United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

SIXTH COMMITTEE 225th

MEETING

Friday, 20 October 1950, at 3 p.m.

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

Chairman: Mr. V. OUTRATA (Czechoslovakia).

Reservations to multilateral conventions (A/1372) (*concluded*)

[Item 56]*

1. Mr. SANTISO GALVEZ (Guatemala) recalled his delegation's statement in the general discussion of the General Assembly (A/PV.280, paras.149-152). In the view of Guatemala, reservations in the true sense of the word did not change the text of conventions, but were mainly designed to safeguard the policies or interests of the States concerned which, without being necessarily directly subject to the provisions in question, might be prejudiced by them. Such reservations constituted unilateral and sovereign acts of States and could not be open to discussion, still less to acceptance or objection, by the other contracting States.

2. Reservations which altered the substance of a convention or which made some of its provisions completely inapplicable as regards the State concerned, were not true reservations. If such reservations were made, however, the conventions to which they applied should be regarded as being in force only between the States which had accepted them. That was the practice of the Organization of American States.

3. The position of the Government of Guatemala on the question of reservations to the Convention on Genocide had been made clear in its letter to the Secretary-General, reproduced in the Secretary-General's report (A/1372, annex II, section III). Referring to the reservations made by certain States to the Genocide Convention, Guatemala had stated that reservations to international conventions were acts inherent in the sovereignty of States and were not open to discussion, acceptance or rejection by other States. In collective conventions, reservations made by a State affected only the application of the clause concerned in the relations of other States with the State making the reservation. Guatemala therefore considered that the fact that it disagreed with certain reservations to the Genocide Convention should not prevent the countries concerned from becoming Parties to it.

4. He could not vote for the first part of the operative part of the joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.125) which asked for an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, for the same reasons as the Polish representative had adduced. He would vote, however, for the remaining part of the draft, although he reserved his position on the recommendations which the International Law Commission might make in its report on the question.

5. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said that with the deposit of the requisite number of ratifications containing no reservations, the question of the legal effect of reservations for the purpose of determining the entry into force of the Convention on Genocide had been automatically settled. Some representatives had maintained, however, that the problem might arise again with respect to other multilateral conventions, and that consequently a general solution should be found. In view of the prevailing differences of opinion, the Committee had felt it was not competent to find a solution of the problem as a whole, or even to agree upon the temporary instructions to be given to the Secretary-General, and had consequently agreed to consult a more competent legal body. There again, however, opinions had been divided, some preferring reference to the International Court of Justice, and others, to the International Law Commission. The joint draft resolution, which would authorize consulting both bodies, had not resolved that conflict, nor, being a compromise, had it given complete satisfaction to members. However, a resolution was not absolutely necessary; the problem of the Convention on Genocide having been settled, no further action need be taken, in particular as the question was being studied by the International Law Commission in connexion with the codification of the law of treaties. His delegation would have no objection to asking that body to hasten its study of the matter, taking into account the views expressed in the Committee at the current session, as provided at the end of the operative part of the joint draft resolution.

6. On the other hand, the Philippine delegation could not support the first paragraph of the operative part of

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

the draft resolution which referred the question to the International Court of Justice, and would support the Soviet amendment (A/C.6/L.127) for deletion of that provision. He asked that a roll-call vote should be taken when the amendment, or the part of the text to which it referred, was put to the vote. For the same reason, it could not support the suggestions made by the representative of Israel.

7. The International Court of Justice had authority to give advisory opinions under Article 96 of the Charter and Article 65 of its Statute only. Those opinions, as the Court itself had admitted, had no binding force — as distinguished from judgments in contentious cases — and were not given to States, but to the organs entitled to request them.[1] Hence if the question of the legal effects of reservations to the Convention on Genocide were referred to the Court, its advisory opinion would have no binding force on the reserving or objecting States. It would not solve the problem, for example, of Australia's objections to the reservations contained in the Philippine and Bulgarian instruments of ratification and accession, respectively, a problem which, according to the Secretary-General, remains notwithstanding the entry into force of the Convention on Genocide. However, the Convention itself provided the solution in article IX, which stated that disputes between contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the Convention should be submitted to the Court at the request of any of the parties to the dispute.

