United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ELEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE, 699th MEETING

Monday, 3 December 1956, at 3.10 p.m.

New York

CONTENTS

Chairman: **Mr. Hermod LANNUNG (Denmark).**

AGENDA ITEM 33

Draft Convention on the Nationality of Married Women (Economic and Social Council resolution 587 E (XX), A/2944, A/3059, A/C.6/L.373, A/3154, chap. VII, section IX, para. 541, A/3193, A/C.3/L.513) (*continued*)

ARTICLE 5

1. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) was afraid that, as it stood, article 5, paragraph 1, of the draft Convention on the Nationality of Married Women (Economic and Social Council resolution 587 E (XX), annex A) would make it impossible for some States to accede to the Convention. In view of the humanitarian nature of the instrument, it was undesirable that any State should be prevented from acceding to it on purely political grounds. The same difficulty had arisen at the previous meeting in connexion with the signing of the Convention and it was a pity that the Committee had decided to reject the Byelorussian amendment (A/C.3/L.518) and to adopt the complicated procedure proposed by Australia (Economic and Social Council resolution 587 E (XX), annex A).

2. His delegation thought that any State undertaking to assume the obligations imposed by the Convention should be able to accede to it. He accordingly proposed the deletion from paragraph 1 of the words "referred to in paragraph 1 of article 4". There would then be no discrepancy between article 5 and article 9 of the draft Convention, since under the Statute of the International Court of Justice the Court was open to all States whether or not they were members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

3. Mrs. NOVIKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) supported the Bulgarian proposal, which was based on the same considerations as had been the Byelorussian amendment to article 4.

4. Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom) thought that the arguments that had been advanced against any amendment of article 4 held good for article 5; she would accordingly be against any change in the wording.

5. Mr. THIERRY (France) agreed with the United Kingdom representative; it would be illogical to provide two different systems for articles 4 and 5. He was therefore opposed to any amendment of article 5.

6. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Bulgarian amendment to paragraph 1 of article 5, calling for the deletion of the words "referred to in paragraph 1 of article 4".

The amendment was rejected by 28 votes to 10, with 17 abstentions.

7. The CHAIRMAN put article 5 of the draft Convention (Economic and Social Council resolution 587 E (XX), annex A) to the vote.

Article 5 was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

ARTICLE 6

8. The CHAIRMAN put article 6 of the draft Convention to the vote.

Article 6 was adopted by 49 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

NEW ARTICLE

9. Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom) recalled that at the tenth session of the General Assembly the United Kingdom delegation had submitted two amendments in the Sixth Committee (A/C.6/L.373). One of the amendments consisted of a new article to be inserted after article 6. The United Kingdom wished to maintain that amendment, which appeared also in annex A to Economic and Social Council resolution 587 E (XX).

10. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee had before it two amendments proposing the insertion of a new article between articles 6 and 7: one submitted by Belgium (A/C.3/L.513) and the other by the United Kingdom (Economic and Social Council resolution 587 E (XX), annex A).

11. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) objected to the Belgian amendment, because its effect would be to leave metropolitan States entirely free to decide whether or not the Convention was to apply to the territories for whose international relations they were responsible. The United Kingdom amendment, too, was designed to limit the scope of the Convention and to prevent its application to Non-Self-Governing Territories.

12. In view of the undeniably humanitarian nature of the Convention, it would be contrary to the interests of the indigenous populations to give the administering Powers full discretion in that regard. Besides, the General Assembly had already taken a position on that point in connexion with the draft International Covenants on Human Rights: in resolution 422 (V) it had recommended that the provisions of the Covenants should extend to or be applicable equally to a

signatory metropolitan State and to all the territories which were being administered or governed by such metropolitan State. That was a recommendation which ought to influence the decision in the case under discussion, for any solution adopted in the case of the draft Covenants should be applicable to the draft Convention. That being so, her delegation could not but regard the Belgian and United Kingdom amendments as unacceptable.

13. Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom) explained why her delegation had proposed the insertion of a new article after article 6. In the first place, for the purpose of nationality, the British colonies, with the exception of Southern Rhodesia, were treated as one with the metropolitan territory of the United Kingdom and there was one common "citizenship of the United Kingdom and colonies" for those territories. That national status was a matter on which only the Parliament of the United Kingdom could legislate. If the United Kingdom nationality law was in conformity with the requirements of the Convention, those requirements would be fulfilled in relation to all citizens of the United Kingdom and colonies, no matter to which territory they belonged, and no provision for separate colonial application was required so far as the status conferred by that law was concerned.

14. On the other hand, there were certain territories for whose international relations the United Kingdom Government was responsible but whose citizens were not citizens of the United Kingdom and colonies. Southern Rhodesia and the protected state of Tonga were cases in point. The United Kingdom Parliament could not enact legislation relating to nationality for those territories. Therefore, to take account of the constitutional relationship between the United Kingdom and such territories, an article was necessary providing that the Convention could be made applicable to them separately as soon as their local nationality law had been brought into line with the Convention. If there were no such article, the United Kingdom would be unable to accede to the Convention unless and until all the territories which had a national status separate from that of citizens of the United Kingdom and colonies had brought their nationality law into conformity with the Convention. That would unnecessarily impede the United Kingdom's participation.

15. From the point of view of the United Kingdom, therefore, it was necessary that the Convention should, first, apply to citizens of the United Kingdom and colonies and, secondly, permit later application to other forms of national status possessed by persons belonging to particular territories. The first sentence of the proposed text made it clear that, apart from extensions made under the second sentence, the Convention would apply only to "nationals" of the Contracting State in the ordinary sense of the term, that is, in the case of the United Kingdom, to citizens of the United Kingdom and colonies. The second sentence made it possible for the Convention to be extended to any other national status possessed by reason of connexion with a territory for whose international relations the Contracting State was responsible.

16. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia) thought that, in view of its humanitarian nature, the Convention should apply to all territories, including all dependent territories. The Belgian and United Kingdom amendments were designed to limit the scope of the Convention and to prevent its application in the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories. His delegation would accordingly be unable to support either amendment, especially since the Commission on Human Rights had decided in the case of the International Covenants on Human Rights that all the provisions should be applicable equally to a signatory metropolitan State and to the territories which were being administered or governed by such metropolitan State.

17. Mr. BRENA (Uruguay) outlined the four characteristics by which international conventions were distinguished: they were instruments between sovereign States in the classic meaning of the term; they established direct relations between the signatory States; they precluded any delegation of powers; they constituted an arrangement. In the opinion of his delegation, the Committee would be taking purely domestic matters into account if it adopted the proposed amendments. The difficulties the United Kingdom experienced by reason of the variety of constitutional ties between itself and the territories for whose international relations it was responsible could obviously not be settled by the Committee. Any measures to facilitate the application of the Convention to dependent territories must be a matter for the British Parliament. Furthermore, if the Committee was going to examine the special difficulties of each State one after the other, the debate would go on forever. In the circumstances, he could not vote in favour of either the Belgian or the United Kingdom amendment.

18. Mr. VLAHOV (Yugoslavia) said that in view of the nature of the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, the adoption of a territorial clause was out of the question. It would be an act of discrimination to give certain countries the right to decide the time at which they would guarantee respect for the rights recognized by the Convention in the territories under their administration and it would be tantamount to approving the principles which traditionally underlay all colonial policies. Any refusal to apply the Convention to dependent territories would be contrary to Article 73 of the Charter, in which the colonial Powers had recognized the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of those territories were paramount. In order to fulfil their obligations they should seek to improve the lot of the indigenous inhabitants and one means of doing so would certainly be to apply the provisions of the Convention, for it represented a very marked advance in its field. The Yugoslav delegation was therefore firmly opposed to the Belgian and the United Kingdom amendments and would vote against them.

19. Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) thought that it was quite unnecessary to insert a colonial clause of the type proposed by Belgium and the United Kingdom. The Convention on the Nationality of Married Women was clearly social and humanitarian in character and should therefore be applied as widely as possible. Moreover, in the case in point, there did not seem to be any particular advantage in a clause of that type, which was a kind of "colonial clause" often referred to euphemistically as a "territorial clause". If some States had difficulties for domestic reasons, those difficulties should be settled by them by national measures. It should also be borne in mind that the General Assembly itself had shown the way when it had decided not to limit the application of the International Covenants on Human Rights to the metropolitan territories

of signatory States. The General Assembly had applied a special procedure with regard to the work of the Commission on Human Rights in giving the Commission very strict instructions, in order to emphasize its very definite opposition to the inclusion of any colonial clause in the draft Covenants. That precedent should be followed in the case of the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, which raised far fewer substantive difficulties in that connexion than the International Covenants on Human Rights.

20. Of the two amendments, those of Belgium and the United Kingdom respectively, that of the United Kingdom seemed the less open to criticism; when faced with the choice between two evils, one had to choose the lesser. But his delegation failed to see the need to choose between two solutions which were open to criticism and which had indeed been criticized; it preferred the good, which was to retain the original text proposed by Cuba.

21. Mr. THIERRY (France) said that, in regard to the question of territorial application, the position of France was made easier by the fact that French legislation on nationality had embodied the principles set forth in the Convention for more than ten years and his delegation had always been in favour of the principle of universality. It would therefore support the Belgian amendment. Universality did not necessarily signify uniformity and the amendment made it possible to reconcile universality of application with the diversity of juridical conditions obtaining in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It could even be said that, far from restricting the field of application of the Convention, the Belgian amendment would help to enlarge it, since it would enable States which wished to ratify the Convention to do so immediately and to extend its application to the various territories under their administration at a later date, as soon as the legal problems which arose in their connexion had been settled.

22. Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) agreed wholeheartedly with the representative of Uruguay. The Convention was designed to eliminate any controversy which might arise over the question of nationality. Its aims were at once humanitarian and pacific; it sought to eliminate all discrimination on the basis of sex in matters of nationality. The Chilean delegation would vote against the Belgian amendment, because it would leave the signatory State complete discretion in regard to the integral or partial application of the Convention; that was contrary to the spirit of universality, the need for which was recognized by all. The effect of the amendment would be to exclude certain territories and thus to introduce discrimination in the field of the status of women. The United Kingdom amendment was not so sweeping: it referred to one particular case, that of the domestic legislation of the United Kingdom. That question, however, should be settled by the United Kingdom authorities in the spirit of the Convention, the purpose of which was to repair an important omission in international private law. He would therefore vote against the United Kingdom amendment also.

23. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that the new article proposed by the Belgian delegation sought to prevent, by a legal and political artifice, the application of the provisions of the Convention to the Non-Self-Governing Territories, and to leave the matter entirely to the discretion of the metropolitan Powers; thus, by reason of the discrimination which it would establish, it ran counter to the humanitarian aims of the Convention and to the provisions of the Charter, in particular those of Article 73. The Syrian delegation had always considered that social legislation should apply on terms of absolute equality to the peoples of metropolitan countries and to those of Non-Self-Governing Territories; they should apply to human beings as such, irrespective of the political entity and the race to which they belonged. The Syrian delegation would vote against the Belgian amendment and, on the same grounds, against the United Kingdom amendment. If certain States which administered Non-Self-Governing Territories encountered legislative difficulties, they should gradually overcome them in the interest of the peoples of those territories, who should be encouraged, by progressive measures similar to those contained in the draft Convention, to develop in the direction indicated by the General Assembly. It was opposition to such development, in the manner of the Belgian and United Kingdom amendments, that was the source of the disputes which arose between metropolitan Powers and Non-Self-Governing Territories. The French representative's arguments were not convincing; universality and uniformity were two conditions which went hand in hand in the application of international conventions, which were specifically designed to make uniform and to extend legislative provisions adopted by agreement.

24. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation had always felt that the Convention should extend to as many States and territories as possible; it would therefore vote against the Belgian and United Kingdom amendments. It should be noted that those amendments, which were contrary to the Charter, as had already been pointed out, were contrary also to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in particular the second paragraph of article 2. All States which were in favour of that provision and of the Declaration in general should therefore oppose the amendments.

