

Document:-
A/CN.4/SR.1871

Summary record of the 1871st meeting

Topic:
Other topics

Extract from the Yearbook of the International Law Commission:-
1984, vol. I

*Downloaded from the web site of the International Law Commission
(<http://www.un.org/law/ilc/index.htm>)*

amendment proposed by Sir Ian Sinclair to the first sentence was acceptable. As for the third sentence, the phrase beginning "it would be better" was couched in the conditional mood and was hence sufficiently dubitative. Moreover, he believed it desirable to retain the words "denial of the right of self-determination".

48. Sir Ian SINCLAIR said that he would not insist on the deletion of the words "denial of the right of self-determination", or on the retention of the word "possibly", in the amendment he had proposed for the third sentence of the paragraph.

49. Mr. KOROMA said that the words "condemnation of colonialism", at the beginning of the paragraph, had a political connotation. It would therefore be preferable to speak of the "illegality of colonialism", which would also better reflect the intended meaning. However, he supported Sir Ian Sinclair's revised amendment to the third sentence, namely "wording modelled on article 19".

50. Mr. THIAM (Special Rapporteur) said he accepted the amendment proposed by Sir Ian Sinclair to the second part of the third sentence, as revised by Sir Ian Sinclair.

51. Mr. DÍAZ GONZÁLEZ pointed out that colonialism was unlawful not because General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) had declared it to be so, but because it was unlawful *ab initio*. The General Assembly resolution merely acknowledged its unlawful character. Hence it was difficult to say that the unlawfulness of colonialism "derives" from the General Assembly resolution.

52. Sir Ian SINCLAIR said that General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in fact amounted to a general condemnation of colonialism in all its forms. Possibly, therefore, the words "in all its forms" could be inserted after "condemnation of colonialism", in the first sentence.

53. Mr. KOROMA proposed that the first sentence of the paragraph should be amended to read: "Colonialism was declared illegal by resolution 1514, adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1960."

54. Mr. BALANDA said that it would be better to speak of "condemnation" of colonialism, a term more in keeping with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

55. Chief AKINJIDE said that Mr. Koroma's point regarding the illegality of colonialism was well taken. He would suggest, however, that the word "again" should be inserted at an appropriate point in the first sentence of the paragraph.

56. Mr. DÍAZ GONZÁLEZ said he would have no objection to leaving paragraph 42 unchanged. If, however, the word "initially" were to be introduced in the first sentence, as proposed by Sir Ian Sinclair, it might suggest that colonialism had not been unlawful before the adoption of the relevant resolution—an absurdity which he for one could not accept.

57. Mr. KOROMA said that the statement that the condemnation of colonialism derived from General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) was not factually correct.

He therefore maintained his proposal, either as originally worded or as amended by Chief Akinjide.

58. Sir Ian SINCLAIR said he was fully prepared to withdraw his proposal that the word "initially" be inserted in the first sentence of the paragraph, if it created a problem. He would none the less suggest that the first sentence be redrafted, as a simple statement of fact, to read: "General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 condemned colonialism in all its forms and manifestations."

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 42, as amended, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

1871st MEETING

Wednesday, 25 July 1984, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Alexander YANKOV

Present: Chief Akinjide, Mr. Balanda, Mr. Díaz González, Mr. Evensen, Mr. Francis, Mr. Jacovides, Mr. Koroma, Mr. Lacleta Muñoz, Mr. Mahiou, Mr. Malek, Mr. McCaffrey, Mr. Ni, Mr. Ogiso, Mr. Quentin-Baxter, Mr. Razafindralambo, Mr. Riphagen, Sir Ian Sinclair, Mr. Stavropoulos, Mr. Sucharitkul, Mr. Thiam, Mr. Ushakov.

Draft report of the Commission on the work of its thirty-sixth session (*continued*)

CHAPTER II. *Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind (concluded)* (A/CN.4/L.371 and Add.1)

B. *Consideration of the topic at the present session (concluded)* (A/CN.4/L.371 and Add.1)

Paragraphs 23 to 55 (*concluded*) (A/CN.4/L.371/Add.1)

Paragraph 43

1. Mr. McCaffrey proposed the insertion, in the sixth sentence, of the words "many members believed that" between the words "Nevertheless" and "*apartheid*". Moreover, in the penultimate sentence, the words "as *jus cogens*" should be deleted.

2. Sir Ian SINCLAIR said that another solution to the problem posed by the penultimate sentence of the paragraph would be to replace the words "does not deprive" by "did not, in their view, deprive".

3. Mr. MAHIOU, supported by Chief AKINJIDE, welcomed Mr. McCaffrey's suggestion concerning the sixth sentence, but thought it would be preferable to say "most members believed that". Sir Ian Sinclair's suggestion was also acceptable and the penultimate sentence could be reworded: "From their point of view, the fact that some States had not acceded to the Convention on *Apartheid* did not deprive it of its force as *jus cogens*".