8. It was conceivable that disputes might arise between a reserving State on the one hand, and an objecting State on the other, as to the legal effects of the latter's objections, or between a reserving State and other States which, without objecting to the reservations, might maintain that the accession of the reserving State had been invalidated by the objection of one State. Or a concrete case might arise in which the status of a Party to the dispute, as contracting Party to the Convention on Genocide, might be a preliminary question, or one of the main questions to be decided. Those and similar disputes could, if necessary, be resolved by the International Court of Justice as contentious cases under Chapters II and III of its Statute. Its judgment would be binding on the Parties, whereas an advisory opinion — even if guided by following provisions of the Statute applying to contentious cases — would have no binding force.

9. Although, as pointed out above, the elements of a dispute existed, no disputes had as yet arisen, and it was possible that the reservations made to the Convention on Genocide by the Philippines and by Bulgaria, or the objections thereto by Australia, might be withdrawn. At any rate, the States concerned should be given the opportunity to settle the matter among themselves, and failing that, to agree upon the issues to be submitted to the Court. The General Assembly must not precipitate the issue. The Philippines, as a possible Party to those disputes, would prefer them to be submitted to the Court as a contentious case — in which event the Court's judgment would be binding — rather than in the form of a request by the General Assembly for an advisory opinion which might not be equally respected by all Member States.

10. It might be said that such procedure would not solve the general problem of the Secretary-General's functions as depositary of multilateral conventions, in particular as regards the effects of reservations thereto, or objections to such reservations. An advisory opinion of the Court, as contemplated in the joint draft resolution, however, would also not provide a solution to the general problem. In any case, the Secretary-General need not be concerned with the specific problem of the legal effect of reservations to the Convention on Genocide; his duties were clearly outlined in articles XVII, XVIII and XIX of the Convention, and were purely ministerial in law. The justification for the original proposal to refer that specific problem to the advisory opinion of the Court, namely, the determination of the entry into force of the Convention on Genocide, had disappeared. It is difficult to see on what ground the General Assembly could now refer the question to the Court.

11. Lastly, a dispute, in order to be within the competence of the Court, must involve the contracting Parties, which, in a case like the present, must themselves formulate the specific issues arising out of reservations or objections thereto which they wished to submit to the Court. Further, such disputes must be real, and not merely theoretical. That applied also to requests for advisory opinions, as had been made clear in the case of the interpretation of the peace treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania when the Court had refused to answer certain questions, which it had considered hypothetical.[2] The third question in the joint draft resolution had that defect.

12. The Philippine delegation, therefore, believed that it was enough to refer the general question to the International Law Commission which, as the preceding discussion seemed to indicate, would deal with it more from the point of view of progressive development than of codification of existing law. In conformity with its Constitution, which adopted the generally accepted principles of international law as part of the national law, the Philippine Government would accept the Commission's recommendations, as approved by the General Assembly, as part of its national law.

13. In conclusion, he stated that his government attached great importance to the question at issue as it might be directly affected by the decision taken by the Committee, and he hoped that the latter would decide on no action which might prejudice his country's position.

14. The CHAIRMAN declared the discussion closed, and called for a vote on the joint draft resolution and the Soviet amendment. As the suggestions made by the representative of Israel had not been presented as formal amendments, they were not before the Committee.

After some discussion, it was agreed not to vote on the amendment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/C.6/L.127) for deletion of the first part of the

[1] International Court of Justice, *Reports of Judgments, Advisory Opinions and Orders*, Interpretation of Peace Treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, Advisory Opinion of March 30th, 1950, p. 65.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 65 and 221.

operative part of the joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.125), but to vote on the draft resolution in parts, beginning with the first part of the operative part, then the second part of the operative part, and thereafter the preamble. Should the result of the first two votes make it necessary, the preamble would be voted on paragraph by paragraph.