25. Mr. MAURER (Romania) recalled that his delegation had already said (698th meeting), in connexion with article 4, that there could be no question of limiting the effects of the Convention to certain countries. The Convention was designed to bring into effect, on a particularly important point, the principle of equality between men and women, the scope of which was universal. It would be contradictory to proclaim that universal principle and at the same time to restrict its application in any respect whatever.

26. The Belgian amendment and the United Kingdom amendment ran counter to the spirit of the draft Convention. The result of the proposed provisions would be to exclude from the benefit of the Convention all indigenous women in the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories.

27. The amendments raised problems which had been under discussion for a long time; the point at issue was the so-called "colonial clause", which appeared in several conventions. He wondered, however, what that clause represented at the current time; it seemed to be nothing more than a relic from the past. So much was plain from the arguments which had been put forward in its favour, most of which were constitutional in character. He was thinking in particular of the arguments adduced by the United Kingdom. It was hard to see how the absence of the colonial clause

could prevent a State from signing the Convention, because if that State had the power of decision in regard to the legislation of non-metropolitan territories, the colonial clause was without application, and if it had no such power of decision, the colonial clause was useless, since no one could be required to do the impossible.

28. The amendments concerned territories whose international relations were the responsibility of the State which wished to use the colonial clause. It was surely not possible for a State to speak on behalf of certain territories without at the same time having the right or the power to influence their legislation. Such a position would seem to be most extraordinary. Conventions concluded among States were always likely to require amendments in domestic legislation and a State could not evade the effects of a convention by arguing that it was impossible to introduce the necessary legislative amendments. The right to speak on behalf of certain territories could not be disassociated from the right to influence their domestic legislation. The inevitable conclusion was that there was no real problem there; if there had been, the States concerned would have settled it long since either by constitutional arrangements or by organizing their participation in international conferences in a different manner.

29. Nor could the arguments the Belgian representative had put forward at the 697th meeting, in particular that of the need to apply the Convention to Non-Self-Governing Territories gradually, be invoked in support of the colonial clause. It was hard to see why it should be precisely those women who had most need of protection who should be deprived of it.

30. It should also be noted that adoption of either of the amendments might have most serious consequences. By allowing the principle of equality of men and women to be flouted on such an important point as that of the nationality of married women, the way would be opened to restrictions or limitations of other fundamental human rights. The result of progressive limitation might be that there would no longer be any rights of man, but only the rights of some men. It had been found unwise to introduce such restrictions into the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, and there was no more reason to include them in the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women. The representative of Belgium had pointed to certain existing situations which would make it impossible to apply the Convention immediately, but his argument would have been all the more valid for the Convention on the Political Rights of Women.

31. Lastly, he recalled the General Assembly's decision (resolution 422 (V)) that the International Covenants on Human Rights should apply to all territories without distinction. In the circumstances, there did not appear to be any justification for an alternative solution, since, by its very nature, the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women should be universally applicable.

32. For all those reasons, the Romanian delegation was against the Belgian and United Kingdom amendments.

33. Mr. AKBAY (Turkey) said that his delegation might have a compromise solution to suggest, possibly as an amendment. He would therefore like some time to consider that possibility before a vote was taken.

34. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) hoped that the representative of Turkey would inform the Committee of his suggestion during the meeting; the question had been fully discussed on several occasions and the Committee was in a position to take a decision quickly.

35. Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom) pointed out to the USSR representative, who had expressed opposition to any restrictions with respect to signature and accession in connexion with article 4, that the United Kingdom amendment had the effect of facilitating accession by her Government; its rejection might make it impossible for the United Kingdom to sign the Convention.

36. Contrary to what the representative of Syria had said, the proposed article was not discriminatory; it simply acknowledged that certain territories had their own nationality laws and that it was for them to decide regarding the Convention. If the proposed article were omitted, the United Kingdom would have to impose a decision on them, contrary to the provisions of Article 73 of the Charter. It might well be asked whether the opponents of the United Kingdom amendment, instead of being concerned with the well-being of the peoples concerned, were not trying to place the metropolitan countries in an embarrassing position when all that those countries were trying to do was to extend the Convention to as many territories as possible.

