

**United Nations Conference on the Representation of States
in Their Relations with International Organizations**

Vienna, Austria
4 February - 14 March 1975

Document:-
A/CONF.67/C.1/SR.25

25th meeting of the Committee of the Whole

Extract from Volume I of the Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Representation of States in Their Relations with International Organizations (Summary records of the plenary meetings and of the meetings of the Committee of the Whole)

94. Mr. EL-ERIAN (Expert Consultant) said that in his presentation of the proposal, the Swiss representative had started from the premise that in view of the great variety of conferences, the emphasis should be laid on flexibility in the rules applicable to them. Consequently, the main idea was that the status of a great many conferences should be determined by agreement. The Swiss representative had made it clear, however, that he recognized the value of general regulations, for he had cited the example of his country making use of the Convention on Special Missions, although not a party to it. That illustrated the importance of the work of codification, since in addition to providing an instrument for those States which ratified it, a convention could also serve as a model for other States. A similar example from his own experience had been the use of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations in drawing up the agreement establishing consular relations between Egypt and the German Democratic Republic, although neither State was a party to that Convention.

95. In dealing with conferences, the ILC had encoun-

tered the same difficulties as in dealing with special missions: they were so varied that it was impossible to devise regulations to suit particular categories, although a body of opinion had wanted to differentiate between them in that way. After careful consideration, the ILC had decided to draft general regulations, which, according to statistics based on existing practice, would cover the great majority of cases. Important conferences were more frequent than unimportant conferences. There was scope to use agreements to cover certain types of conferences, for which some of the provisions of part III might appear excessive. With the Chairman's permission, he would like to give a considered opinion on the subject at the next meeting of the Committee.

96. The CHAIRMAN said if there was no objection he would take it that the Committee agreed to continue the discussion at the next meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

25th meeting

Monday, 24 February 1975, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. NETTEL (Austria).

Consideration of the question of the representation of States in their relations with international organizations in accordance with resolutions 2966 (XXVII), 3072 (XXVIII) and 3247 (XXIX) adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1972, 30 November 1973 and 29 November 1974 (continued)

New article proposed by the Swiss delegation (concluded) (A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77)

1. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Netherlands representative had not submitted an oral amendment to the Swiss proposal; he had merely made a suggestion for consideration by the Drafting Committee if the proposal was adopted.

2. Mr. EL-ERIAN (Expert Consultant) said that in his statement at the end of the previous meeting he had confined his comments to conferences, but part III of the draft articles proposed by the International Law Commission (ILC) (see A/CONF.67/4) also covered delegations to organs and would probably be more frequently applied for that purpose, since the number of meetings of both principal and subsidiary organs of international organizations was increasing even more rapidly than the number of conferences.

3. The ILC had discussed the dilemma described by the Swiss representative; some members had thought that a distinction should be made between different categories of meetings of organs. The majority however had realized that it would be difficult to establish criteria for such a distinction. Furthermore, it might result in subsidiary organs of the same organization receiving different treatment.

4. He recalled that the ILC had faced the same situa-

tion with regard to special missions. It had requested the Special Rapporteur to examine the possibility of applying the functional theory and limiting the extent of certain privileges and immunities in the case of particular categories of special missions. The Special Rapporteur had however concluded that all special missions must be assured all the privileges, immunities and facilities which they required to represent properly the State whose sovereign will they expressed.¹ That attitude had been confirmed by the General Assembly when it had adopted the Convention on Special Missions.²

5. In dealing with the subject-matter of part III of the convention under consideration, the ILC had based itself on the assumption that delegations to organs and conferences occupied in multilateral diplomacy a position analogous to that of special missions in bilateral diplomacy and that its approach should be similar.

6. Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) said that the Swiss proposal (A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77) required further clarification on a number of points. First of all, it was not clear whether it was an amendment in the ordinary sense of the term or a new idea referring to new subject-matter. That point raised the further question of whether it should be placed at the beginning of part III or indeed discussed at the present juncture, rather than later on.

7. The proposed new article should be examined first of all in the context of article 4, which had already

¹ See *Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1967*, documents A/CN.4/194 and Add.1-5, paras. 270 and 271.