4. Mr. THIAM (Special Rapporteur) said that he too thought the wording "From their point of view" was preferable. Moreover, if it was not deemed possible to aver that the Commission was unanimous in regarding *apartheid* as a crime, the least that could be done was to speak in the sixth sentence of "most members".

5. Mr. USHAKOV said it was essential to refrain from speaking of a majority. He preferred the expression "many members" to "most members".

6. After a brief exchange of views in which Chief AKINJIDE, Mr. FRANCIS and Mr. McCAFFREY took part, the CHAIRMAN suggested that, in the sixth sentence, the words "most members believed that" should be inserted between the words "Nevertheless" and "*apartheid*". He further suggested that Mr. Mahiou's second proposal concerning the penultimate sentence should be adopted.

It was so agreed.

7. Mr. KOROMA, referring to the first sentence, proposed that the words "the crime of" should be inserted between "condemning" and "*apartheid*".

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 43, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 44

Paragraph 44 was adopted.

Paragraph 45

8. Mr. OGISO proposed the addition of the following sentence at the end of the paragraph: "Some members were of the view that, unless international agreements for prohibition of atomic weapons were reached within the framework of general disarmament, it was premature to conclude that the use of atomic weapons was an offence."

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 45, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 46

Paragraph 46 was adopted.

Paragraph 47

9. Mr. BALANDA proposed that the words "—at least the first use—of such weapons of mass destruction", at the end of the second sentence, should be replaced by "—at least in the case of a State that made the first use—of such weapons of mass destruction".

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 47, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 48

10. Mr. McCAFFREY, referring to the second sentence, proposed that the phrase "recognizes serious damage to the environment as an international crime" should be replaced by "recognizes that, under certain conditions, causing serious damage to the environment may be considered as an international crime".

It was so agreed.

11. Mr. BALANDA proposed that the first sentence should be replaced by: "The problem of the *environment* had also been considered."

12. Sir Ian SINCLAIR said that the words "should lead", in the fifth sentence, should be replaced by "might lead".

13. Mr. THIAM (Special Rapporteur), while not insisting on the retention of the initial wording, pointed out that the use of the conditional in the French original should meet Sir Ian Sinclair's concern.

The amendment proposed by Sir Ian Sinclair was adopted.

Paragraph 48, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 49

14. Mr. BALANDA proposed the deletion, in the penultimate sentence, of the words "the crime of" before "mercenarism", since mercenarism was not yet regarded as a crime.

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 49, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 50

15. Mr. BALANDA proposed, in order to bring the language of the report into line with that of the relevant conventions, that the words "country to which they are accredited", at the end of the second sentence, should be replaced by "State to which they are accredited".

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 50, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 51

16. Mr. OGISO said he did not think that the statement contained in the last sentence of the paragraph had actually been agreed on. Hence it would be better to delete that sentence.

17. Mr. MAHIOU, supported by Mr. DÍAZ GONZÁLEZ and Mr. RAZAFINDRALAMBO, urged retention of the final sentence of the paragraph, although the wording might be recast in order to take account of divergences of view.

18. Chief AKINJIDE said that he too favoured retention of the sentence, either as drafted or possibly in a slightly amended form.

19. Sir Ian SINCLAIR proposed that the sentence should read: "Opinion in the Commission was divided on whether it would be desirable to include economic aggression as a separate offence in the draft."

20. Mr. DÍAZ GONZÁLEZ said he could not agree to Sir Ian Sinclair's proposal. It would be better to say that the members of the Commission had taken different views on the matter.

21. Mr. THIAM (Special Rapporteur) suggested that the existing text of the last sentence should be retained, to be followed by a new sentence reading: "However,

some members expressed reservations about the advisability of including the concept of economic aggression in the draft."

22. Mr. McCAFFREY said that that would not convey an accurate picture of the position in the Commission.

23. Mr. USHAKOV said that it was not a serious matter, and merely involved a preliminary issue. The Commission would not fail to deal with it in depth when specific articles were proposed at a later stage.

24. Sir Ian SINCLAIR proposed that, in order to overcome the difficulties, the final sentence should be amended to read: "All in all, there was a body of opinion in the Commission that was not opposed to condemning economic aggression, provided that a suitable definition and terminology could be found." That would then be followed by the sentence proposed by the Special Rapporteur.

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 51, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 52 to 54

Paragraphs 52 to 54 were adopted.

Paragraph 55

Subparagraph 1

25. Mr. USHAKOV said that the formulation of subparagraph 1 was somewhat strange. It would be better to replace the words "the Commission recommends to the General Assembly" by "the Commission intends".

It was so agreed.