37. Mr. BRACOPS (Belgium) noted that the United Kingdom amendment differed from the Belgian amendment only in form: the United Kingdom amendment referred to a specific situation, the position of the United Kingdom, whereas the Belgian amendment was broader and perhaps more easily applicable because it was so simple.

38. He was surprised at the impression of some that Belgium and the United Kingdom were attempting to challenge anyone's right to benefit by the Convention. The amendments proposed met the urgent need to take into account the principle of progressive application of the Convention; automatic and compulsory application would be against all logic. He recalled the provisions of the Belgian amendment and drew attention to its very positive character. It was based on Article 73 of the Charter, all the provisions of which rested on the principle of progressive development. Of course, it was regrettable that mankind was made up of different groups of human beings at various levels of development, but that was an undeniable fact. What had to be done was to bring about the progressive development of the most backward groups to a more advanced level. That was the spirit in which the Belgian amendment had been drafted.

39. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) thought the Committee should consider that important question thoroughly and devote full time to it. Accordingly, the request of the representative of Turkey should be granted.

40. Mr. MARRIOTT (Australia) said that the absence of an article on territorial application was wholly regrettable; his delegation had therefore welcomed the proposals of the United Kingdom and Belgium. The national status of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories was a very important and complicated question. The Convention could not apply automatically to all dependent territories of signatory

States. Account had to be taken of the particular circumstances of the various territories, and the delay in applying the Convention resulting from some of those circumstances should not be allowed to delay ratification of the Convention by the metropolitan Powers. If only for that reason, the draft Convention should include a territorial application clause. The Australian delegation found both of the proposed texts satisfactory.

41. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) pointed out that the question of the territorial clause came up every year and the same arguments were always adduced. The States favouring inclusion of the clause invariably invoked Article 73 of the Charter. Such a position was not valid, however, because often those States had not promoted the political, economic and social advancement provided for in the Article in the territories they administered, nor brought them the peace and prosperity which they were entitled to expect. The discontent prevailing in some territories and the uprisings which took place there were ample proof of that fact. The discontent was not stirred up by subversive elements or foreign influence; it was the expression of the trend within the territories towards progress and reforms. In view of the existing situation and the events taking place in the territories, the champions of the territorial clause were not justified in invoking Article 73.

42. The equally skilful argument of comparing universality with uniformity was not tenable either. The diversity of social, juridical or constitutional systems could not be invoked for the purpose of blocking application of the principle of universality. Human rights were fundamental rights which should apply to all human beings without distinction as to race, language, the social structure of the country or the method of electing the government. Since the draft Convention dealt with the rights of the human person, it should be universally applicable and the lack of uniformity was not a valid argument against such universality.

43. Far from trying to embarrass the administering Powers, the Committee was prepared, on the contrary, to consider their difficulties and to help them resolve them. In reality, those Powers found themselves in a difficult position because they were fully occupied in territories where rebellion sometimes threatened to erupt. That was why they sought excuses and invoked the concept of progressive application. Experience had shown what abuses the word "progressive" was used to conceal. Despite the desire of the administering powers in many cases to speed the process of applying the Convention to the territories they administered, there would always be politicians who thought it was not the proper moment to do so and that it was better to wait. However, the peoples of the territories were awakening. They were eager to benefit by all conventions drawn up by the United Nations, and they would achieve that goal despite all obstacles.

44. The United Kingdom representative had said that the inhabitants of the United Kingdom colonies were *ipso facto* British citizens. If that was so, there was no problem, and the Convention should automatically be applicable to them. With regard to the two territories cited, Southern Rhodesia and Tonga, whose citizens had separate nationality, the United Kingdom Government did not have to act as an intermediary; the authorities of those territories were perfectly capable of studying the Convention and deciding whether or not they wanted to accede to it.

45. Lastly, the argument of certain States that if there was no territorial clause they could not accede to the Convention, was a threat which had often been made. Conventions and covenants should be a stimulus to Governments and should spur them to amend the laws of the country so that, if they were not in a position to ratify those agreements immediately, they could do so one day. It was sufficient for an adequate number of States to sign the Convention immediately; in that way, it would come into force and other countries could amend their legislation to enable them to accede as soon as possible.