² Resolution 2530 (XXIV), annex.

been adopted. Article 4 (a) referred to agreements "in force", and in that regard it was not affected by the Swiss proposal, which referred to *ad hoc* agreements concluded in connexion with a particular session or a particular conference. Accordingly, the Swiss proposal was related to article 4 (b), which dealt with "other . . . agreements", namely, ones which were not yet in force. However, such "other . . . agreements" had to do with conferences convened by, or under the auspices of, international organizations of universal character. So far as conferences of that kind were concerned, the idea contained in the Swiss amendment was covered by article 4 (b).

8. There were, however, two categories of delegations which fell outside the purview of that provision: delegations to conferences not convened by, or under the auspices of, international organizations of universal character, and delegations to organs. It was precisely those two categories of delegations which appeared to be covered by the Swiss proposal. With regard to the former category, the use of the words "States concerned" in the Swiss text was illuminating, since they implied that it was important political conferences which could be given the preferential status of permanent missions. In that respect, the Swiss proposal was desirable, since it should be borne in mind that political meetings, or, indeed, other possible meetings of importance not convened by international organizations of universal character were not covered by the International Law Commission's draft. His delegation could see no difficulty in the proposition that the status of delegations to international political conferences could be raised by special agreement.

9. The Swiss text required further clarification in its reference to delegates to organs. According to the definition given in article 1, paragraph 1 (4), the International Law Commission's draft did not cover organs of organizations other than those of universal character. It was not however clear whether the Swiss proposal referred to the organs defined in that provision or to organs of other organizations.

10. The International Law Commission's text of part III also lacked clarity with regard to delegations to organs. They were referred to only once—in article 42—and it was not clear whether the succeeding articles should be taken as referring to both delegations to organs and delegations to conferences. That was an important point since over 30 articles were affected, and the issue would be clarified in subsequent discussions. He was well aware that in addition to legal considerations, the realities of international life had also to be taken into account. It might well be that it was not desirable to give everyone the status of ambassador but there was a considerable difference between that position and an excessive reduction of the privileges and immunities granted to delegations to organs.

11. The CHAIRMAN said that if the Swiss proposal A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77 was adopted, it would be for the Drafting Committee to make a recommendation about its position in the convention under considera-

tion. He suggested that the list of speakers on the Swiss proposal should be closed.

It was so decided.

12. Mr. THAKORE (India) said that the part of the Swiss proposal (A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77) that referred to the possibility of concluding an agreement between the organization and the host State to govern the status of participants in a conference, reflected existing practice. While introducing an element of flexibility, it did not intend to supplant part III of the draft convention, which laid down the basic rules for the great majority of conferences. Moreover, the scope of the Swiss proposal was not the same as that of article 2, paragraph 4, which applied to international organizations other than those of universal character. Her delegation therefore supported the first part of the Swiss proposal.

13. With regard to the second part of the Swiss proposal that referred only to the status of permanent missions being applied to the delegations to the organ or conference, she considered that it introduced an element of rigidity in that it appeared to take into account only long conferences, although other types of conferences, such as technical conferences of short duration, which would require very limited privileges and immunities, also merited special treatment. She therefore proposed as an oral amendment that the concluding part of A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77, after the words "States concerned" should refer to: "the status, privileges and immunities to be given to the delegations to the organ or conference, keeping in view the nature, purpose and duration of the Conference".

14. Her amendment was flexible and would meet special requirements. It would not lend itself to subjective interpretation since the terms "nature" and "purpose" were well understood and were used in multilateral instruments. In addition, it would be useful to take into account the duration of the conference. She supported the suggestion made by the Netherlands representative, which clarified the text of A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77.

15. Mr. LAVIÑA (Philippines) said that careful consideration of the Swiss proposal (A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77) during the weekend interval since the adjournment of the previous meeting had not dispelled his delegation's misgivings. In a modest way, his country was a host State, since the Asian Development Bank and one of the regional offices of the World Health Organization had their headquarters at Manila, where, *inter alia*, the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development was due to be held in 1976. Hence his delegation's interest in the Swiss proposal.

16. Should the proposal be adopted, all the substantive provisions in part III of the draft would appear to become dependent on an agreement of the parties for their application. The question thus arose whether, for example, every meeting of the Asian Development Bank would have to be preceded by negotiations with each of the individual States which were members of its governing body. Moreover, there appeared to be no criterion for determining whether a particular organ or

conference qualified for the type of agreement envisaged in the Swiss proposal.