15. In accordance with the Philippine representative's request, the CHAIRMAN called for a roll-call vote on the first part of the operative part, beginning with the words "Requests the International Court of Justice . . ." and ending with ". . . but which has not yet done so".

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, France, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Sweden, Union of South Africa.

Against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Argentina, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Philippines, Poland, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Abstaining: Venezuela, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Lebanon, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand.

The first part of the operative part of the joint draft resolution was adopted by 28 votes to 13, with 10 abstentions.

The second part of the operative part was adopted by 46 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The preamble as a whole was adopted by 40 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

The draft resolution (A/C.6/L.125) as a whole was adopted by 36 votes to 7, with 9 abstentions.

16. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) said that it was customary for resolutions of the type just adopted to include a final paragraph requesting the Secretary-General to transmit the relevant documents to the organs concerned. The Secretary-General would naturally transmit the documents in any case, but it would be helpful if he were specifically authorized to do so in the resolution also, since a certain amount of expenditure was involved.

17. Mr. DEJEAN (Haiti) explained that, as he opposed the first part of the operative part of the draft resolution for the reasons given by other representatives, he had abstained in the vote on the draft as a whole, although he had voted for the second part.

18. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) appreciated the point raised by the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department and formally proposed the insertion of an additional paragraph in the draft resolution as adopted.

19. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not think it was necessary to make such an addition since the point was already adequately covered in the United Nations Charter and the Statute of the International Court of Justice. Moreover, it was contrary to the rules of procedure that the Secretary-General or even a delegation should propose the addition of an extra paragraph once a resolution had been adopted.

20. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should decide by a vote whether it wished to consider the proposal submitted by the representative of Iran.

There were 18 votes in favour of admitting the proposal, 11 against and 18 abstentions.

21. Mr. BALLARD (Australia) and Mr. DE LACHARRIERE (France) pointed out that a two-thirds majority would be needed before the Iranian proposal could be admitted, since to add a new paragraph to an already adopted resolution involved the reconsideration of that resolution and thus came under the provisions of rule 122 of the rules of procedure.

22. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) emphasized that the sole aim of his suggestion had been to make sure that the Secretary-General was acting in accordance with Assembly instructions, even on minor points. Since there appeared to be procedural difficulties involved in the adoption of his suggestion, he assured the Committee that the Secretary-General would transmit the necessary documents even if he were not specifically authorized to incur the additional expenditure.

23. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) withdrew his proposal in view of the difficulties that had arisen and in the light of the remarks made by the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department.

24. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) wished to make a brief statement at the conclusion of the discussion on the item on reservations to multilateral conventions. He emphasized that the Secretary-General's sole purpose in placing the item on the agenda had been to serve the interests of the Organization. The Secretary-General had hoped to receive some instructions on the way in which he was to carry out his functions as the depositary of multilateral conventions concluded under the auspices of the United Nations. The question had, however, turned out to be extremely complex and highly controversial and the Committee had therefore decided that it should be given further study by other legal bodies. In the meantime, the Secretary-General would naturally try to perform his functions as he had done hitherto, paying due regard to the discussions held in the Sixth Committee.

25. It was the earnest desire of everyone, including the Secretary-General, that the multilateral conventions concluded under the auspices of the United Nations should be as universal as possible in their application. It had been partially due to problems connected with the entry into force of the Convention on Genocide that the Secretary-General had felt it necessary to consult the General Assembly on the subject of reservations. When that Convention had been adopted at the third session, the President of the Assembly had stated that it was an epoch-making event. It was extremely fortunate that there were now so many ratifications to the

Convention on Genocide that there was no longer any problem regarding its entry into force.

