United Nations Conference on the Elimination or Reduction of Future Statelessness

Geneva, 1959 and New York, 1961

Document:-
A/CONF.9/5

Comments by Governments on the revised Draft Convention on the Elimination of Future Statelessness and the revised Draft Convention on the Reduction of Future Statelessness, prepared by the International Law Commission at its sixth session

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Distr.
GENERAL

A/CONF.9/5
24 February 1959
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: VARIOUS

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE ELIMINATION OR REDUCTION OF FUTURE STATELESSNESS

Comments by Governments on the revised Draft Convention on the Elimination of Future Statelessness and the revised Draft Convention on the Reduction of Future Statelessness Prepared by the International Law Commission at its sixth session

59-04540

(22 p.)

/...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Note by the Secretary-General	3
Comments by Governments	4
1. Belgium	4
2. Finland	5
3. France	7
4. Italy	10
5. Norway	13
6. Sweden	14
7. Switzerland	15
8. Turkey	19

Note by the Secretary-General

1. By a letter dated 11 August 1958, the Secretary-General informed all States invited to the United Nations Conference on the Elimination or Reduction of Future Statelessness under paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 896 (IX) that he had decided, in pursuance of that same paragraph, to convene the Conference at the European Office of the United Nations, Geneva, between 24 March and 17 April 1959. In the same letter the Secretary-General requested the submission by 30 November 1958 of any comments on the revised Draft Convention on the Elimination of Future Statelessness and the revised Draft Convention on the Reduction of Future Statelessness, contained in the Report of the International Law Commission covering the work of its sixth session in 1954 (A/2693).

2. The present document reproduces the texts of the comments received in response to that request and prior to 20 February 1959, namely, the comments of Belgium, Finland, France, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey. Comments received after that date will be reproduced and circulated as addenda to the present document.

3. It will be recalled that the Governments of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, Honduras, India, Lebanon, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America had previously submitted comments on the draft conventions prepared by the International Law Commission at its fifth session in 1953 (A/2456), and these had been taken into account by the Commission in preparing the revised drafts which are now before the Conference and to which the comments contained in this document relate. The comments on the earlier drafts are to be found in the annex to the Report of the International Law Commission covering the work of its sixth session (A/2693).

4. It should also be noted that a memorandum submitted by the Government of Denmark, containing comments, which had been circulated to States invited to the Conference in August 1955 (English text) and October 1957 (French text), has been reproduced as a separate conference document (A/CONF.9/4).

Comments by Governments

1. BELGIUM

Note Verbale from the Permament Mission of Belgium to the United Nations dated 6 January 1959

/Original: French/

....

With regard to the Belgian Government's comments on the two revised draft Conventions adopted by the General Assembly at its ninth session (resolution 896 (IX)), the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Belgium has requested me to inform the Legal Counsel that the drafts, as examined at the sixth session of the International Law Commission of the United Nations, are open to the same objections as those stated in his letter of 22 February 1954, which was annexed to Note Verbale No. S.313 of the Permament Mission, dated 24 February 1954.

The comments reproduced in Supplement No. 9 (A/2693) of the United Nations General Assembly (p. 23) should therefore be adapted to the final version of the drafts.

Thus, the reference to article 5, paragraph 1, should be to article 5; the reference to article 7 and 8 should be to article 8 and 9; and the reference to article 10 should be to article 11.

Article 7, paragraph 1, of the draft Conventions would also seem to warrant certain reservations. Although it may be highly desirable that "renunciation shall not result in loss of nationality unless the person renouncing it has or acquires another nationality", there are cases where it is equally desirable for other considerations to be given precedence. Thus, on the rare occasions when Belgian legislation allows deprivation of nationality, there is a provision permitting the spouse and children of the person deprived of nationality to renounce Belgian nationality without having to prove possession of another nationality. The intention here is to preserve family unity.

2. FINLAND

Letter from the Permament Mission of Finland to the United Nations dated 1 December 1958

/Original: English/

....

The Government, having given consideration to the revised Draft convention on the elimination of future statelessness and the revised Draft convention on the reduction of future statelessness, contained in the Report of the International Law Commission covering the work of its sixth session, submit the following comments on the two revised draft conventions:

Both the draft convention on the elimination of future statelessness and the draft convention on the reduction of future statelessness are primarily based on the principle of the jus soli. This main rule has been modified by applying in certain cases, as a subsidiary rule, the principle of the jus sanguinis.

