

United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities

Vienna, Austria
2 March - 14 April 1961

Document:-
A/CONF.20/C.1/SR.41

41st meeting of the Committee of the Whole

Extract from Volume I of the *Official Records of the United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities (Summary records of the plenary meetings and of the meetings of the Committee of the Whole)*

Conference should remain in the archives of the Austrian Government, as a just tribute, together with the title of the convention, to the part Austria had played in the success of the Conference. He hoped that that compromise solution would be acceptable to the Committee, particularly since the delegation of Austria had said it was acceptable to the Austrian Government. It would be strange if the Conference were to be a cause of embarrassment or difficulty for the Austrian Government, and he respectfully suggested that those delegations which had made proposals on the final clauses which might cause difficulty or embarrassment should consider the possibility of withdrawing them.

40. Mr. NAFEH ZADE (United Arab Republic) said that his country firmly supported the principle of universality, and he had defended that principle during the debate on the accession of States to the Geneva Conventions on the Law of the Sea. It was even more imperative to observe that principle in the case of a convention which established rules of diplomatic law and which was intended to contribute to the progressive development of international law. His delegation expressed its gratitude to the Austrian Government and to the City of Vienna for the generous hospitality they had accorded to the Conference and to the delegations, and would have great pleasure in voting for the proposals associating the City of Vienna with the title of the convention.

41. Mr. DADZIE (Ghana) said that his delegation's proposal needed little comment, for the proposed title conformed to the nomenclature of legal instruments and to custom. In regard to article 1 of the final clauses proposed by the seven delegations, restricting accession to the convention to the States mentioned in the General Assembly resolution, he referred to the interesting debate in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly in 1959 on the question of participation in the Vienna Conference.

42. At that time the delegation of Ghana had had special reasons to vote for the formula as it appeared in General Assembly resolution 1450 (XIV); however, in view of the historic importance of the convention on diplomatic intercourse and immunities, it felt bound to support the Indian delegation's opinion that accession to the convention should be open to all States. In regard to the deposit of instruments of ratification, he supported the proposal of Ecuador and Venezuela, which conformed to international courtesy and, like the proposals associating the City of Vienna with the title of the convention, was a just tribute to Austria. He associated his delegation with all those which had expressed their gratitude to the Federal Government of Austria for its generous hospitality, and to the people of Vienna for the courtesy with which they had received the participants in the Conference.

43. Mr. BARNES (Liberia) said that this delegation, as co-sponsor of the seven-Power proposal, wished to express its gratitude to the government and people of Austria by associating the City of Vienna with the title of the convention. In regard to deposit of instruments of ratification, he said the proposal observed the continuity principle and custom. The Conference had met under United Nations auspices, and in resolution 1450

(XIV) the General Assembly had limited the field of accession to the Convention. The Conference, which derived from the General Assembly, was bound to conform to the instructions laid down by its parent body. The article 1 of the final clauses proposed by the seven delegations was the logical consequence of that obligation.

44. Mr. DANKWORT (Federal Republic of Germany) associated his government with the tributes and thanks offered to the Austrian Government and people. In that spirit his delegation would support the proposals of the seven delegations, of Iran and of Ireland and Sweden. In regard to signature and accession, he thought the restrictions laid down by the General Assembly after long discussion were appropriate. It therefore approved the seven-Power proposal for article 1 of the final clauses, which did not prevent other States from acceding to the convention if invited to do so by the General Assembly.

45. Mr. HAYTA (Turkey) said it was hardly necessary to explain at length why his delegation had joined with six others in proposing a title and final clauses of the convention. As mentioned in the commentary to the seven-Power proposal, the practice of designating the Secretary-General as depositary had been observed not only in the case of the Conventions on the Law of the Sea, but in that of all general conventions adopted by or under the auspices of the United Nations. The Conference, which had met to codify the rules of international law governing diplomatic intercourse and immunities, could not depart from the practice followed by other United Nations conferences. The designation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations as depositary of the instruments of ratification of the convention could in no way be considered a breach of courtesy to the Austrian Government.

