate misuse of which affected, in particular, the sovereign rights of third world countries. The need for the democratization of the system had again been reflected in the current debate in the Committee, in which

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

an overwhelming majority had supported the concrete and constructive proposals and suggestions contained in the Special Committee's report (A/32/33), in particular, those proposing a limitation of the right of veto so as to exclude some specific areas such as the admission of new members and the settlement of disputes. Such a limitation would be a progressive step in the right direction.

12. With regard to the relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council, his delegation supported the Special Committee's proposal that the role of the General Assembly should be strengthened whenever the Security Council was paralysed by the veto.

13. There were many other objective and interesting proposals such as those contained in sections II B (Means, methods and procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes), II C (Economic and social questions) and II G (Other matters) of the Secretary-General's analytical study (A/AC.182/L.2). In the last-named section, the proposal to delete the obsolete provisions of Articles 53 and 107 of the Charter was particularly noteworthy.

14. Special mention should be made of the proposals regarding decolonization contained in section II D of the Analytical Study. Despite the important role played by the Charter in the struggle against colonialism, there were still some areas in which the process of decolonization had not yet achieved its objectives and where the United Nations should undoubtedly play a role. It was necessary to fight colonialism in all its forms and manifestations and, to that end, there was an urgent need to carry out a more vigorous and continuous investigation of the situations resulting from colonialism, foreign domination and occupation.

15. His delegation considered that the Charter, despite its flexibility, was inevitably limited by the perspectives and conditions of 30 years earlier. It should be revised in order to reflect the changing conditions of the contemporary world. The Security Council, for example, did not reflect the shift in the centres of power which had occurred since 1945. There was no reason why 144 Member States, which represented the vast masses of the world population, should continue to be subject to the whims of a small group of States because of an accident of history.

16. In conclusion, he emphasized that the United Nations was a living institution which should be changed and transformed in order to preserve its vitality and dynamism. The world had entrusted it with an enormous responsibility. His delegation was confident that the international community would take joint, positive, practical measures to enable the United Nations to deal fully and effectively with contemporary realities.

17. Mr. MBOMA (Zaire) said that, although the Special Committee had finished the first reading of the analytical study submitted by the Secretary-General, it had not completed its mandate. In order to do so, it should be able to count on the loyalty and willingness of all States Members of the United Nations to fulfil the ideals of the Organization and co-operate fully in the maintenance of international peace and security. Unfortunately, that co-operation was lacking in certain delegations who used the pretext of the differences of opinion referred to in the

report of the Special Committee to prevent that Committee from proposing any changes to the Charter or to delay its work indefinitely. For its part, his country, which in the early days of its independence had benefited from United Nations assistance, had, for a number of years been calling for the revision of the Charter. His delegation had never questioned the principles and purposes of the United Nations. However, since 1945, the world had undergone profound changes at all levels, and those changes should be reflected in the Charter. It was true that the Charter had withstood the test of time. Nevertheless, being the work of man, it should be the subject of continuous efforts to find better ways of expressing the will of the States that had signed it. Moreover, the Charter itself, in Article 108, provided for the possibility of amendment. United Nations structures should be reorganized in order to ensure that they functioned to the satisfaction of the entire international community; a mere change of attitudes or intentions was not enough. His delegation considered that it was necessary to amend the Charter in order to strengthen the role of the United Nations. For that reason, it would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.12.

18. Mrs. Fraschini De PASTORI (Uruguay) said that her country had been a Member of the United Nations since 1945 and, over the years, had defended the principles and purposes laid down at San Francisco. The United Nations was still the best hope of resolving differences and hostilities, fostering closer and more rewarding relations among all nations and promoting international co-operation with mutual benefits in the economic and social fields. However, it was right and proper that, after 32 years, a committee should have been set up to review the Charter and the possibility of strengthening of the role of the Organization, with a view to establishing the best system for solving current world problems. For those reasons, her delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolutions 3349 (XXIX) and 3499 (XXX) and had sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.6/31/L.6. The Committee's task was a difficult one since it had to take account of the different proposals and co-ordinate them in an effective manner with the principles and purposes which were the very essence of the United Nations and of international law, with due account for the existing balance between the norms embodied in the Charter. The serious approach of the Committee enabled her delegation to continue to support its work and to sponsor draft resolution A/C.6/32/L.2.