The national law of Finland is based on the latter principle. Considering, however, the modifications contained both in the national law of Finland on the one hand and in the draft conventions on the other, the legislation on nationality in Finland and the draft conventions are to a great extent, not incompatible. This applies in particular to the draft convention on the reduction of future statelessness, which consequently is preferable to Finland.

However, some amendments would be necessary in order to bring the national law of Finland into full harmony with the provisions of each of the draft conventions. Nevertheless, the Government of Finland have no objections to the principles underlying each of the draft conventions.

According to article 11 of both draft conventions, a new agency of the United Nations and a new international tribunal should be established, the former to act on behalf of stateless persons before Governments or before the tribunal, and the latter to decide any dispute between the State Parties to the Conventions concerning the interpretation or application of the conventions and to decide complaints presented by the said agency on behalf of stateless persons claiming to have been denied nationality in violation of the provisions of the conventions.

There is no doubt as to the necessity of those new bodies. Considering, however, the constant increase in the number of the organs of the United Nations leading indispensably to a rise in the expenses of the organization, the question should be examined, whether it would be possible to charge one of the existing agencies of the United Nations with those tasks planned to be given to the new agency. Similarly it should be considered, whether the International Court of Justice, by an extension of its jurisdiction, could deal with the disputes and complaints mentioned in article 11, paragraph 2.

3. FRANCE

Transmitted by a Note Verbale from the Permament Mission of France to the United Nations dated 31 October 1958

/Original: French/

....

I should like, moreover to communicate the comments of the Government of the French Republic on the draft conventions.

The considerations motivating the authors of these drafts have long attracted the interest of French legislators, and French legislation has, on the whole, been in keeping with the spirit of the proposed conventions.

In agreement, however, with the views expressed by several States in their comments annexed to the report of the International Law Commission covering the work of its sixth session, the French Government feels that, because of the present state of the law on this subject the draft convention on the elimination of future statelessness is too categorical to elicit general support or even a substantial number of accessions.

On the other hand, the French Government would be prepared to consider accepting the draft convention on the reduction of future statelessness, subject to the reservations set out below and without prejudice to such further reservations as its representatives might feel called upon to make during the conference.

I. The main reservation it feels obliged to make relates to article 1 of the draft. In its present form this article confers the nationality of the country of birth on all children who "would otherwise be stateless", i.e., on children of unknown parents and on those whose parents are known but have no nationality. It allows the preservation of such nationality to be made dependent on residence and also provides for a right of option at the age of eighteen years.

A brief analysis of French national law and of how in particular, it affects the children of stateless persons will help to clarify the French Government's position concerning this article:

(a) A child born in France of unknown parents becomes a French national on a provisional basis and remains a French national if his relationship to his parents is not determined before his majority (twenty-one years) or if, having been determined, it does not confer the parents' nationality under the national law of the parents (article 21 of the French Nationality Code).

(b) A child born in France of alien parents, whether stateless or not, acquires French nationality on attaining his majority if he has been normally resident in French territory for a period of five years between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one years and does not exercise his right to decline such nationality (article 44). It should be noted that, if the parents are stateless, that right cannot in fact be exercised, because a person may not renounce French nationality unless he can show he possesses another nationality through his parents.

(c) A child as referred to above may acquire French nationality by express option before he attains his majority on condition that his legal representative, before the child has attained the age of sixteen years, or the child himself after attaining that age, has fulfilled the condition of five years' residence. This option may therefore be exercised immediately after the birth of the child if the father has met the residence requirement. What this amounts to is the acquisition of nationality by right where birth and prolonged residence support the presumption that the child intends to make his home in France.

A stateless child who has been born in, and is settled in France thus has the opportunity of determining his status immediately - as is done in most cases - or of waiting until he attains his majority to do so, the essential condition being permanency of residence in French territory.

(d) There is another provision of French law which, while of less general application, allows children taken in or adopted by French nationals to acquire French nationality by declaration irrespective of their place of birth. This provision has been generously applied for the benefit of abandoned children who, in Germany and, more recently, in the States of Indochina, who, were given shelter by the French authorities and were later placed in French homes.

As the existing French law on this subject is quite comprehensive, the French Government does not feel that any of the provisions can be abandoned or modified. version of article 1 along the following lines would, however, be acceptable.