46. The Turkish delegation supported Iran's proposal as amended by the Netherlands and accepted by the Austrian delegation. It also supported the proposal of Ireland and Sweden, which paid a deserved tribute to the Austrian Government.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

FORTY-FIRST MEETING

Wednesday, 5 April 1961, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. LALL (India)

Consideration of the draft articles on diplomatic intercourse and immunities adopted by the International Law Commission at its tenth session (A/CONF.20/4) (concluded)

Title and final clauses

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue its debate on the title and final clauses of the draft convention on diplomatic intercourse and immunities.¹

¹ For the various proposals submitted concerning the title and the final clauses, see 40th meeting, para. 1 and footnote.

2. He recalled that at the 40th meeting (para. 33) the representative of Chile had asked whether it would be practicable for the Final Act to remain in the archives of the Government of Austria while the Convention was deposited at United Nations Headquarters. He asked the representative of the Secretary-General to answer the question.
3. Mr. STAVROPOULOS, representative of the Secretary-General, said the arrangement would cause no difficulty. It would require some collaboration, which he was sure would be ready and agreeable, between the Foreign Ministry of the Government of Austria and the United Nations.
4. Mr. GASIOROWSKI (Poland), commenting on points raised at the previous meeting, said that there seemed to have been some misunderstanding of the scope of General Assembly resolution 1450 (XIV) convening the Conference. The purpose of the resolution was simply to invite the participants and to create the technical conditions favourable to the Conference. Once the Conference had been convened, the sovereign States participating were completely free to take any decision they wished.
5. He agreed with the representative of Switzerland that uniformity was an important element of codification, which should be centralized in the United Nations; but that requirement was not excluded by the proposal submitted by Poland and Czechoslovakia (L.175). There were precedents for the deposit of instruments of ratification elsewhere than with the United Nations: for example, the Geneva conventions on the protection of war victims, the most recent of which dated from 1949,² had been deposited with the Government of Switzerland, on whose territory they had been drawn up.
6. Since the representative of Switzerland, in stressing the need for uniformity, had taken as his starting-point the advantages of codification, he might have been expected to speak out strongly in favour of universality. Yet he had not done so, even though universality, as the representative of India had pointed out, was vital to effective codification.
7. The Drafting Committee should choose a general rather than an enumerative title which, if complete, would be cumbersome, for in that case it would have to include the word "privileges" which was mentioned in several articles. There was general agreement that the title should contain the name of Vienna. He suggested "Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations", which would at the same time cover diplomatic privileges and immunities.
8. Mr. BOLLINI SHAW (Argentina) expressed his delegation's gratitude to the Government of Austria for its kindness, and to the people of Vienna for their generosity. His delegation would support the final clauses proposed by the seven delegations (L.289 and Add.1 and 3), with the sub-amendment submitted by the Netherlands (L.330/Rev.1).
9. Mr. GLASER (Romania) said that, since the purpose of the convention was to govern diplomatic relations between all States without exception, every sovereign State without exception should have the right to accede to it. To decide otherwise would not only destroy a principle of vital importance but might also cause serious practical difficulties: for example, in a case where an aeroplane in which a diplomatic courier was travelling had to make a forced landing in a State not a party to the convention. Many other examples could be cited. The principle of non-discrimination laid down in article 44 was the essence of the convention. The limitation on accession proposed by the seven delegations was clearly discriminatory, and conflicted with the spirit of the law which the Conference was attempting to codify and the very *raison d'être* of the convention.
10. To deposit the ratifications of a multilateral agreement with the State on whose territory it had been concluded and signed was not merely an act of courtesy but also a common practice. It had been argued that an exception to that practice had been made in the case of the Conventions on the Law of the Sea concluded at Geneva in 1958, the ratifications of which had been deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Switzerland, however, had no maritime tradition, whereas Austria was traditionally associated with diplomatic agreements, as the General Assembly had recognized. There was no good reason for departing from general usage, to which the proposals by Poland and Czechoslovakia (L.175) and Ecuador and Venezuela (L.332) conformed.
11. Mr. KAHAMBA (Congo: Leopoldville) also paid a tribute to the Government of Austria. Like the representative of Tunisia, he was sure that the Committee would find a satisfactory form for the final clauses of the convention.
12. Mr. SUBARDJO (Indonesia) said that it should be open to all States to accede to the convention, and supported in particular the views expressed by the representatives of India and the Federation of Malaya. It was regrettable that a number of States had not been invited to participate in the work of the Conference, but they should at least be able to express agreement with its conclusions by becoming parties to the convention. His delegation would therefore support the proposal of Poland and Czechoslovakia. It added its thanks to the Government of Austria and the people of Vienna for their generosity and the warmth of their welcome.
13. Mr. de ROMREE (Belgium) expressed the cordial thanks of his delegation to the Government of Austria and the people of Vienna. His delegation would vote for the sub-amendment submitted by the Netherlands (L.330/Rev.1) to the seven-Power proposal, and for the motion concerning the custody of the Final Act submitted by Ireland and Sweden (L.331), an intermediate solution which, he was happy to note, had been supported by the delegation of Austria.
14. Mr. CAMERON (United States of America) pointed out that the designation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations as the depositary of the instruments of