AGENDA ITEM 112: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION ON THE WORK OF ITS TWENTY-NINTH SESSION (continued) (A/32/10, A/32/183)

19. Mr. SETTE CAMARA (Brazil) said that, at its twenty-ninth session, the International Law Commission had accomplished an impressive amount of work, as would be seen from the report (A/32/10).

20. With regard to chapter II, which dealt with State responsibility, the Commission had discussed the sixth report of the Special Rapporteur, Professor Roberto Ago, and had adopted articles 20, 21 and 22 which constituted an important step forward in the codification of that complex field of international law. Article 20 dealt with the international obligation calling for the States to adopt a specific course of conduct. That type of obligation might entail an action or an omission and might relate to the conduct of the executive, legislative or judicial organs of the State. The

(Mr. Sette Camara, Brazil)

commentaries appended to that article dealt in depth with all those hypotheses, citing a considerable number or practical examples to clarify the different situations. The practice contained in those commentaries led to the conclusion that the simple failure to adopt the prescribed and agreed conduct constituted a breach of an international obligation, regardless of the existence of any delictual fact. The text of the article adopted by the Commission did not offer any difficulty and it was a logical conclusion to the doctrine developed in the draft articles. It was worth noting that the Commission had improved the original formulation of the Special Rapporteur to make it more flexible and appropriate to the reality of international practice.

21. Article 21 dealt with the so-called obligation of result, whereby the State was committed to ensuring a particular situation or result through whatever means it chose. Paragraph 2 of that article dealt with the situation in which, even if the State had initially adopted a conduct not in conformity with the obligation, it might be given another opportunity to correct the said conduct so as to bring about the desired result. Besides the situation in which a remedy was applied to the internationally acceptable initial conduct of the State, there was another more radical one by which initial conduct not in conformity with the obligation was completely obliterated by the subsequent conduct of the State, such as in the case of reparation for damage. The important point to bear in mind was that the State's choice of the means to be employed could in no instance constitute a breach of the obligation. The text of the article adopted by the Commission was a considerable improvement on the original proposal of the Special Rapporteur in that the new formulation avoided the distinction between complete and incomplete breach.

22. Article 22 was a very important provision since it embodied the principle of general international law known as the "exhaustion of local remedies" whereby State responsibility did not occur before all the remedies available for getting satisfaction at the internal level were exhausted.

23. As regards the exhaustion of local remedies, his delegation shared the opinion of the Commission that that principle of general international law was not just a simple procedural device related to the implementation of international responsibility, but rather a rule of substance which generated the responsibility in question. His delegation also agreed with the Commission's differing from the report of the Special Rapporteur in not extending the scope of that rule to a State's treatment of its own nationals. That would have been too bold a step in the field of the progressive development of international law. In short, his delegation supported articles 20 to 22. Their adoption by the Commission was supported by a mass of precedent drawn from State practice and court decisions.

24. Turning to chapter III of the report, relating to the succession of States in respect of matters other than treaties, he emphasized the high quality of the meticulous research carried out by the Special Rapporteur, and the remarkable simplification achieved by the Commission in the wording of articles 17 to 22, to maintain a commendable parallelism with the articles concerning succession to State property. He agreed with the Commission's view that so-called "régime debts" should not be considered as a category distinct from State debts, and also

(Mr. Sette Camara, Brazil)

its decision to consider individual cases of State succession before dealing with the question of "odious debts" or "subjugation debts". His delegation felt that the word "international", which appeared in square brackets in article 18, should be retained, since the draft articles referred to State debts and no attempt should be made to define the financial relations of the State with private individuals, such relations being governed solely by the internal legal order. Article 19 embodied the rule governing the passing of debts in full parallelism with article 6 relating to succession to State property. The most important article in that section was article 20, in which the Commission had simplified and clarified articles "R", "S", "T" and "U" as proposed by the Special Rapporteur, in particular by discarding the allusion to "devolution agreements" which would have been inconsistent with article 8 of the draft on the succession of States in respect of treaties, where such agreements were considered merely as statements of intention. "Devolution agreements" did not transfer debts of the predecessor State to the successor State vis-à-vis third States; nor did they establish per se a novation of rights or obligations between the predecessor State and the successor State without a renewed intervention of the will of the successor State in the full use of its sovereignty. On the other hand, the text drafted by the Special Rapporteur, contrary to what the Commission had done in the draft on the succession of States in respect of treaties, treated in different ways devolution agreements and unilateral declarations of the successor State. Article "U" as drafted by the Special Rapporteur also introduced a wide admission of tacit consent.