"1. A person who would otherwise be stateless shall acquire, at the age of twenty-one years or earlier, the nationality of the Party in whose territory he is born.

"2. The national law of the Party may make preservation or acquisition of such nationality dependent on the person being normally resident in its territory until the age of twenty-one years.

"3. If, in consequence of the operation of paragraph 2, a person on attaining the age of twenty-one years would become stateless...."

II. The wording of article 8 would involve restrictions on French national law which would seem to serve no useful purpose. Although the procedure for the deprivation of French nationality is not entirely in conformity with article 8 of the draft and such deprivation is pronounced by the administrative rather than by the judicial authorities, the entire matter is most stringently regulated by French law. Deprivation cannot, for instance, be applied to natural-born French nationals. Furthermore, the limited number of cases where it is applicable and the maximum period during which it can be pronounced prevent it from being a general and still less a discretionary, measure. Although the judicial authority has no jurisdiction in this matter, a decision depriving a person of his nationality requires the concurring opinion of the Conseil d'Etat and, in addition, its legality can be contested through redress against ultra vires action by the relevant administrative authority.

The French Government reserves its position regarding article 8, in the belief that its legislation provides appropriate and adequate guarantees.

It feels obliged to point out that the words "recourse to judicial authority" should, in all events, be replaced by "recourse to a higher authority", since in France, for example, it is the administrative authorities that are competent in such matters. The expression suggested would not involve any basic change in the provisions and would simplify interpretation.

III. The French Government also reserves its opinion on both the principle and application of article 11.

The French Government has no fundamental objections to the remaining provisions of the draft convention on the reduction of future statelessness.

/...

4. ITALY

Transmitted by a Note Verbale from the Permanent Mission of Italy to the United Nations dated 21 January 1959

[Original: Italian]

To begin with a comment of a general nature, we consider it desirable, in view of the close analogy between the two draft conventions, that the two texts should be combined in a single draft. This would also facilitate the work of the conference to be held at Geneva from 24 March to 17 April 1959.

We wish to comment as follows on the two draft conventions:

1. Draft convention on the elimination of future statelessness:

(a) We have no comment to make on the first seven articles, which correspond largely to the principles already embodied in our national legislation and which it is also proposed to embody in our citizenship bill.

(b) Article 8, however, as at present worded, contains a provision which does not appear acceptable to Italy, as the principle which it states is in conflict with article 8 (3) of the Italian Citizenship Act of 1912, the provisions of which are retained in the new bill on the subject.

If article 8 of the draft, which is certain to be opposed on political grounds by certain countries, cannot be eliminated entirely, it will be necessary to pay particular attention to the meaning of the word "penalty".

In any event, we would draw attention to the need to eliminate the phrase "or on any other ground", since under the Italian legal system, as distinct from that of some other countries, there are no cases where a person may be deprived of his nationality by way of "penalty" or as a penal measure. Should it be considered necessary to incorporate some such principle in the draft convention, the formula which might be most acceptable to Italy would be the following:

"Deprivation of nationality may not be ordered as a penal measure for political or ordinary offences".

(c) We have no comment to make on articles 9 and 10.

(d) Article 11 provides for a detailed machinery which is perhaps excessively cumbersome and on which several comments might be made.

/...

First, there does not appear to be any justification for the establishment of an "agency" in any of the Contracting Parties, which would act "on behalf of stateless persons before Governments".

If it is considered necessary to have some administrative body to deal with such questions, it would appear sufficient for this purpose simply to establish, as was done in other cases, a committee under the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, a body which is particularly qualified to deal with the problems of fugitives, refugees and stateless persons and which has dealt extensively with their problems as recently as this year, for instance, at the recent Rome meeting.

The article then provides for the establishment, within the framework of the United Nations, of a "tribunal" with special competence in such matters, thus creating a new international jurisdiction which might give rise to various difficulties.

Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice already establishes the Court's competence in matters relating to the interpretation of international agreements, and it would therefore be highly desirable not to remove an isolated matter out of its jurisidiction, ex post facto but rather to allow the Court to rule also on the questions referred to in the Convention.

2. Draft convention on the reduction of future statelessness:

(a) Subject to our earlier comments with regard to article 8, we believe that, in principle and bearing in mind the purpose of the draft convention, it would be preferable to take as a basis the text of the draft convention on the elimination of future statelessness, referred to above, in view also of the fact that the former text contains provisions which are more favourable and more in harmony with the liberal principles on which Italian law is based;

(b) Again, we have no comments to make on the first six articles of this text.

