

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 1198th  
MEETING

Friday, 30 November 1962,  
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 46:</i>	
<i>Draft Declaration on the Right of Asylum</i>	
<i>(continued)</i>	
<i>Preamble and article 1 (continued) . . . . .</i>	313
<i>Adoption of the preamble. . . . .</i>	316
<i>Organization of work. . . . .</i>	317

*Chairman:* Mr. Nemi Chandra KASLIWAL  
(India).

## AGENDA ITEM 46

**Draft Declaration on the Right of Asylum (A/4452 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1, A/4792, A/4793, A/5145, E/3335, E/3403 and Add.1-5, A/C.3/L.1035 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.1036-1038, A/C.3/L.1039/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1040-1041, A/C.3/L.1042/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1043/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1044 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.1045) (continued)**

### PREAMBLE AND ARTICLE 1 (continued)

1. Miss KUBOTA (Japan) said that none of the proposed amendments substantially improved the text of the draft Declaration, which was itself the result of compromise (E/3335, para. 147). The amendments submitted by Poland (A/C.3/L.1040), Belgium (A/C.3/L.1039/Rev.2) and Bulgaria (A/C.3/L.1041) were unsatisfactory attempts to define the categories of persons to whom asylum should or should not be granted. The eight-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.1044 and Add.1) had the defect that it implied, somewhat paradoxically, that persons struggling against colonialism were not entitled to invoke article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Soviet amendments (A/C.3/L.1043) would refer in the preamble of the draft Declaration to the maintenance of international peace and security and the development of friendly relations among all States—two ideas not involved in the granting of asylum, which should be based on purely humanitarian reasons. There was no great need for the Peruvian amendment (A/C.3/L.1042/Rev.1) in view of the wording of article 1 of the draft. Part 1 of the Belgian amendments which referred to instruments dealing with the status of refugees and stateless persons, was an unnecessary precaution, since the draft Declaration naturally did not prejudice those instruments in any way. Lastly, it was clear from the text of the draft Declaration that it did not refer to diplomatic asylum, and it was in accordance with that interpretation that the Japanese Government was prepared to support it. It seemed unnecessary, therefore, to insert the word "territorial" in the title as requested by Poland in its first set of amendments (A/C.3/L.1038).

2. Consequently, the Japanese delegation would not agree to any of the proposed amendments, in the belief that a majority of the members of the Committee would be prepared to vote for the original text.

3. Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) introduced the revised USSR amendments (A/C.3/L.1043/Rev.1)—a compromise text which took account, *inter alia*, of the comments made by the Peruvian delegation at the meeting of the working group.

4. The Soviet delegation considered it logical to group in one paragraph all the purposes and principles proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations, because they were inseparable. It would point out to the representative of Japan, who had apparently not taken note of the revised amendment, that the wording of article 4 made it necessary to mention those purposes and principles in the preamble of the draft Declaration. The development of friendly relations among nations and, in particular, the maintenance of peace and security were directly related to the right of asylum because, if the host State used for political ends persons it had admitted, that could only be to the detriment of its relations with the State from which they came and, consequently, to the detriment of peace.

5. Another purpose of the revised amendment was to protect the dignity of the person to whom asylum was granted and to ensure that he could not be used as a tool by the host State. It should therefore be acceptable to all delegations.

6. Miss KUBOTA (Japan) confirmed that her comments had referred solely to the original version of the Soviet amendment (A/C.3/L.1043).

7. Mr. PRZETACZNIK (Poland) reported on the results of the exchange of views that had taken place between the Algerian, Belgian and Polish delegations concerning the amendments submitted to the preamble and to article 1 of the draft Declaration. The three delegations proposed that the Committee should take no decision on the title of the draft Declaration until after it had adopted all the articles. They believed that the revised Peruvian amendment was generally acceptable, provided that it was brought into line with article 1. With respect to article 1, the three delegations proposed the addition of a second paragraph, worded as in point 2 of the Belgian amendments.

8. The Polish delegation did not believe it necessary to insert in the fourth preambular paragraph the phrase "dealing with the status of refugees and stateless persons", as proposed by Belgium in point 1 of its amendments. However, it supported the eight-Power amendment which it hoped would be put to the vote before the Bulgarian amendment.