25. Another change introduced by the Commission had been to enlarge the concept of third States so as to include international organizations and, as explained in paragraph 12 of the commentary, other subjects of international law. His delegation agreed, prima facie, that technical accuracy would call for that addition, but it would like to be enlightened about the practice of States on that specific point in order to determine whether there were any precedents of international organizations or other subjects of international law in that situation. The Commission may have had in mind the practice of the International Monetary Fund. If so, it would be useful to spell it out.

26. Turning to section 2, he noted that article 21 seemed to deal only with the general debt of the predecessor State, since the whole rationale developed by the commentaries of the Commission favoured a well-established rule requiring the successor State to assume the localized debts of the predecessor State. His delegation supported the provision contained in paragraph 1, which seemed innocuous, since, in the last analysis, it boiled down to agreement between the parties. However, he had some misgivings with regard to paragraph 2, which was based on the concept of equity. Article 38, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, which was based on that same concept, had never gained the acceptance of any State whatsoever. Equity was the absence of law; it represented natural justice, as opposed to legal justice. Furthermore, the vagueness of that concept was further aggravated by the fact that, according to that paragraph, account should be taken of the property, rights and interests which passed to the successor State in relation to the State debt. The nature of the debt might be much more important in determining the passing than the amount of property transferred. Therefore, the Commission should reconsider article 21 and perhaps find solutions that would not be so amorphous and ill-defined.

(Mr. Sette Camara, Brazil)

27. His delegation praised the inclusion of article 22 relating to newly independent States, in spite of the arguments of some that, since the decolonization process was in its final stage, such a situation was of limited interest. The problems of succession of States in respect of matters other than treaties might persist for many years after the attainment of independence. Moreover, there were still some 25 Non-Self-Governing Territories being dealt with by the Special Committee of 24, not to mention the explosive questions of Zimbabwe and Namibia, which the whole world hoped would attain independence as soon as possible. The Commission's commentaries on the decolonization process were very meticulous and erudite.

28. On the other hand, his delegation had particularly appreciated section VI of chapter 5 of the ninth special report, the bulk of which was contained in paragraphs 39 to 51 of the commentaries, in which the Special Rapporteur had provided the Commission with an up-to-date picture of the situation of developing countries asphyxiated by the growing burden of their external debt. Although the Commission could do little with regard to economic problems, the Special Rapporteur's digression provided an extremely useful background for the formulation contained in article 22, paragraph 2. There, too, the Commission had improved considerably on the original proposals of the Special Rapporteur by merging them in a much simpler negative rule. He reiterated his doubts concerning agreements between the predecessor State and the newly independent State, which sounded very much like the leonine and rejected category of devolution agreements. However, those misgivings were attenuated by the fact that the wording of the article established a link between the debts and activity of the predecessor State in the territory concerned. His delegation also had doubts concerning the criterion of the equitable relation between the debts and property, rights and interests passing to the newly independent State. His delegation fully supported article 2, paragraph 2, which constituted a very important provision for the defence of the interests of the newly independent State.

29. With those remarks, his delegation approved articles 17 to 22 of the draft on succession of States in respect of matters other than treaties and congratulated the Commission and the Special Rapporteur, Mr. Bedjaoui, for the considerable progress achieved in that difficult and complex field.

30. It had been in the examination of the topic of treaties concluded between States and international organizations or between two or more international organizations that the Commission had achieved the most remarkable results. The basis for its work had been the fourth (A/CN.4/285), fifth (A/CN.4/290 and Add.1) and sixth (A/CN.4/298) special reports of Professor Reuter. The Commission had considered part II, section 2, of the draft, relating to the conclusion and entry into force of treaties, and part III, concerning the observance, application and interpretation of treaties. It had not been possible to consider article 34 for lack of time.