26. Mr. FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom) drew attention to the fact that the resolution just adopted did not include a request to the International Court of Justice to give its opinion on what actually constituted a reservation. His delegation attached considerable importance to that question. In its opinion, one of the reservations made by the Bulgarian Government to the Convention on Genocide was a true reservation since its purpose was to restrict the scope of the Convention in its application to the reserving country. At the same time, however, the Bulgarian Government had made a second reservation which the United Kingdom delegation, among others, did not regard as a proper reservation, since its purpose was to extend the scope of the Convention in its application to other countries which might become Parties thereto. That was not a reservation proper, but a mere statement of opinion. He had voted in favour of the resolution just adopted, but as it contained no question to the Court regarding the true nature of a reservation, the delegation of the United Kingdom had wished to record its attitude on that point.

27. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department had twice violated the rules of procedure. In the first place, he had introduced a proposal in the name of the Secretary-General and the latter was not entitled to do so under the rules of procedure. Secondly, while representatives were in the course of explaining their votes he had intervened to define the attitude which the Secretary-General would adopt towards his functions as the depositary of multilateral conventions and how he would proceed to send the necessary documentation to the International Court of Justice and to the International Law Commission. That question had already been fully discussed and any further reference to it appeared to be an attempt to re-open the discussion and thus to disorganize the Committee's work. Moreover, with regard to the Convention on Genocide, the Secretary-General's functions as depositary were clearly defined in the text and he should not therefore require any further instructions on that point.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that he had called upon the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department to make a statement to the Committee in accordance with rule 111 of the rules of procedure. He fully agreed that the Secretary-General could not submit specific proposals to the Committee, but he recalled that the suggestion of the Assistant Secretary-General for an additional paragraph had been endorsed and submitted formally by the representative of Iran. In submitting the point to the Committee, he had thought it could be decided by a vote.

29. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) quite understood that the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department should have raised the question of the expenditure involved in transmtting the necessary documents to the International Court of Justice and to the International Law Commission. In his opinion, the question could quite easily be settled if the Secretary-General submitted an estimate of the financial implications of the resolution under rule 153 of the rules of procedure. That estimate could then be considered by the appropriate organs of the Assembly.

30. Mr. SPIROPOULOS (Greece) was of the opinion that rule 153 was not applicable, as the proposed addition to the draft resolution, which would have entailed costs, had been withdrawn.

31. Mr. ROBERTS (Union of South Africa) considered that the action of the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department in raising the question of financial implications had been misinterpreted. It was, indeed, his obvious duty to draw the Committee's attention to any new requirements which resulted from the adoption of a resolution. That was no re-consideration of a matter already decided. He agreed with the representative of Yugoslavia that the question could now be settled by the submission of a financial estimate and emphasized that, in his opinion, there had been no violation of the rules of procedure.

32. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) supported by Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) moved the adjournment of the meeting so that delegations would have time to prepare for the discussion of the following item on the agenda.

33. Mr. SPIROPOULOS (Greece) and Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) opposed the motion for adjournment on the grounds that the Committee could usefully consider the procedure to be adopted in the discussion of the report of the International Law Commission, without necessarily embarking upon its substance.

The motion for adjournment was rejected by 14 votes to 12, with 17 abstentions.

Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its second session (A/1316)

[Item 52]

34. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) suggested that the report of the International Law Commission should be discussed in parts and that the Committee could dispense with a general debate on the report as a whole. In that way it would be possible to avoid unnecessary repetitions and the whole discussion would be much clearer.

35. Mr. ROBINSON (Israel) pointed out that parts II, III and IV of the report contained concrete recommendations on the three subjects on which the International Law Commission had completed its study. He therefore proposed that the Committee should first discuss those three parts separately and take a decision on each of them. After that, the Committee could turn to discuss the first general part of the report, and parts V and VI.

36. Sir Frank SOSKICE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had certain comments to make on general points arising out of part I of the report. He would therefore prefer to begin the discussion with part I and to continue with each part in the order in which it appeared.

37. Mr. GARCIA AMADOR (Cuba) recalled that, during its second session, the International Law Commission had completed its study of certain subjects and would continue its study of others. Parts V and VI of

the report covered the subjects which were still before the International Law Commission and had been submitted to the Assembly merely for information. Representatives could naturally comment on those parts of the report but when the time came to take a decision the Committee would probably simply take note of them.