We do have an objection, however, to the second sentence of article 7 (3), as we are obviously unable to accept the principle that a naturalized citizen should lose his nationality on account of residence in his country of origin for a period to be determined in accordance with the legislation of the Party which granted the naturalization; to stipulate that such a

person might, on entirely discretional and therefore debatable grounds, be deprived of the nationality he has acquited would only create new and abnormal causes of statelessness. We therefore believe that the sentence should be deleted.

(c) With reference to article 8, we wish to repeat the comments and reservations previously made with regard to article 8 of the first draft convention.

(d) With reference to article 11, the comments made in respect of article 11 of the previous draft apply also in this case.

5. NORWAY

Letter from the Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations dated 22 January 1959

/Original: English/

....

The two revised conventions prepared by the International Law Commission during its sixth session do not essentially differ from the drafts prepared by the Commission during its fifth session. The Norwegian Government's position, therefore, remains in principle as outlined in my letter of 6 April 1954 (doc. A/CN.4/82/Add.1).[1] As stated in that letter, the Norwegian Government is in agreement with the objectives underlying the drafts concerned and would regard their acceptance as multilateral conventions as a great advantage. The provisions of the drafts, however, deviate in various respects from the existing Norwegian Nationality Act of 8 December 1950. This Act was adopted as a result of co-operation between the Scandinavian countries, and should not, for the sake of nordic uniformity be amended except in co-operation with Denmark and Sweden.

In these circumstances the Norwegian Government - which will take part in the conference which will be convened at Geneva between 24 March and 17 April 1959 - must reserve its position with regard to the question of adherence to the two draft conventions until renewed consultations have taken place with the Danish and Swedish Governments.

---

[1] See Annex to the Report of the International Law Commission covering the work of its sixth session, Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Session, Supplement No. 9, A/2693, p. 30.

6. SWEDEN

Letter from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden
dated 22 November 1958

/Original: English/

....

As to your request for comments on the two revised draft conventions, the Swedish Government's attitude is necessarily to be formed in close co-operation with the Danish and Norweign Governments, since the present Swedish Citizenship Act is itself a result of such co-operation. Consultations on the subject of the two draft conventions are, therefore, likely to take place between the three Scandinavian Governments prior to the Geneva Conference in 1959. Pending the result of such consultations, the Swedish Government might, however, express the purely preliminary opinion that it feels inclined to share, on the whole, the main points of view presented by the Danish Government in a Memorandum of 28 March 1955, circulated to Member States with your letter LEG 292/7/02(1) of 8 August 1955.

....

7. SWITZERLAND

Transmitted by letter from the Office of the Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations dated 25 November 1958

/Original: French/

Switzerland has always been concerned with statelessness and was one of the first countries to seek a remedy for it. Its Constitution of 1848 already contained a provision dealing with this matter. Although in those days the problem was mainly domestic in character, the fact remains that since that time every effort has been made to avoid legislation that would produce further cases of statelessness.

The Federal Act of 29 September 1952 on Swiss nationality broadly conforms to this trend and accords with most of the wishes and precepts so far enunciated on the international plane.

Although paternal relationship (jus sanguinis a patre) is the general rule for the acquisition of Swiss nationality at birth, maternal relationship is taken into account, not only to provide an illegitimate child with a nationality (art. 1, b), but also to prevent a legitimate child from becoming stateless. Thus, the legitimate child of a foreign father and a Swiss mother acquires his mother's Swiss nationality at birth when he is unable to acquire another nationality (art. 5).

A child found on Swiss territory is granted Swiss nationality (art. 6), so that he will not become stateless. For the same reason, where parental relationship is proved before he attains his majority, the child only loses that nationality if he acquired another.

On change of status, the illegitimate child of a Swiss mother and a foreign father does not lose Swiss nationality unless he has been legitimated by the marriage of his parents (art. 8) and then, again to avoid statelessness, only where he has thereby acquired the foreign nationality of his father.

A Swiss woman who marries an alien can retain Swiss nationality (art. 9) if she makes a declaration to that effect at the time when the banns are published or the marriage is solemnized. If she fails to claim Swiss nationality, she still

does not lose it unless she acquires, or already possesses, her husband's nationality, thus avoiding statelessness.