31. The Special Rapporteur and the Commission had used the articles of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties as guidelines for the draft articles, endeavouring to give the same numbers to corresponding articles in the majority of cases. The Special Rapporteur had again given evidence of his ability and ingenuity in proposing formulas which made the provisions of the Vienna Convention applicable, as far as possible, to treaties entered into by international organizations.

(Mr. Sette Camara, Brazil)

32. Most of the time allocated by the Commission to that topic had been devoted to the problem of reservations, which had been fully reformulated by the Special Rapporteur in his fifth report. While sponsoring the application of the liberal régime of the Vienna Convention in matters of reservations, the Special Rapporteur had not failed to underline the extremely complicated problems that could arise when international organizations and some of their member States were parties to the same treaty. The general application of the liberal régime of the Vienna Convention in respect of reservations could lead to a chaotic situation. Nor could the solution be to deny international organizations the right to formulate or accept reservations, or to object to them. The problem was to determine what limitations should be imposed on the exercise of that right. In accordance with that line of reasoning, the Special Rapporteur had proposed separate articles for treaties concluded between two or more international organizations (articles 19 and 20) and for treaties concluded between States and international organizations (articles 19 bis and 20 bis). In the first case, that of homogeneous participation, the liberal régime of article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties should prevail. In the second case, that of heterogeneous participation, the Commission had approved a more restrictive régime, subjecting the formulation of reservations to express authorization by the treaty itself or to agreement of the parties, provided that the participation of an international organization was essential to the object and purpose of the treaty (article 19 bis, para. 2). Where the participation of the international organization was not essential, the régime of the Vienna Convention itself applied. On the other hand, the Commission had decided to add a draft article 19 ter, which was devoted to the question of objections to reservations, and retained the liberal régime for objections in the case of homogeneous participation, while limiting, in paragraph 3, the possibility of objecting in cases of treaties of heterogeneous participation.

33. Articles 20 and 20 bis provided for the acceptance of reservations, thereby retaining the general principle of the Vienna Convention that reservations did not depend on acceptance, unless the treaty so provided, together with the delay of 12 months for tacit acceptance. His delegation wondered whether the elaborate scheme of situations contained in article 20 bis, paragraph 3, was necessary, or whether it might be preferable to leave that question to the interpretation of the Treaty.

34. Articles 21 and 22, which dealt with the legal effects of reservations and of objections to reservations, were based upon the corresponding provisions of the Vienna Convention; the wording had merely been adapted to suit the different categories of treaties under consideration. The same approach had been used with respect to articles 23 and 23 bis, as well as articles 24 and 25, concerning the entry into force and provisional application of treaties.

35. Part III followed the example of the Vienna Convention and opened with the enunciation in article 26 of the rule pacta sunt servanda.

36. In article 27, the text of article 27 of the Vienna Convention had been adapted to the needs of the draft by means of the introduction of the concept of

(Mr. Sette Camara, Brazil)

the rules of an organization. the similarity of situations was admissible if the expression "rules of the organization" was used in the broad sense. However, there was a certain nuance that the Commission had failed to bring out clearly enough. In fact, in the case of States, the capacity to conclude treaties was derived from international law, and the provision of the Vienna Convention was therefore fully justified. However, according to article 6 of the draft, the capacity of an organization to conclude a treaty was derived from its own rules, and the conclusion of a treaty in contravention of those rules would thus be a case of conclusion ultra vires, and in that case the invocation of the rules might be justified. The Commission itself had harboured some doubts concerning article 27, paragraph 2, which had been regarded as provisionally approved in first reading, and the reaction of Governments would no doubt prompt the Commission to find a solution that was more compatible with the reality of international facts. Article 27, paragraph 3, would deal with the hypothesis of manifest violations.

37. The text of article 28 was identical to that of the Vienna Convention, and the same was true of article 29, in which the only changes were those necessary to cover the participation of international organizations.