² For reference, see 40th meeting, footnote to para 11.

the convention, as proposed by the seven Powers, was consistent with established practice, with regard to conventions concluded by the United Nations or at conferences convened by the Organization. The practice had been followed in the case of 90 conventions drawn up to carry forward the work of the United Nations in accordance with its Charter. The Vienna Conference had been convened by the United Nations, and its proceedings were based on the work of the International Law Commission, an organ established under Article 13 of the United Nations Charter.

15. The seven-Power proposal and the amendment of Iran (L.317) made States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and other States invited by the General Assembly of the United Nations eligible to become parties to the convention. Such eligibility corresponded to the provisions of other United Nations conventions, and was compatible with the terms of General Assembly resolution 1450 (XIV). It was essential that political questions should be settled by the General Assembly itself and not by an *ad hoc* technical conference. The Committee could best ensure a successful conclusion of its task by avoiding political controversy alien to the technical purpose of the Conference. The important question was, who was in favour of United Nations practices and procedures, and who was against them? Any departure from the procedure of the seven-Power proposal, with the amendment by Iran and the sub-amendment by the Netherlands, would be viewed most seriously by his government.

16. His delegation would support the motion proposed by Ireland and Sweden (L.331) concerning the custody of the Final Act.

17. U SOE TIN (Burma) also paid a tribute to Austrian hospitality. It was fitting that the name of Vienna, synonymous with diplomatic history, should be associated with the convention, and that the Government of Austria should be the custodian of the Final Act. He therefore supported the amendments submitted by Iran and the Netherlands, and the motion by Sweden and Ireland concerning the custody of the Final Act.

18. He could not support articles 1 and 3 of the final clauses proposed by the seven delegations, which tended to restrict the number of States which could become parties to the Convention. All States which maintained diplomatic relations with other States should be allowed to accede. He therefore appealed to the sponsors of the proposal in question to agree to the deletion of the words in article 1 "and by any other State invited by the General Assembly of the United Nations to become a Party to the Convention", and of the words in article 3 "belonging to any of the categories mentioned in article 1". If the sponsors would not accept the deletion of those passages, he would request a separate vote on them.

19. Mr. de ERICE y O'SHEA (Spain) said that the Conference was sovereign only within its terms of reference. Those were set forth in resolution 1450 (XIV), operative paragraph 3 of which had invited all States Members of the United Nations, States members of the specialized agencies, and States parties to the Statute of the Inter-

national Court of Justice to participate in the Conference. Since, by virtue of operative paragraph 1 of the same resolution, the Conference had been convened to consider the question of diplomatic intercourse and immunities and "to embody the results of its work in an international convention", it followed that only the countries specified in the resolution could sign the convention.

20. Nevertheless, in order to leave the door open to subsequent accession by other States, article 1 of the seven-Power proposal specified that any other State could be invited by the General Assembly to become a party to the convention. The General Assembly, and the General Assembly alone, had power to invite States other than those mentioned in resolution 1450 (XIV) to become parties to the convention. The Conference itself was bound to limit the signatories of the convention to those States which had been invited by the General Assembly to participate.

21. He recalled that resolution 1450 (XIV) had been adopted by the General Assembly by 67 votes to 1. A five-Power amendment which would have opened participation in the Conference to all States had been previously rejected. The question had therefore already been decided by the General Assembly.