17. Another difficulty was that, under the proposed new article, it would appear to be possible for the host State to agree with one member State of the organization to grant its delegation the status of a permanent mission, while denying it to others.

18. A practical problem would also arise as a result of the number of delegations involved in certain cases. A country could well be host in one year to five important meetings or conferences attended by an average of 50 delegations each. One could well imagine the complications that would then arise from 250 separate sets of negotiations. In that regard, he requested the sponsor to explain whether it was envisaged that the status of a sending State's delegation should be renegotiated prior to each session of a particular organ.

19. None of those issues would be at all easy to deal with under the proposed new article. Certainly, his delegation would not be in a position to support the proposal unless the points in question were clarified. In the light of the explanations given by the Expert Consultant concerning the reasons underlying the various provisions of part III of the draft, his delegation felt that those provisions were adequate, in that they preserved the principle of the legal equality of States; under those provisions, all delegations representing sovereign States would receive equal and non-discriminatory treatment.

20. Mr. RITTER (Switzerland) said that the statements made during the discussion, and in particular those of the Expert Consultant and of the delegations of Greece and India, clearly showed that the fundamental problem facing the Conference was the same which had faced the ILC itself. It arose from the great variety of situations that would inevitably be covered by any set of articles on the topic of delegations. Clearly, a short meeting of a small technical body did not require the same measure of privileges and immunities as an important conference of long duration.

21. That being so, he wished to dispel certain misunderstandings which had become apparent during the discussion, regarding the scope and purpose of the new article proposed by his delegation (A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77). That new article was not intended to replace the provisions of part III in any way; if adopted, it would simply become the first article of that part of the future convention.

22. The effect of the new article would be to make it possible, by agreement between the parties concerned, to extend to the delegations to a particular conference or meeting the full measure of privileges and immunities specified in part II of the draft. It was envisaged by his delegation that the parties concerned—i.e. the organization and the host State—would enter into such agreements in the case of important conferences or meetings of long duration.

23. Two situations were contemplated in the proposal. One was the case of a meeting of a large number of States convened by an international organization, in which case the agreement could only be concluded between the organization concerned and the host State.

The second was the case of an important conference of representatives of a small number of States, such as those which had recently been held at Vienna and at Geneva. As the actual practice in those cases showed, the question of the status, privileges and immunities of the delegations concerned was the object of an agreement between the host State on the one hand and the participating States on the other.

24. Basing itself on article 2, paragraph 4, the proposed new article could also be applied to the case of a meeting convened by an international organization which was not of universal character and was therefore not covered by the provisions of article 4. In another respect, the proposed new provision went further than article 4, in that it gave the host State guidance on the course to be followed, by suggesting as a normal solution the granting of the status of permanent missions to delegations to conferences of long duration.

25. There was thus no danger that the provisions of part III would be eliminated or curtailed should the Swiss proposal be adopted. He wished to say, however, that if the proposal was adopted, his delegation would propose amendments that would make the provisions of part III more suited to the normal type of small conference or meeting. For example, article 47 could be simplified so as to eliminate the mandatory character of the notifications contemplated under paragraph 1, subparagraphs (b), (c), (d), and (e) of paragraph 1 of the article. In that manner, the sending State would only be required to notify the particulars specified at present in paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) of article 47. For delegates who would spend only a few days in a hotel in the host country, such a notification would be sufficient. It conformed with the existing practice; for obvious practical reasons, sending States rarely advised the organization, and through it the host State, of the names of the hotels where the members of their delegations were staying.

26. Of course, a sending State would still remain free to make all such notifications which would thus have as a consequence to impose on the host State the corresponding obligations. What his delegation would propose was simply that only the notification in paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) of article 47 should remain mandatory.

27. That simplification would be proposed by his delegation equally in the interests of the sending States themselves, in order to relieve them of the unnecessary formality of making too many notifications. There was no intention on the part of his delegation to propose any curtailment of the privileges and immunities that would be extended to delegates.

28. He stressed that the only immediate effect of the adoption of his delegation's proposal would be to make provision for the possibility of conferring upon delegations attending certain high level meetings a greater measure of privileges and immunities than those specified in part III; where no agreement was made for that purpose, the provisions of part III would stand.

29. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had considered with care the proposed new article and had arrive at the conclusion

that there was no justification for its inclusion in the draft. The statement made by its sponsor showed that the proposal was based on the underlying idea that the privileges and immunities extended to delegates to smaller meetings were excessive and that it was necessary to provide in part III for a more modest measure of facilities.

30. The proposed new provision stated that the status of permanent mission would be conferred upon a delegation only where an agreement to that effect was entered into between the host State and the delegation concerned. Since the granting of the privileges and immunities in question was thus not made mandatory, it would in the last resort depend on the willingness of the host State to agree on the subject with the organization. Thus the adoption of the Swiss proposal would greatly affect the privileges and immunities of medium-sized or small delegations attending a conference for a relatively short period of time.

31. His delegation was strongly opposed to that approach. It urged that a precise body of rules should be adopted to specify the privileges and immunities to be extended to all delegations, large and small. In the case of meetings lasting only a few days, the proposed new provision would have the effect of depriving the delegates of privileges and immunities, since there would be little or no time in which to conclude the agreement contemplated.

32. His delegation objected to a proposal having such unsatisfactory effects and apparently based on a desire to save a certain amount of money for the treasury of the host State. In that regard, he stressed that a host State did after all derive benefits both in terms of prestige and otherwise from the holding on its territory of a conference or a meeting of an organ. It was precisely for that reason that, whenever any such meeting was due to be held, there were many offers from different countries wishing to act as host State. There was also another side to the question. The very desire to limit the privileges and immunities of delegations should put members on their guard, since such limitation would automatically lead to the limitation of the privileges and immunities of observer delegations. That would be unjustified and would not be in accordance with either the dictates of contemporary practice or the dictates of international life.

33. The result of the adoption of the proposal would inevitably be to curtail the privileges and immunities of delegations, whatever the intentions of the sponsor of the proposal in submitting his amendments might be. His delegation stressed the importance of adopting all the provisions of article 47 and the other articles of the draft and to reject all attempts to reduce the measure of privileges and immunities granted to delegations.

34. Mr. STUART (Australia) said his delegation considered that the procedure suggested in the new article proposed by Switzerland was purely optional. It did not detract from the other provisions concerning privileges and immunities thus far agreed upon by the Committee and was intended simply to facilitate their application at short notice. Moreover, the administrative difficulties likely to arise in according the wide

range of privileges and immunities provided for in the proposed convention would be onerous and, in some cases, insuperable, whereas the arrangement envisaged in the Swiss proposal would facilitate the implementation of the relevant provisions of the proposed convention by the organization and the host State. His delegation therefore supported the Swiss proposal and could not vote in favour of the oral amendment proposed by India, which would not provide the simplicity sought in the Swiss proposal.

35. Mr. JELIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that the Swiss proposal for a new article was based on the incorrect assumption that there existed important differences between a permanent mission and a delegation. Its adoption would inevitably lead to difficulties and would open the way to proposals to reduce the extent of privileges and immunities which delegations were entitled to expect.

36. In line with the observations of the Expert Consultant, his delegation would oppose all attempts to curtail those privileges and immunities, and could not therefore support the Swiss proposal.

37. Sir Vincent EVANS (United Kingdom) said that, as he understood it, the Swiss proposal (A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77) was motivated by the consideration that the provisions at present included in part III did not provide an appropriate standard of treatment for the great majority of meetings and conferences to which part III would apply.

38. It was felt by the sponsor that, for certain conferences and meetings, there might be a case for applying a régime of privileges and immunities similar to that applicable under part II to permanent missions. Furthermore, should the proposal be adopted, its sponsor would later make proposals which would have the effect of adjusting and simplifying certain provisions of part III.

39. The representative of India had expressed the view that the present provisions of part III were not appropriate to the full range of international conferences and meetings of organs of organizations of universal character to which they would apply. She had therefore urged that the text of the proposed new article should be made more flexible in order to enable the standard of privileges and immunities provided by part III to be increased in certain circumstances and to be reduced in others.