9. With regard to the second set of amendments submitted by his own delegation (A/C.3/L.1040), he ex-

plained that he was withdrawing the second of the paragraphs to be added to article 1 but was maintaining the first, since the absence of such a clause would make it particularly difficult to resolve conflicts which might arise between the State granting asylum and the State of origin concerning persons who considered themselves entitled to invoke the right of asylum. It was clear from the international instruments relating to the right of asylum that it was for the State granting asylum to evaluate the nature of the offence committed by the person requesting it. Thus, it was logical and desirable to acknowledge that the evaluation of the grounds for the grant of asylum was within the competence of the host State, which, of course, must respect the spirit of the Declaration.

10. Mrs. TREE (United States of America) considered that the first preambular paragraph of the text under discussion, which was based in large measure on a proposal made by the United States of America in the Commission on Human Rights (E/3335, para. 79), enunciated the only purpose of the United Nations genuinely and directly related to the right of asylum. To mention other purposes would be simply to shift the emphasis from the proper object of the draft Declaration—the promotion of respect for the right of asylum as a humanitarian measure. Her delegation hoped that the USSR would not press its objections and that the Committee would be able rapidly to complete its work on that important instrument.

11. Sir Douglas GLOVER (United Kingdom) noted with regret that all the amendments submitted placed the emphasis on protecting State sovereignty, whereas the purpose of the Declaration was to safeguard the rights of persons belonging to persecuted minorities.

12. The United Kingdom delegation would abstain on both the revised Soviet amendments because, if the text relating to the preamble were accepted, it would be difficult not to accept also the new paragraph proposed for article 4, which his delegation could not endorse. It would vote against the second set of Polish amendments (A/C.3/L.1040) but would support the revised Peruvian amendment.

13. In connexion with the eight-Power amendment, he remarked that it would be unwise to mention a passing phase of history in an international instrument. When the implementation clauses of the Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages had been discussed, a number of delegations had opposed the inclusion of a territorial application clause, on the ground that that would be tantamount in a way to legalizing colonialism. Those delegations had maintained that any mention of the colonialist system was an anachronism. The same reasoning might be applied to the draft Declaration on the Right of Asylum.

14. The United Kingdom delegation could not endorse point 2 of the Belgian amendments, which would bolster the right of States to refuse asylum.

15. Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) said he was glad that the representative of Poland had maintained the first part of point 2 of his second set of amendments (A/C.3/L.1040), which embodied an idea of the greatest importance, not only to the countries of Latin America, but to the whole world. He did not agree with the United Kingdom representative that all the amendments, including that of Poland, tended to deprive the Declaration of its *raison d'être*, which was the protection of the human person; they merely took into account the

sovereign rights of the State. His delegation's view was that the State of which a person requested asylum must make the decision after, of course, carefully studying the case and investigating the basis of the charges laid against him by the State of origin. The new paragraph proposed by the Polish delegation was a praiseworthy contribution to the maintenance of peace, since it would facilitate the settlement of controversies that might arise between two States and it might at times prevent the breaking-off of relations, which constituted a threat to international peace and security.

16. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) observed, as a co-sponsor of the eight-Power amendment, that no comparison could be made between the draft Declaration on the Right of Asylum and the Convention on marriage. Her delegation had joined with others in opposing the inclusion of a colonial clause in the Convention because that would have been tantamount to recognizing the existence of colonial Powers. The purpose of the eight-Power amendment, on the other hand, was to put on record that the struggle against colonialism still continued. Although some delegations declared optimistically that colonialism would have disappeared within the next ten years or so, she greatly feared that it would survive for a longer period in more or less disguised forms. It was essential therefore, to specify that, so long as that struggle continued, persons engaged in it must be able to enjoy the right of asylum.

17. Mr. QUIAMBAO (Philippines), supported by Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), proposed that the Committee should discontinue its discussion of article 1 and should simply vote on the preamble, so that the present debate might produce positive results on at least one point.

18. Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Philippine proposal was not in line with the general view, which seemed to favour a vote not only on the preamble but also on article 1; the article had been very thoroughly studied and, thanks to the efforts made by the sponsors of amendments, a prompt decision on it should be possible. There were difficulties involved in the drafting of any international instrument, but it would be rather discouraging to have to spread the drafting of a text such as that under discussion over a great many sessions.

19. Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) said that he could not support the Philippine proposal. The various problems raised by the preamble and by article 1 had been studied in great detail, and it would be regrettable if such painstaking work were to result only in the adoption of the preamble. His delegation would be in favour of closing the debate on the preamble and article 1, as a decision on those could certainly be taken at the current session.

20. Mr. GHORBAL (United Arab Republic) said that he was prepared to support the Chilean representative's suggestion.

21. Mr. QUIAMBAO (Philippines) said that he would be delighted if the Committee found time to adopt the preamble and article 1 at the current session, but if there was no certainty that it could do so, it should attempt to obtain a decision at least on the preamble; the discussion of article 1 could be resumed after that.

22. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should proceed immediately to a vote on the preamble.

*It was so decided.*

23. Mr. NEDBAILLO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that it had been claimed that the Soviet amendments would divert the draft Declaration from its original objective—the safeguarding of a fundamental human right—to strengthening the sovereign rights of States. His delegation believed that the amendment quite rightly placed the emphasis on the role of the State in protecting human rights; he would recall in that connexion the fourth preambular paragraph of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which, though expressly concerned with human rights, nevertheless stressed—as did the Soviet proposal—the importance of friendly relations among States. In those circumstances his delegation would vote for the USSR amendment.

24. Mr. LEIRO (Norway) considered that it would be undesirable, in the draft Declaration under discussion, which should be worded as simply and as directly as possible, to define the notion of asylum or to specify the persons to whom asylum might be granted. Regarding the amendments to the preamble, his delegation would support the revised Peruvian text but would vote against the revised Soviet proposals and would abstain on all the other amendments.

25. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that the preamble to the draft Declaration rightly referred to one of the purposes enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations, namely, the achievement of international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, because it had a direct relation to human rights and fundamental freedoms and, consequently, to the right of asylum. In the same spirit, her delegation supported the revised Soviet amendments since any attack on peace ultimately meant a negation of human rights, inasmuch as peace and friendly relations were essential to the observance and development of fundamental rights. She also endorsed the revised Peruvian amendment, which was complementary to the Soviet amendments.

26. Mr. SHARP (New Zealand) said that the revised Soviet amendments taken by themselves were unexceptionable and, in fact, constituted an excellent statement of principle. Nevertheless, there could be no question that the granting of asylum by one State to a national of another State was capable of giving rise to some irritation between the two States, and that to stress in general terms, as did the Soviet amendment, the need for maintaining international peace and security and the importance of developing friendly relations among States, was in a sense to invite States never to grant asylum.

27. The idea of maintaining peace was much better expressed in the revised Peruvian amendment, which stressed that the granting of asylum was a peaceful and humanitarian act and that as such it could not be regarded as unfriendly by any other State. In those circumstances, he would vote against the USSR amendment, less because he was opposed to it than because he considered it less satisfactory than the Peruvian proposal.

28. Mr. MALECELA (Tanganyika) said that the original text of the preamble seemed to him sufficiently well drafted to need no amendment. Admittedly, it could be improved, but little was to be gained by adding further abstract principles to it. While the text

of point 1 of the revised Soviet amendments was, of course, taken from the Charter, he wondered whether it was really necessary to amend the preamble simply in order to quote the Charter. His delegation appealed to the Soviet Union representative to withdraw his amendment; if its appeal went unheeded it would have to abstain in the vote on that text.

29. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) requested the Soviet Union representative to delete from his amendment the words "to develop friendly relations among all States". The granting of asylum could very easily be regarded by the State of origin of the beneficiary as a hostile act on the part of the host State, so that prospective host States might refuse asylum for fear of damaging friendly relations among States. The right of asylum would thus be seriously threatened and possibly even nullified. If the Soviet Union representative agreed to that deletion, his amendment would have the Saudi Arabian delegation's support.

30. Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in a spirit of co-operation his delegation was prepared to accede to the Saudi Arabian representative's request for it acknowledged that the phrase in question was not absolutely essential. In addition, in consideration of the difficulties drawn to its attention by several representatives, his delegation would withdraw point 2 of its revised amendments.