22. With regard to the choice of the depositary of the convention, and the suggestion that the country of signature was traditionally made custodian, he pointed out that the Conference was being held under United Nations auspices and therefore in a sense in the United Nations rather than in Austria. Austria acted as host to the United Nations under an agreement which declared the extritoriality of the meeting-place of the Conference and the privileges and immunities enjoyed by the representatives. The United Nations should therefore act as depositary of the convention.

23. He supported the motion by Ireland and Sweden concerning the custody of the Final Act, which constituted a fitting tribute to the host country.

24. Mr. GHAZALI (Federation of Malaya) supported the request of the representative of Burma for a separate vote on the two specified passages if the sponsors would not agree to their deletion. It was necessary for the universality of the convention that it should be open to all States. It would indeed be tragic if a State willing to abide by the rules laid down in the convention could not accede to it because of international manoeuvres. The right to participate in the observance of the law of nations could not be denied to any State.

25. The prestige of the United Nations called for observance of the principle of universality. If article 1 were adopted as proposed by the seven delegations, the General Assembly would have to pass resolutions in order to invite countries other than those specified in article 1 to accede to the convention. If after such a resolution the country finally decided not to accede to the convention, the rebuff would harm the prestige of the United Nations. It was certainly preferable to open the convention to accession by all, and so avoid such undesirable situations.

26. Mr. TUNKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that General Assembly resolution 1450 (XIV) related only to the convening of the Conference. The representatives of States at the Conference had complete freedom of decision; the General Assembly had no power to dictate conditions to governments. For instance, the General Assembly had referred to the Conference the subject of special missions; but the Committee had recommended the Conference not to deal with it (39th meeting, para. 63). The General Assembly could not dictate the contents of the articles of the convention; they were determined exclusively by the representatives of the sovereign States participating in the Conference.

27. There was undoubtedly a close link between the restrictive language used in General Assembly resolution 1450 (XIV) and that in articles 1 and 5 of the seven-Power proposal; that language was a reflection of the cold war. He urged the Committee to act in accordance with the accepted principles of international law and to open the convention to universal accession.

28. Mr. SIMMONDS (Ghana) supported the representatives of Burma and the Federation of Malaya in regard to the request for a separate vote. He strongly supported the principle of universality of the convention which would be in keeping with the words in the preamble of the Charter requiring Member States to practise tolerance and to live together in peace with one another as good neighbours.

29. Mr. PONCE MIRANDA (Ecuador) withdrew on behalf of its two sponsors the proposal submitted by Ecuador and Venezuela (L.332), the purpose of which was covered by other proposals before the Committee.

30. Mr. REGALA (Philippines) replied to those who had advocated the principle of universality in the application of international law. The Committee, when considering article 45 (Settlement of disputes), had rejected a proposal for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Surely, if it were desired to work for universality of the rule of law, no better course could have been followed than to adopt the principle of that compulsory jurisdiction.

31. The principle of the equality of States was indeed fundamental, and he ventured to inquire whether those who advocated it so strongly would be prepared to renounce the right of veto in the Security Council, which conflicted with it.

32. He fully agreed that the General Assembly could not dictate to the Conference the tenor of the articles of the convention; but it had specifically limited participation in the Conference.

33. Mr. KRISHNA RAO (India) joined the representatives of Burma and the Federation of Malaya in urging the sponsors of the seven-Power proposal to delete the two controversial passages. If the sponsors could not agree to that deletion, he would support the request for a separate vote on those passages.

34. General Assembly resolution 1450 (XIV) specified which States should be invited to the Conference, but

did not prescribe anywhere that only States participating in the Conference could become parties to the convention.

35. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, said that the greater part of the discussion had focused on the seven-Power proposal. He therefore moved that the Committee should decide to vote on that proposal before voting on the earlier proposal by Czechoslovakia and Poland (L.175). Since the two texts were not amendments, the Committee could decide under rule 42 of the rules of procedure to vote on them out of their order of submission.

36. Mr. GASIOROWSKI (Poland) opposed the motion, and urged that the proposal by Czechoslovakia and Poland should be voted upon first, since it had been submitted before the seven-Power proposal.