40. As his delegation saw it, a provision along the lines suggested by the Indian representative might well constitute a useful means of introducing flexibility into the future convention. If, therefore, the provisions of article 2, paragraph 4 and of article 4, subparagraph (b) did not give the kind of flexibility which the Indian representative sought to introduce, his own delegation would give careful consideration to the Indian amendment, to which it had no objection in principle.

41. As to his delegation's general position regarding part III, he said that it contained a number of provisions which did not constitute an acceptable standard for the general run of international conferences and meetings of organs of international organizations of universal character. It had always seemed to his dele-

gation that the ILC should not have departed from the standards laid down by the General Assembly in the 1946–1947 Conventions on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies³ respectively, and no case had now been made out for departing from those standards in respect of delegations.

42. Accordingly, the United Kingdom delegation would propose and support amendments to the various provisions of part III designed to bring them more into line with the relevant provisions of the Conventions of 1946–1947.

43. There could of course be special cases in which the standards laid down in those conventions might not be appropriate. He was thinking of conferences of very long duration and of extraordinary magnitude or importance which, in the view of the delegations attending it, might well justify a régime more in line with that laid down in part II for permanent missions.

44. He was not at all certain, however, that that result could not be achieved simply by the application of the provisions of article 2, paragraph 4 or of subparagraph (b) of article 4. If, however, the Swiss proposal (A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77) were adopted, that would help the Conference to return to the standards of the 1946–1947 Conventions, which his delegation still considered should be the norm. It was clear that no final position could be taken in the matter until the various articles in part III had been dealt with. If, however, the Swiss proposal were eventually adopted, it would be desirable to introduce into its text some drafting changes to make it clear to what kind of meeting it was really intended to refer. The present text of the Swiss proposal was not clear on that point.

45. The CHAIRMAN gave the floor to the representatives of Austria and of Switzerland for the exercise of the right of reply, in accordance with rule 24 of the rules of procedure.

46. Mr. ZEMANEK (Austria) said, in reply to the reference by the USSR representative to mercenary motives on the part of host countries, that his delegation hoped that that reference had not been made having in mind the State that was host to the present Conference. He was, however, in a position to assure representatives that his country, Austria, had shouldered expenses connected with the present Conference which far exceeded any material gain that Austria might derive from it, except in the very unlikely event of the representatives to the present Conference becoming what was commonly known as “big spenders”.

47. Mr. RITTER (Switzerland) said that he wished to dispel a misunderstanding which he perceived in the statement made by the USSR representative. The proposed new article would not have the effect of reducing in any way the system of privileges and immunities laid down in part III for delegations to organs and to conferences. Should no agreement be entered into by the parties concerned under the proposed new article, all the provisions of part III would automatically apply to the delegations and delegates concerned.

48. The picture given of this proposed new article was inaccurate for another reason as well. If it was true that countries were eager to be the hosts of meetings, then even with regard to the type of agreement envisaged in his delegation’s proposal, prospective host States were likely to compete in making liberal offers of privileges and immunities in order to attract a conference or a meeting. The participating States would thus be able to choose, from among the host States, the one which offered the best régime for the delegations that would attend.

49. He wished to clarify the example which he had given relating to article 47 (Notifications). The simplification which his delegation would propose to that article would have the effect of relieving sending States of the unnecessary and cumbersome formality of making the whole series of notifications now contemplated in subparagraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e) of paragraph 1 of that article. The host State would gain absolutely nothing by that simplification.

50. He wished strongly to rebut the assertion that the Swiss proposal would tend to curtail the privileges and immunities of delegations. A mere glance at the proposal (A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77) showed that it only envisaged the possibility of augmenting the measure of privileges and immunities to be granted to delegations by specifying that they could, by agreement, be given the status of permanent missions. The net result of such an agreement would be to extend to delegations the privileges and immunities specified in part II, which were more extensive than those laid down in part III. No provision whatsoever was made in the proposed new article for any reduction of privileges and immunities.

51. As to the intention of his delegation to make proposals at a later stage to amend certain provisions of part III, it did not affect in any way the decision which the Committee was about to take on the proposed new article. Whatever that decision, the Committee was obviously free to take whatever decision it wished on each of the articles that had not yet been discussed. The ultimate shape of part III would depend on the will of the Committee.

52. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should vote first on the Indian oral amendment to the new article proposed by Switzerland and then on the Swiss proposal contained in document A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77. The suggestion concerning the Swiss proposal made by the Netherlands delegation would be referred to the Drafting Committee if the Swiss proposal was adopted.

53. Mr. TANKOUA (United Republic of Cameroon), speaking on a point of order, said he did not think that delegations had had sufficient time to consider the oral amendment proposed by India and suggested that the vote should be deferred.

54. The CHAIRMAN recalled that many oral amendments to preceding articles had been proposed in the Committee, which had always been willing to vote on such amendments immediately. Moreover, he felt that the point of the oral amendment submitted by India was clear and he therefore hoped that the representative

³ Resolutions 22 A (I) and 179 (II).

of the United Republic of Cameroon would not press his suggestion. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee could agree to proceed to the vote.

It was so decided.

55. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian oral amendment to the new article proposed by Switzerland.

The amendment was rejected by 24 votes to 14, with 29 abstentions.

56. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Swiss proposal for a new article (A/CONF.67/C.1/L.77).

The proposal was rejected by 29 votes to 16, with 20 abstentions.

57. Mr. MOLINA LANDAETA (Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, although his delegation had not taken part in the discussion, it had had some doubts concerning the legal implications of the Swiss proposal for a new article and, in particular, concerning the way in which small and large delegations to conferences and meetings of organs would be treated. In order to maintain the present balance between delegations of various kinds, it had therefore abstained from voting on the Swiss proposal.

58. Mr. HELLNERS (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the Swiss proposal because it had not been able to foresee exactly what implications the adoption of that proposal would have for the implementation of the other provisions of part III of the draft articles.

59. Mr. SURENA (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the Swiss proposal for a new article because it was not sure what the full implications of that proposal would be for the Committee's past and future decisions on the draft articles. He pointed out, however, that his delegation's abstention did not mean that it shared the view expressed by one delegation that all delegations should be accorded the status of permanent missions. Rather, his delegation took the view that there was a distinction between types of delegations and that it should be reflected in the draft articles.

60. Mr. GÜNEY (Turkey), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the Indian oral amendment and on the Swiss

proposal for a new article because the goal of the Swiss proposal was covered by article 4 of the draft convention and because the adoption of the Swiss proposal would have made it necessary to simplify the provisions of part III. Such a simplification would have been difficult, if not impossible, and would have upset the balance created in the draft articles.

61. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted against the Swiss proposal because of the many uncertainties to which it gave rise. It might have been able to vote in favour of the proposal if it had been stated that the proposed new article would not affect the application of part III of the draft articles.

Article 47 (Notifications) (continued) (A/CONF.67/4)

62. Mr. UNGERER (Federal Republic of Germany), introducing an oral amendment to article 47, recalled that, at the 24th meeting, his delegation had requested separate votes on parts of article 47. It now withdrew that request and proposed an oral amendment to article 47 designed to add, after the present paragraph 1, subparagraph (a), the following new paragraph 2: "It may notify, as appropriate, the Organization or the conference of:". The present subparagraphs (b) to (e) would then be renumbered as subparagraphs (a) to (d) of the new paragraph 2. The reason for his delegation's oral amendment was that the notifications required in the present subparagraphs (b) to (e) were not indispensable for many types of meetings and should therefore not be compulsory.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would continue its consideration of article 47 at the next meeting.

64. He announced that the time-limit for the submission of amendments to articles 71 to 75 was noon on Tuesday 25 February and observed that there were no corresponding articles in the annex to be considered in connexion with those articles.

65. Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) raised the question of the time-limit for the submission of amendments to articles B to L in the annex corresponding to articles 42 to 58 of part III.

66. The CHAIRMAN said in reply that an announcement concerning those articles would be made at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

26th meeting

Monday, 24 February 1975, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. NETTEL (Austria).

Consideration of the question of the representation of States in their relations with international organizations in accordance with resolutions 2966 (XXVII), 3072 (XXVIII) and 3247 (XXIX) adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1972, 30 November 1973 and 29 November 1974 (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations to submit by noon of the following day any amendments they wished to make to articles 71 to 75 and to such of articles B to L of the annex to the draft of the International Law Commission (ILC) (see A/CONF.67/4) as they considered should be examined in conjunction therewith.