46. The arguments put forward were merely well-presented new editions of old arguments and the principle of universality should not be sacrificed to give satisfaction to those who had adduced those arguments.

47. Mr. TSAO (China) said that his delegation had always taken a very broad view of the territorial clause. It sided with the colonial territories, but was nevertheless aware of the constitutional and objective difficulties faced by the administering Powers. The Committee was dealing with an international convention and should ensure that it was applicable to as many territories as possible and that as many States as possible could adhere to it. To that end, his delegation was prepared to support the United Kingdom amendment. The adoption of that amendment would not mean that certain specific rights were not being granted to certain territories, but that the various laws relating to nationality in force in different territories were being respected. On the other hand, the wording of the Belgian amendment, although its intentions were very commendable, seemed too general and gave the metropolitan country too much discretionary power. In fact it would make that country alone responsible for deciding subjectively whether the Convention should be applied to any given territory. He wondered whether a formula like that proposed by the United Kingdom would not also be suitable for the territories administered by Belgium. Perhaps the representatives of Belgium, the United Kingdom and Turkey could meet and draft a compromise text together. It would be unwise to vote hastily and without first thoroughly examining and attempting to solve the very real difficulties involved.

48. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) pointed out that the Belgian amendment had been submitted on 28 November and that the United Kingdom amendment had been proposed the previous year. All delegations should therefore be in a position to discuss and vote on those texts. Nothing new had happened to justify a postponement of the vote, and the Committee was already behind in its work. The United Kingdom and Belgian amendments raised questions of principle on which a large number of delegations, including his own, were unwilling to make concessions. Those questions were discussed at every session of the General Assembly; the positions of Member States were well known and there was very little chance that they would change by the next meeting. Moreover, the Turkish representative had said that he was not certain he would be able to submit an amendment at the following meeting. The

Committee could not function on the basis of probability.

49. He therefore moved the closure of the debate, in accordance with rule 120 of the rules of procedure, and proposed that the vote should be taken immediately.

50. Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom) said that the Turkish representative would have enough time to submit his amendment if the debate was adjourned to the following meeting. Her delegation, for its part, was quite prepared to co-operate with him. A compromise formula acceptable to all could be found; that had been provided in the case of the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave-Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery. Indeed, the Conference of Plenipotentiaries convened to draft that Convention had voted by a very large majority for the insertion of a territorial clause.

51. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) opposed the closure of the debate. In her opinion, the articles under examination were extremely important and the Committee should not act hastily.

52. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) withdrew his motion for the closure of the debate.

53. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) recalled that at the Conference convened to draft the Supplementary Convention on Slavery, which he had attended as an observer, it had been stated that the insertion of the territorial clause should in no circumstances be regarded as a precedent for the International Covenants on Human Rights or any other important convention. Only on that condition had many delegations accepted that clause after much bargaining and compromise. He hoped that a situation of that kind would not arise again in connexion with the draft Convention under study. If the Turkish representative intended to submit a proposal along those lines, his delegation would be unable to support it.

54. The Turkish representative should indicate forthwith whether he would submit a specific text or merely offer suggestions. In the latter case he could already mention the salient points.

55. Mr. AKBAY (Turkey) said that his delegation was unable to submit a specific text at the current stage. It was his intention to find a compromise formula acceptable to the majority. It would endeavour to submit a text to the Committee or at least make suggestions that might enable another delegation to propose an amendment.

56. Mr. THIERRY (France) proposed that the words "having an autonomous status with respect to nationality" should be added to the end of the Belgian text. That would show that the clause was not meant to be discriminatory but that its intention was to take into account the various forms of legal status that existed in different territories. If that suggestion was accepted favourably, his delegation was prepared to submit a formal amendment.

57. Mr. BRENA (Uruguay) said that courtesy demanded that the Turkish representative should be given time to submit the compromise formula to which he had referred. He therefore proposed the adjournment of the debate.

The motion for adjournment was adopted.

58. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the sponsors of amendments should consult together in order to arrive at a compromise formula.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

Printed in U.S.A. M—77301—January 1957—2,150