The United Kingdom motion was adopted by 46 votes to 16, with 9 abstentions.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was therefore called upon to vote on the seven-Power proposal (L.289 and Add.1) with the amendment by Iran (L.317), itself amended by the Netherlands sub-amendment (L.330/Rev.1), since the amendment and sub-amendment had been accepted by the sponsors.

38. Mr. PECHOTA (Czechoslovakia) suggested that it would be desirable to replace in the first sentence of the Netherlands sub-amendment the date 31 October 1961 by the date 31 March 1962, and to delete the remainder of the sub-amendment. It would be more practical to leave the convention open for signature at Vienna for the whole period, and not to transfer the original of the convention to New York before the time-limit scheduled for signature.

39. Mr. RIPHAGEN (Netherlands) could not accept that suggestion.

40. Mr. GLASER (Romania), speaking on a point of order, asked the representatives who wished the two controversial passages to be deleted to explain the apparent inconsistency of the deletions. The deletion from article 1 of the General Assembly's power to invite other States to sign the convention would have a restrictive effect; but the deletion from article 3 of the reference to the categories of States mentioned in article 1 would open the convention to accession by all States.

41. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) said that the aim of universality could be achieved by opening the convention to both signature and accession by all States. He therefore asked that a separate vote be taken on the passage in article 1 beginning with the words "invited by the General Assembly . . ." If the passage were rejected, article 1 would state that the convention would be open for signature not only by the States invited to participate in the Conference, but also "by any other State".

42. Mr. KRISHNA RAO (India) explained that his intention and that of the representatives of Burma and the Federation of Malaya had been to open the convention to accession by all States. However, on behalf of the three delegations, he agreed to the Tunisian request.

43. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the words in article 1 of the proposed final clauses: "invited by the General Assembly of the United Nations to become a Party to the convention".

At the request of the representative of the Philippines, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Peru, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama.

Against: Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Libya, Morocco.

Abstaining: Holy See.

The passage was adopted by 47 votes to 26, with 1 abstention.

44. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the passage "belonging to any of the categories mentioned in article 1" appearing in article 3 of the proposed final clauses.

At the request of the representative of the Philippines, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Peru, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Peru, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Panama.

Against: Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Nigeria.

Abstaining: Portugal, Congo (Leopoldville), Ecuador, Finland, Holy See, Libya, Morocco, Pakistan.

The passage was adopted by 42 votes to 24, with 8 abstentions.

45. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposed final clauses (L.289 and Add.1) with the changes accepted by the sponsors (L.317 and 330/Rev.1).

The final clauses as a whole were adopted by 48 votes to 12, with 14 abstentions.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that the proposal submitted by Czechoslovakia and Poland (L.175) would not be put to the vote, as it was covered by the adoption of the seven-Power proposal.

47. He said the Committee had before it a number of proposals regarding the title of the convention, but since they were all drafting proposals he suggested that they should be referred to the Drafting Committee.

It was so agreed.

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion by Ireland and Sweden concerning the custody of the Final act (L.331).

The motion was adopted by 59 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

49. Mr. BARTOŠ (Yugoslavia) explained that he had voted against the controversial passages, not for the same reasons as the representatives of Tunisia, but because he believed in the universality principle. International law recognized all States, and it was unthinkable that any State that promoted peaceful relations between countries and support for the United Nations Charter, and observed the rules of the convention, should be excluded from participation.

50. Mr. KIRCHSCHLAEGER (Austria), speaking on behalf of the Government and people of Austria, expressed his sincere thanks for the kind tributes that had been paid to his country and for the honour bestowed on it by the mention of Vienna in the title of the convention and by entrusting the custody of the Final Act of the Conference to the Government of Austria.

51. Mr. BAIG (Pakistan) said he had voted for the seven-Power proposal and the amendments incorporated in it because it seemed to him the best compromise. He had abstained from the vote on whether accession should be open to all States because, though not fully convinced, he had been deeply impressed by the arguments against restriction.

52. He thanked the Government of Austria and the authorities of the City of Vienna for their hospitality and for the excellent arrangements made for the Conference.

53. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia), exercising his right of reply, explained that he had asked for a separate vote on part of the final articles because he wished to preserve the principle of universality. He had voted against the seven-Power proposal because it did not recognize that principle.