38. With regard to the formulation of the Nürnberg principles, the situation was somewhat peculiar since the General Assembly had "affirmed" them in 1946 under resolution 95 (I) and the following year it had directed the International Law Commission to "formulate" the principles under resolution 177 (II). In that same resolution, the Assembly had also directed the Commission to prepare a draft code of offences against the peace and security of mankind, indicating clearly the place to be accorded to the Nürnberg principles. His delegation fully endorsed the attitude adopted by the Commission to the latter instruction in paragraph 150 of its report and felt that there was no need for the Assembly to take any definite decision on that part of the report during the current session. It could simply take note of the formulation of the Nürnberg principles.

39. Finally, he referred to the Commission's recommendations on the ways and means for making the evidence of customary international law more readily available. Without expressing any opinion on the Commission's conclusions regarding the nature and scope of customary international law, his delegation considered that the Assembly should approve the Commission's recommendations on the subject and should take steps to see that those recommendations were put into effect.

40. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed that there were essentially only three parts of the International Law Commission's report on which a substantive discussion and a decision would be required by the Committee. He thought, however, that the United Kingdom proposal, if adopted, would not lead to any fruitful results. He suggested that the Committee should first dispose of parts II, III and IV of the report, and then decide whether it wished to discuss other sections of the report in detail. His delegation wished also to make observations in connexion with part I.

41. Sir Frank SOSKICE (United Kingdom) had taken full account of the arguments put forward by the representative of the Soviet Union, but could not support his proposal for the following reasons. His delegation had given much thought to the general circumstances affecting the work of the Commission and had some considerations to put forward which, it felt, were only relevant to part I. In view of the importance it attached to those general questions, it would prefer to take up the parts of the report in orderly sequence, beginning with part I.

42. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) stated that there were some matters which, though not of the same substantive importance as parts II, III and IV, nevertheless required urgent attention as they might entail financial implications. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, the Secretary-General would have to prepare for the Fifth Committee's consideration detailed estimates of the costs of certain resolutions. The General Assembly would not take a decision on those matters until it had heard the views of the Fifth Committee. Bearing those considerations in mind, therefore, it might be more expedient for the Committee to give its attention first to paragraphs 21 and 22 of part I of the report. That would give the Fifth Committee time to review the financial implications of those points and make its recommendations.

43. Mr. MAURTUA (Peru) assumed that the International Law Commission was guided in its work by certain basic principles applicable to the formulation and codification of the general rules of international law. On the basis of that assumption, the Commission's report should be examined as a whole, and from that viewpoint, he suggested that the proper procedure would be to begin with a general debate on the report as a whole. The Committee might also consider a second possible solution, namely the arbitrary separation of related materials into totally unrelated units, and examine the report point by point. The third solution would be to discuss the report in sections. Under that procedure, the report could be divided for purposes of discussion into four sections, the first consisting of part I; the second to include part II; the third consisting of parts III, IV and V, and the fourth to be made up of part VI.

44. Mr. ROBERTS (Union of South Africa) appreciated the viewpoint of the Soviet representative, but thought that speedier and more satisfactory results would be achieved if the Committee adopted the procedure proposed by the United Kingdom representative. He suggested, however, that the Chairman should be given wide discretion in the conduct of the debate.

45. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) stated that, in making his original proposal, he had assumed that the Sixth Committee would consider all the factors relevant to the General Assembly's decision on the report. Accordingly, with regard to part I, the debate should cover the policies and procedures adopted by the International Law Commission in its work.

46. The Committee should devote the major part of its attention to the substantive items contained in parts II, III and IV. Nevertheless, there were matters in parts V and VI and in part I, such as the question of the emoluments for members, the date and place of the third session of the Commission and the choice of a further topic of study, which had been referred to the Commission by the Economic and Social Council and would require action on the part of the Sixth Committee. Moreover, the items dealt with in those parts could not easily be considered together. It was for those reasons that he had suggested that the Committee should discuss each part of the report separately, reserving the right of the members during the discussion of any particular part to refer to related portions of other parts of the report, if they deemed it necessary.