A Swiss national born abroad of a father also born abroad loses Swiss nationality unless he registers with a Swiss authority before attaining the age of twenty-two years (art. 10), but even then only on the express condition that he possesses another nationality.

A Swiss woman who has lost Swiss nationality through marriage to an alien can, in the event of subsequent statelessness, be reinstated by special arrangement (art. 19, first paragraph, sub-paragraph c); if she had children who are also stateless, she is entitled to have them naturalized by a simplified procedure (art. 20, second paragraph, and art. 28, first paragraph, item b).

A Swiss national cannot lose Swiss nationality at his request unless he acquires, or is assured of, a foreign nationality (art. 42). Moreover, Swiss nationality cannot be withdrawn from a person whose conduct has caused serious prejudice to the interests or good name of Switzerland unless that person possesses dual nationality (art. 48).

In general practice, Switzerland also takes full account of the possible eventual statelessness of applicants for normal Swiss naturalization.

Having itself endeavoured to avoid causing statelessness and to eliminate even those cases of statelessness for which it was not responsible, Switzerland welcomes the present attempt to seek international agreement on the elimination or reduction of future statelessness. It appreciates the excellent work done by the United Nations, and particularly by the International Law Commission, but deeply regrets that it cannot endorse the principal remedy proposed: attribution of a nationality at birth on the principle of the jus soli.

Such a solution is an obvious choice for States whose nationality legislation is itself based on the jus soli. Those States would have no sacrifice to make, and are, in most cases, least affected by statelessness. It is an established fact that the European countries whose nationality laws are based essentially on the jus sanguinis have the largest number of refugees and stateless persons either temporarily or permanently on their territory. To oblige those States, many of

/...

which are over-populated, to absorb indiscriminately into their population thousands of people whose only link with that territory is the accident of their birth on it would be to strike at the structure and very existence of those States. It should indeed be borne in mind that nationality does not fill the same sociological role in all countries. Whereas, in most American legislation the bond which links a person with a State is based essentially on association with territory, on domicile in the country, that is not the case with the greater part of west European legislation. Under much of that legislation, nationality is a moral and spiritual bond, uniting a person with a State and linking him to the traditions of its entire history. It is the cement which gives cohesion to a people. A country like Switzerland, which has over 500,000 aliens on its territory and which, in the past twenty-five years, has given temporary or permanent hospitality to more than 200,000 refugees or stateless persons, cannot incorporate these people in its population without first ascertaining that they have achieved a minimum assimilation of Swiss usage and custom, or at least that they are capable of such assimilation. Such assimilation cannot be assessed at birth, but only when a person has attained the age of eighteen years or majority. If the States whose nationality legislation is based on the jus sanguinis are to be persuaded to make a concession enabling stateless persons to acquire a nationality (and that is the crux of the matter!). a solution should not be sought in the attribution of nationality at birth. Such attribution should take place at an age when the person concerned has developed a true personality and has had prolonged contact with the country in which he intends to settle. The age could be fixed at eighteen years, as that is when a child's independence of his parents becomes apparent; it is also the age at which a child assumes certain personal rights and obligations, notably the obligation of military service. Whether the person concerned should have the right, at that age, to acquire the nationality of his country of residence, and subject to what conditions, is surely a question capable of solution. Even if the only result was an expedited procedure for naturalization, something specific would have been accomplished.

So long as article 1 of each of the two revised draft Conventions is based essentially on the attribution of nationality at birth jure soli, Switzerland regrets that it cannot support those drafts. Admittedly, the draft Convention on the Reduction of Future Statelessness attenuates to some extent the effects of

automatic acquisition at birth by stating that the country of birth may make preservation of such nationality dependent on the person being normally resident in its territory until the age of eighteen years and on the condition that he has not opted for another nationality. The fact none the less remains that the principle of automatic acquisition of nationality at birth jure soli, which Switzerland cannot accept, is in a considerable degree retained. An additional feature is the introduction of a new conception of nationality, viz., nationality that remains in suspense until a later date, but this is open to criticism from both the theoretical and the practical standpoint.

The preamble and the remaining provisions of the revised drafts would seem to offer a basis for agreement. At first scrutiny, therefore, Switzerland would be prepared to approve article 2 and articles 4 to 10 of the revised drafts.