54. Mr. PECHOTA (Czechoslovakia) said that the joint proposal submitted by his delegation and that of Poland (L.175) had been motivated by two main considerations.

First, it had incorporated the principle (supported by many representatives) that the convention should be open for accession to all countries. It was in the interest of the international community as a whole that every country should observe the convention, and the exclusion of some countries was a violation of international law. Secondly, it was fitting for the convention to be deposited with the Government of Austria as the host government of the Conference. He had hoped that the proposal of which he was joint sponsor would meet the views of the Conference. Because of the Austrian representative's statement at the fortieth meeting, however, he had not wished to press the matter to a formal vote. He had voted against the seven-Power proposal because it conflicted with the principle of universality.

Completion of the Committee's work

55. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had completed its work.

56. Mr. CAMERON (United States of America) expressed his sincere appreciation to the Chairman for the skill, courtesy and tact with which he had guided the Committee's proceedings. He had played a very significant part at an important stage in the development of diplomatic relations.

57. Mr. MACDONALD (Canada), speaking on behalf of the representatives of the Commonwealth countries, paid a warm tribute to the Chairman. His ability and experience, both literary and technical, his justice, understanding and clear-mindedness, and his personal qualities had been an inspiration to the Committee and had enabled it to produce a convention that would promote friendly relations in the world for generations to come.

58. Mr. OMOLOLU (Nigeria) said that he was speaking on behalf of the African and, he hoped, the Asian countries. The Committee had been fortunate in having a chairman so fitted for his great and complex task. As the spokesman of a number of new countries, he said that, while the value of the experience of the old countries was undeniable, the new countries, with their freshness and enthusiasm, had also something to contribute. He hoped that the spirit of friendship and co-operation which had prevailed during the proceedings would be perpetuated in the convention.

59. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom) joined the representatives of Canada and the Commonwealth countries in expressing appreciation and gratitude to the Chairman for his dignity, precision and skill, and for the firmness of purpose with which he had led the Committee to a goal that had at one time appeared unattainable.

60. Mr. RUEGGER (Switzerland) voiced the praise of the countries of the old continent. The Chairman's name would be linked for ever with the convention.

61. Mr. OJEDA (Mexico) thanked the Chairman on behalf of the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Chile,

Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.

62. Mr. BARTOŠ (Yugoslavia) said that the successful outcome of the Committee's deliberations was due to the Chairman.

63. Mr. de ERICE y O'SHEA joined in the expression of praise for the Chairman, who had inspired the Committee with the spirit of peaceful co-operation, which was the aim of international law. He also thanked the Secretariat.

64. Mr. TUNKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Chairman's unique qualities had enabled the Committee to accomplish its task with unusual speed. He expressed the thanks of his delegation and those of the people's democracies to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Rapporteur and Secretariat.

65. Mr. de VAUCELLES (France), Mr. YASEEN (Iraq), Mr. NAFEH ZADE (United Arab Republic) and Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) joined in the tributes to the Chairman.

66. Mr. MARESCA (Italy), speaking as a representative of the country which was the cradle of permanent diplomacy, congratulated the Chairman on his brilliant work at an important stage in international development, when the old rules were being linked with the new. His name would remain associated with that development.

67. Mr. LINTON (Israel) also thanked the Chairman, and said that his country's great respect for diplomacy was shown by the use of the same Hebrew word in ancient times (*malachim*) for both angels and diplomatic agents.

68. Mgr. CASAROLI (Holy See), Mr. HAYTA (Turkey) and M. DANKWORT (Federal Republic of Germany) joined in the tributes to the Chairman.

69. The CHAIRMAN expressed his deep and sincere gratitude to the members of the Committee for their co-operation and for the energy and diligence with which they had applied themselves to their work. Listening to the kind and generous tributes, he had felt that they referred to someone else, for the success of the Committee's work was entirely due to the spirit of the delegations. It had been for him an honour, a privilege and a pleasure to listen to their words of wisdom. He would never forget the Conference.

70. He thanked especially his colleagues on the rostrum, the members of the Secretariat, and other staff, without whose help the Conference could not have succeeded. He was sure that the spirit which had prevailed in the Committee would continue for the remainder of the Conference until the adoption of the convention.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.