47. Mr. SPIROPOULOS (Greece) thought the majority of the Committee was agreed that a general debate on the International Law Commission's report would serve little purpose and that the best procedure would be to consider the text part by part. The dis-

cussion of parts II, III and IV would undoubtedly take much time, and as there were items in part I which, if approved, should promptly be brought to the attention of the Fifth Committee, he thought it would be better to adopt the United Kingdom proposal.

48. Mr. DUPUIS (France) supported the Soviet proposal. In view of the considerations to which the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department had referred, he would suggest that the Committee should first discuss paragraphs 21 and 22 of part I. Those were items which the Committee should be able to dispose of without delay; it could then pass on to parts II, III and IV.

49. Mr. PATHAK (India) said that he had originally favoured the Israel proposal, but in view of the remarks of the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department, he too would support the United Kingdom suggestion.

50. Mr. MAKTOS (United States of America) felt that the International Law Commission had arranged its report in the order according to which it considered the items should be examined. Moreover, if the Committee wished the International Law Commission to continue its work in an efficient manner, he thought immediate consideration should be given to part I. He therefore endorsed the United Kingdom proposal.

51. Mr. LOBO (Pakistan) also supported the United Kingdom proposal, for the reasons which had already been expressed.

52. Mr. MAURTUA (Peru) explained that he had not made any formal proposal with regard to the procedure for examining the Commission's report. He had suggested three possible methods of work, namely, a general debate on the report, a discussion on each part, or a debate on each group of related items. None of those solutions would entail the selection of items on the basis of a subjective evaluation of their importance, a procedure to which he was opposed.

53. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that if the United Kingdom representative was suggesting that the report should be discussed part by part in great detail, he feared the Committee would be assuming a task with which it might not be able to cope. He did not think that six general debates would serve any purpose. The best solution, therefore, would be to adopt the practical procedure outlined by the French representative. Moreover, the International Law Commission did not require a debate in the Sixth Committee on subjects on which it was continuing its studies. A discussion of the first chapter of part VI of the report might even lead to a second discussion on reservations to treaties.

54. Mr. HERRERA BAEZ (Dominican Republic) supported the procedure proposed by the United Kingdom representative.

55. In view of the Peruvian representative's remarks on the subject of the relationship between the various parts of the report, he reserved the right to consider later the procedure for dealing with parts II, III and IV.

56. Mr. SPIROPOULOS (Greece) thought that each part of the report would not have to be discussed in the same detail. In part I, there might be only a few paragraphs which would give rise to debate. Parts V and VI were really in the nature of a progress report, and therefore at that stage the Committee could merely note their contents. It would only have to take a decision on parts II, III and IV, and therefore, he thought it should be easy to find a satisfactory procedure for dealing with the report.

57. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) proposed that, in view of the general agreement as to the urgency of paragraphs 21 and 22, the Committee should discuss those items first and postpone its decision on how to proceed with the rest of the report.

58. Mr. SPIROPOULOS (Greece) stressed that in discussing paragraphs 21 and 22 the Committee would be free to consider other sections of part I, should it so desire.

59. Sir Frank SOSKICE (United Kingdom) supported by Mr. DEJEAN (Haiti) endorsed the remarks of the representative of Greece. His observations on part I would not be restricted to paragraphs 21 and 22.

60. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) had no objections to discussing part I as a whole. He merely wished to emphasize that in view of the nature of parts V and VI and of part I, with the exception of paragraphs 21 and 22, it would be preferable not to discuss those sections of the report in great detail.

61. The CHAIRMAN, summing up the views of the Committee, suggested that it should first examine part I of the report; it should then consider parts II, III and IV, in that order. He also proposed that no decision should be taken with regard to parts V and VI at that time.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

Printed in U.S.A.

S—40035—November 1950—3,400