8. TURKEY

Transmitted by a Note Verbale from the Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations dated 20 January 1959

/Original: Turkish/

As the power to revoke citizenship is reserved under Turkish law, the Turkish Government prefers the Draft Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness to the Draft Convention on the Elimination of Statelessness. Its comments will therefore be limited to the Draft Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

Preamble

In the preamble to the Draft Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness it would be logical to reverse the order of the fourth and fifth paragraphs so that the third and fifth paragraphs, which are complementary, would be consecutive.

Article 1

The Turkish Citizenship Act takes the principle of jus soli into account, although to a lesser extent than the Draft Convention. In the matter of the acquisition of citizenship the Draft Convention provides safeguards which are not provided for in national law. The provisions of the two texts concerning the duties incumbent upon States after the attainment of legal age are similar. As the Turkish Citizenship Act unconditionally recognizes the principle of jus sanguinis the first sentence is acceptable. The position is the same as regards the acquisition of citizenship through naturalization. With regard to the transmission of citizenship to children the Turkish Citizenship Act accepts the principle of the equality of the two parents. Accordingly, if the sentence at the end of the paragraph reading "the nationality of the father shall prevail over that of the mother" means that the mother's citizenship will always be nullified by that of the father, this provision is at variance with the Turkish Citizenship Act.

Article 2

This provision, which is embodied in the 1930 Hague Convention and the national laws of various countries, is considered acceptable.

Article 3

Acceptable.

Article 4

This article is in harmony with Turkish law in which the principle of jus sanguinis is accepted without reservation.

Article 5

This article is fully consistent with Turkish law and is acceptable. Under Turkish law marriage, termination of marriage, legitimation, recognition or adoption does not entail loss of citizenship.

Article 6

It is a basic principle of Turkish law that the wives and children of persons who renounce Turkish nationality retain their Turkish nationality. This provision of the Draft is therefore consistent with the Turkish Citizenship Act.

There is a difference between the second paragraph of the article and Turkish law: the provision in the Draft under which nationality cannot be renounced unless another nationality is acquired is not in conformity with Turkish law as Turkish nationality can be renounced if a special authorization is obtained and renunciation is not conditional upon the acquisition of a new nationality.

The third paragraph of the article is not in conformity with Turkish law. The reference in the Draft to "failure to register" is inconsistent with Turkish law and is not acceptable. Further, the Turkish citizenship of former aliens to whom Turkish citizenship has been granted may validly be revoked for reasons of public order and national security and as the Draft does not take this possibility into account, the article cannot be accepted.

Article 7

As Turkish law does not contain provisions entailing the automatic loss of Turkish citizenship, it is thought that there will be no objection to the acceptance of this article.

Article 8

The grounds for deprivation of citizenship under the Turkish Citizenship Act cannot be extended or restricted along the lines indicated. The draft article in question is in conflict with Turkish law in this respect and cannot be accepted.

The second paragraph of the article is consistent with Turkish legislation and is therefore acceptable.

Article 9

As the article is not at variance with Turkish law, it is acceptable.

Article 10

As the article is not at variance with Turkish law, it is acceptable.

Article 11

Although the fact that an agency to give effect to the legal safeguards provided by the Convention and a legal organ to supervise the observance of the Convention are to be established is a matter for satisfaction, the circumstance that the agency and tribunal are not to be established and enter into operation until some future date gives ground for misgiving. Before entering into an obligation States have the right to know the scope of the obligation and in what manner and to what extent they are to participate in the bodies to be established. The provision in article 11, paragraph 3, which envisages the establishment of the bodies in question on the proposal of only one of the Contracting Parties if the agency or tribunal has not been established within two years, accordingly seems excessive. It would therefore seem desirable that

the establishment and operation of both the agency and the tribunal should be laid down within the framework of the Convention. If this is impossible, at least paragraph 3 of article 11 should be deleted.

It is essential that Contracting States as well as individuals should have the right to appeal to the "agency". Whether the appeal is made by a State or by an individual, the "agency" should have exclusive authority to set the machinery of the tribunal in motion.

The Turkish Government further considers that the provision in article 11, paragraph 4, concerning the acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in regard to disagreements arising out of the application or interpretation of the Convention on the Reduction of Future Statelessness is objectionable as it would permit disputes to be referred to two different international tribunals and in such case it is possible and likely that two different opinions may be given. The provision would thus tend to diminish the prestige of the tribunals in question and article 11, paragraph 4, should therefore be deleted. It is also considered essential that the principle of national representation in both the "agency" and the "tribunal" should be recognized.

Articles 12-18

No comment.