38. Article 30, paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, reproduced the Vienna Convention almost verbatim. Because of a difference of opinion that had arisen with respect to the question of the primacy of the Charter of the United Nations over all successive treaties, article 30, paragraph 6, had been cast in intentionally ambiguous terms but did, however, preserve that primacy.

39. In section 3, articles 31 to 33, the parallel with the Vienna Convention was complete. Section 4, covered by articles 34 to 38, had been fully discussed but, because of the limited time available to it, the Commission had been able to adopt only article 34, which restated the laconic rule of article 34 of the Vienna Convention but had been drafted as two separate provisions so as to cover the two hypotheses of homogeneous and heterogeneous participation. The text also introduced the concept of "third international organization".

40. In chapter V, reference was made to the fact that the Commission had taken up the study of the second part of the topic concerning relations between States and international organizations on the basis of a preliminary report submitted by the Special Rapporteur, Ambassador Abdullah El-Erian. In undertaking that task, the Commission should base its approach on the principle of functionalism; the privileges and immunities of officials of international organizations were not due to the generosity of host States but were indispensable if the officials were to carry out the tasks entrusted to them. So far such privileges and immunities had been established in a piecemeal fashion, and the Commission's task was to unify them and turn them into an instrument which, although it might consist of residual rules, could be applied to as many international organizations as possible. His delegation considered that the topic of the status, privileges and immunities of international organizations and their officials was ripe for codification; its codification would complete the cycle of instruments on diplomatic law.

(Mr. Sette Camara, Brazil)

41. Chapter V made reference to a series of totally uncontroversial decisions of the Commission, including a decision to take up the second reading of the draft articles on the most-favoured-nation clause, the nomination of Professor Stephen Schwebel as the new Special Rapporteur on the topic of non-navigational uses of international water courses, and decisions on other administrative questions.

42. His delegation noted with satisfaction that the thirteenth International Law Seminar had been a great success, and was also happy to see that, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 3501 (XXX), the Commission had started its work on the problem of the status of the diplomatic courier and the diplomatic bag not accompanied by diplomatic courier. The Working Group dealing with that topic had submitted a series of recommendations, and his delegation agreed with those recommendations.

43. With respect to the question of co-operation with other bodies, he drew particular attention to the important statement made before ILC by the observer for the Inter-American Juridical Committee, Professor Haroldo Valladão.

44. The decision to continue the practice of establishing a Planning Group of the Enlarged Bureau was to be welcomed, since the work of that Group had proved extremely fruitful. His delegation supported the decisions taken by ILC, on the basis of the important suggestions made by the Planning Group with respect, for example, to goals for the following session, the inclusion of new topics in the programme and the revision of some drafts prepared several years previously by ILC at the request of the General Assembly.

45. His delegation also supported the conclusions reached by ILC with respect to the form and presentation of its report to the General Assembly, but it would be a mistake to sacrifice the authority of a document which, in the course of 30 years, had become an indispensable mirror reflecting the latest developments in the field of the codification and progressive development of international law, solely to satisfy the wishes of those who had no time to read it.

46. In view of the important assistance which ILC received from the Codification Division of the Office of Legal Affairs, his delegation supported the recommendation in paragraph 122 of the Commission's report to increase the staff of the Codification Division and was prepared to support the inclusion of a paragraph to that effect in the draft resolution to be recommended by the Sixth Committee to the General Assembly in connexion with the item under discussion. His delegation also endorsed the reference in paragraph 123 of the report concerning the manner in which regulations for the control and limitation of documentation should be applied with respect to research projects and studies requested from the Codification Division, and suggested that a statement on the matter should be included in the report of the Sixth Committee to the General Assembly.

(Mr. Sette Camara, Brazil)

47. The excellence of the methods of work of ILC was reflected in the important results obtained with respect to codification; those results stood out when compared to the work of similar bodies such as the League of Nations Committee of Experts for the Progressive Codification of International Law or the Hague Conference for the Codification of International Law. A diplomatic conference soundly based on the proposals of ILC was bound to succeed from the very outset, unlike those conferences which had not benefited from similar preparatory work.

48. His delegation commended ILC since, in its first year following the change in its composition, it had maintained the level of scientific quality and political realism which had traditionally characterized its work.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.