31. Sir Douglas GLOVER (United Kingdom) considered that although the revised version of the Soviet amendment was more satisfactory than the original version, the best course would be to abide by the text submitted by the Commission on Human Rights. He was strengthened in that view by the new change which the USSR delegation had just made in its text at the request of the Saudi Arabian representative. He would accordingly vote against the Soviet amendment.

32. Mr. CAPOTORTI (Italy) said that the reasons why he had opposed the original version of the Soviet amendments were valid for the revised version also, and that the change just made by the USSR representative in that amendment further increased the perplexity of the Italian delegation. He wondered why the Soviet text did not mention Article 1, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, which would seem to have a place in the preamble to the draft Declaration. The problem of asylum was one in which international co-operation had a fundamental part to play, and it was surprising not to see that passage of the Charter included in the enumeration of the purposes of the United Nations which made up the Soviet amendment. It was true that the original text of the preamble referred only to Article 1, paragraph 3, but that was only logical since it was precisely to the sphere of international co-operation in the field of human rights that the draft Declaration belonged. To include in the preamble references to other paragraphs of Article 1 was very dangerous, for any partial quotation distorted the spirit of the text from which it was taken. Moreover, the revised Peruvian text also mentioned the idea of peace, so that the Soviet amendment was entirely unnecessary. In view of what he had said, his delegation would be unable to vote for the USSR proposal.

33. Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) expressed surprise that the Soviet delegation should have decided to delete from its amendment the words "to develop friendly relations among all States". Chile had been in favour of the revised Soviet text because in the

present-day world it was appropriate to relate all problems to that of the maintenance of peace and the development of friendly relations. By deleting the passage in question, the Soviet delegation vitiated its proposal, which thus lost all justification. He would therefore prefer to vote for the original text.

34. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that she, too, disapproved of the deletion of the words "to develop friendly relations among all States". If the Saudi Arabian delegation saw fit, it might request a separate vote on those words.

35. Mr. RIOS (Panama) acknowledged the highly conciliatory spirit displayed by the Soviet delegation, but considered that the words it had agreed to delete were of cardinal importance. Accordingly, his delegation, which had intended simply to abstain on the revised Soviet amendment—because it found the original text more satisfactory—would now be obliged to vote against it.

36. Mr. GHORBAL (United Arab Republic) said that the Italian representative had brought out a very important point. If reference was to be made to the purposes of the United Nations as stated in the Charter, it was necessary to enumerate all of them, and not cite some and not others. It would therefore be better not to delete anything from the revised Soviet amendment. In any case, the excellent Peruvian amendment offered a solution to all the difficulties as it answered the point raised by the representative of Saudi Arabia. His delegation accordingly urged the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the Soviet Union not to delete anything from the text of the amendment submitted by the latter. In any event the Peruvian text should receive unanimous support.

37. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) said that he shared the views of the representative of the United Arab Republic. He considered, moreover, that the position of many delegations with regard to the Soviet amendment would depend upon the fate accorded the Peruvian amendment. He therefore suggested that the latter amendment should be put to the vote first.

38. Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was in a spirit of compromise that he had agreed to delete from his delegation's amendment the words "to develop friendly relations among all States". However, wishing to take into account the remarks just made by several delegations, he was restoring the phrase and suggested that it should be voted upon separately, so that those who did not like it could vote against its retention. The Soviet delegation would vote for the Peruvian amendment.

39. U KHIN MAUNG PYU (Burma) considered that the Soviet amendment was very closely linked to the Peruvian amendment, and said that he would be able to vote for the former only if the latter was adopted.

40. Mr. MENDOZA (Bolivia) endorsed the idea contained in the Soviet amendment. He was also in favour of the Peruvian amendment, which dealt with a point of great importance to all States. Moreover, he believed that the two amendments expressed the same concept, though in different form.

41. Mr. IDRIS (Indonesia) also felt that the Soviet and Peruvian amendments were complementary.

42. Mrs. MANTZOULINOS (Greece) believed that the preamble to an international instrument should refer only to the principles on which the provisions

of that instrument were based. In its present form the preamble to the draft Declaration was in accord with that rule, since its first paragraph concerned human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Soviet amendment would introduce into the preamble principles which, although essential, had no connexion with either the right of the individual to seek asylum or the right of the State to grant asylum. For that reason the Greek delegation would be unable to vote for it. On the other hand it would vote for the Peruvian amendment.

43. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) feared that the Soviet amendment had been misinterpreted by a number of delegations. He personally considered that the principles which it set forth were perfectly relevant in the context of the draft Declaration, and he would vote for it. He would also vote for the Peruvian amendment, which rounded off the Soviet proposal.

44. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that his doubts regarding the phrase "to develop friendly relations among all States" in the Soviet text had arisen solely from the uncertainty regarding the fate of the Peruvian amendment. If the latter was adopted, he would have no difficulty in voting for the Soviet amendment, and there would be no need, so far as he was concerned, for a separate vote.

45. He formally moved that the Committee should vote first on the Peruvian amendment.

46. Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Saudi Arabian motion.

#### *Adoption of the preamble*

47. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections, the Committee would vote first on the Peruvian amendment.

*It was so decided.*

48. Mr. DAS (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that the following two minor corrections to the revised Peruvian amendment should be made: in the first line the words "the fourth and fifth" should be replaced by the words "the third and fourth"; and, in the Spanish text, the word "conforme" before the words "pacífico y humanitario" should be deleted.<sup>1/</sup>

*The Peruvian amendment (A/C.3/L.1042/Rev.1) was adopted by 82 votes to none with 2 abstentions.*

49. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point 1 of the Soviet amendments (A/C.3/L.1043/Rev.1).

*Point 1 of the Soviet amendments was adopted by 45 votes to 21, with 19 abstentions.*

50. Mr. TROCLET (Belgium) said that, to meet the wish of the Philippine delegation, he had rearranged sub-paragraph (a) of point 1 of his amendments (A/C.3/L.1039/Rev.2), so that the instruments dealing with asylum should come first. As a result, his proposal now was to add after the words "dealing with asylum" the words "and the status of refugees and stateless persons".

51. He withdrew sub-paragraph (b) of point 1 of his amendments. It had been proposed mainly in order to meet the wishes of the Latin American delegations, but in the end it did not appear to meet with their approval.

<sup>1/</sup> Subsequently circulated as A/C.3/L.1042/Rev.1/Corr.1.

52. Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he saw no need for the status of refugees and stateless persons to be given special mention since in his view the notion of asylum was a general one which embraced refugees and stateless persons and could include other categories.

53. Mr. TROCLET (Belgium) stressed the value of his amendment. Contrary to the argument of the Soviet delegation, he believed that the idea of asylum was too limited to cover refugees and stateless persons.

54. Mr. DE SANTIAGO LOPEZ (Mexico) said that he shared the Soviet representative's views, to the effect that international agreements which were not in harmony with the Latin American concept of asylum, should not be mentioned. The Convention on Territorial Asylum, signed at Caracas in 1954,<sup>2/</sup> did not distinguish between the person enjoying asylum and a refugee, and granted identical treatment to both.

55. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point 1 of the Belgian amendments (A/C.3/L.1039/Rev.2), as further amended by its sponsor.

*Point 1 of the Belgian amendments, as modified, was adopted by 40 votes to 16, with 27 abstentions.*

56. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the former fourth preambular paragraph, which would now become the fifth preambular paragraph, as thus amended.

57. Mr. NEDBAILO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) requested a separate vote on the words "States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies", since deletion of those words would give the Declaration a more universal character.

*The Committee decided to retain the words "States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies" by 59 votes to 8, with 15 abstentions.*

*The new fifth preambular paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 66 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.*

*The preamble as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 82 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

58. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) felt that the Committee, in view of the short time available, would be unable to vote on article 1 of the draft Declaration and the relevant amendments. He therefore proposed that the Committee should adopt a resolution stating, in effect, that the General Assembly, having already approved the preamble of the draft Declaration on the Right of Asylum but having been unable to vote on the whole of the draft Declaration, decided to examine the latter as early as possible at its eighteenth session and, during that session, to devote whatever number of meetings might be necessary to complete consideration of the item.

59. Mr. PICO (Argentina), supported by Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile), Mr. BEN MEBAREK (Algeria) and Mr. NEDBAILO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), considered that the Committee could devote one more meeting to its consideration of the draft Declaration in order to approve article 1. In view of

the spirit of conciliation which members had shown regarding the preamble and since the sponsors of the various amendments to article 1 seemed to have reached agreement, it would be only right for the Committee to vote at the next meeting on Monday morning on article 1, which was, after all, the keystone of the draft Declaration.

60. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) by no means shared the optimism of the previous speakers. He doubted very much that the Committee would be able to complete its examination of article 1 and of the numerous amendments at one meeting. There was nothing surprising in the draft resolution he had just submitted. The Committee would have to adopt similar resolutions on other items on its agenda and he could not see how the draft Declaration on the Right of Asylum was more important than some of the other questions that the Committee would have to hold over to the eighteenth session.

61. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee had decided some time previously to resume on Monday, 3 December, its examination of the draft International Covenants on Human Rights which it had interrupted on 16 November (1185th meeting) in order to hear the High Commissioner for Refugees. That decision could only be reversed by a two-thirds majority. He also shared the doubts expressed by the representative of Saudi Arabia: it was unlikely that the Committee would be able to dispose of article 1 of the draft Declaration at one meeting.

62. Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had proposed the insertion in the draft international Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of a new article concerning the right of asylum. His delegation was prepared, in the same spirit of conciliation as it had shown in the matter of the preamble to the draft Declaration, to agree that the time that would normally have been set aside for the examination of that new article should be devoted to article 1 of the draft Declaration on the Right of Asylum. There had already been long discussions on that article and some agreement had been reached. It would be a pity if all the efforts made were to remain fruitless.

63. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia), joined by Mrs. MANTZOULINOS (Greece), said that the Committee had only fourteen working days left. Since the start of the present session it had frequently deviated from the programme it had set itself. If that tendency were to prevail once more, the Committee would be unable, through lack of time, to continue its examination of the draft international Covenants constructively.

64. Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile), invoking rule 126 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly requested that a vote be taken immediately on the proposal to continue discussions of article 1 of the draft Declaration at the next meeting. The decision could be adopted by a simple majority of the members present and voting.

65. Mr. GHORBAL (United Arab Republic), joined by Mr. MALECELA (Tanganyika), Mr. BEN MEBAREK (Algeria) and Mr. NEDBAILO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said he feared that, if the Committee did not take a decision on article 1 of the draft Declaration at the present session, the good work done would be wasted and the article in question would again be the subject of lengthy discussion at the eighteenth ses-

<sup>2/</sup> Organization of American States: Law and Treaty Series: Convention on Territorial Asylum, signed at the Tenth Inter-American Conference, Caracas, March 1-28, 1954 (Pan American Union, Washington, D.C., 1954).

sion. He accordingly proposed the closure of the debate on article 1 so that the article itself and the relevant amendments might be put to the vote at the start of the next meeting.

66. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that, under rule 124 of the rules of procedure, if the Committee wished to reconsider a previous decision it would have to take a new decision by a two-thirds majority. Permission to speak on a motion to reconsider was accorded only to two speakers opposing the motion. Pointing out that he and the representative of Greece had already spoken against such a motion, he accordingly requested that the motion be put to the vote immediately, on the clear understanding that a two-thirds majority was required.

67. Regarding the closure of the debate he noted that several representatives, including himself, had not had an opportunity to express their views either on article 1 of the draft Declaration or on the amendments proposed. The Committee would, therefore, be quite unable to reach a decision on that article at one

meeting. With regard to the proposal of the USSR representative, he wished to point out that, in any case, the Committee would not be able to examine the new article of the draft international Covenant on civil and political rights until it had adopted the draft Declaration on the Right of Asylum.

68. Sir Douglas GLOVER (United Kingdom) and Mr. BOUQUIN (France) supported the proposal made by the representative of Saudi Arabia.

69. Mr. NEDBAILO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) moved the adjournment of the meeting under rule 119 of the rules of procedure.

70. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion for adjournment submitted by the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR.

*The motion for adjournment was adopted by 34 votes to 20, with 14 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.