26. Mr. LACLETA MUÑOZ recalled his comments on the Spanish version of paragraph 23 (1869th meeting) and said that, in the Spanish version of subparagraph 1 of paragraph 55, the expression *responsabilidad penal internacional* should be replaced by *responsabilidad criminal internacional*.

It was so agreed.

Subparagraph 1, as amended, was adopted.

Subparagraph 2

27. Mr. FRANCIS said that he was completely opposed to the subparagraph, in view of the terms of General Assembly resolution 38/132, by which the Commission was invited to elaborate an introduction in conformity with paragraph 67 of its report on the work of its thirty-fifth session. In particular, he was unable to agree to the implied abandonment of the inductive and deductive methods adopted by the Commission and recommended to the General Assembly.

28. Mr. McCAFFREY proposed that the expression "the list of offences" should be replaced by "a tentative list of offences" or by "a provisional list of offences" and that, at the end of the subparagraph, the phrase "relating to offences against the peace and security of mankind", or some similar wording, should be added.

29. As to Mr. Francis's point, possibly a form of wording could be found to indicate that the Commission

should draw up a tentative list of offences while formulating the introduction; the Commission would thus not be tied down to an established order of procedure.

30. Mr. USHAKOV suggested that the formulation "the Commission recommends to the General Assembly ... that the Commission should begin" should be replaced by "the Commission ... intends to begin", as in subparagraph 1.

31. Mr. MAHIOU supported the changes proposed by Mr. McCaffrey, which introduced useful elements of precision. Moreover, to allay the concern of Mr. Francis, the second part of the sentence could be made more flexible by saying: "... intends ... to begin by drawing up a provisional list of offences while bearing in mind the drafting of an introduction ..."

32. Mr. FRANCIS said he was grateful for those suggestions but, in his view, if the General Assembly asked the Commission to do something, the Commission should do it. The idea that it was impossible, even at the current early stage, to abide by the spirit of General Assembly resolution 38/132 was totally unacceptable, and he would like his view to be reflected in the records.

33. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as a member of the Commission, said that, while he agreed in principle with Mr. Francis, General Assembly resolution 38/132, as he read it, did not stipulate any given order of work, but invited the Commission to consider the two aspects of the matter, namely the list of offences and an introduction containing general principles. It was important to respect the Special Rapporteur's method of work and not to tie his hands. Possibly Mr. Mahiou's proposal could be reworded to convey the idea that the Commission would consider the general introduction while working on the list of offences.

34. Mr. EVENSEN suggested that, in order to achieve complete equality between the two elements involved, the last part of the subparagraph could be redrafted to read: "by drawing up a provisional list of offences and by drafting an introduction summarizing the general principles of international criminal law".

35. Mr. THIAM (Special Rapporteur) said that the members of the Commission could naturally differ on the interpretation of General Assembly resolutions. With regard to the study of the various topics assigned to special rapporteurs, the Commission had always left it to each special rapporteur to decide on his methods of work. For his own part, he could not agree to work under supervision. He simply expected to receive guidelines from the Commission. Mr. Mahiou's suggestion was acceptable.

36. Mr. FRANCIS said his stance was dictated by the terms of General Assembly resolution 38/132. He had spoken in his personal capacity as a member of the Commission, but also in the context of what the General Assembly had asked the Commission to do. He could not agree to the subparagraph in its existing form, but there was no reason for the Commission not to accept it, either as drafted or in an amended form. His own position was simply that the matter should be referred to the General Assembly for its response and further instructions.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Commission agreed to adopt the amendments proposed by Mr. McCaffrey and Mr. Mahiou.

It was so agreed.

Subparagraph 2, as amended, was adopted.

Subparagraph 3 (a)

38. Mr. USHAKOV proposed that the opening words of subparagraph 3 (a) should be replaced by: "The Commission intends to include the offences covered by the 1954 draft code..."

It was so agreed.

Subparagraph 3 (a), as amended, was adopted.

Subparagraph 3 (b)

39. Sir Ian SINCLAIR proposed that the words "and possibly" should be added before "serious damage".

It was so agreed.

40. Mr. OGISO proposed that the word "suitable" should be replaced by "appropriate".

It was so agreed.

Subparagraph 3 (b), as amended, was adopted.

Subparagraph 3 (c)

41. Mr. KOROMA proposed that the opening phrase should simply read: "With regard to the use of atomic weapons ...".

It was so agreed.

42. Mr. USHAKOV said that he failed to see what "more specific guidance" the General Assembly could give the Commission, since a number of its resolutions already condemned the first use of atomic weapons. Only when the draft was communicated to the Governments could the Commission expect to receive specific indications.

43. Mr. THIAM (Special Rapporteur) suggested that the latter part of the sentence, "considers that it should await more specific guidance from the General Assembly in view of the political aspects of the problem", should be replaced by "intends to examine the matter in greater depth".

44. Sir Ian SINCLAIR suggested that the words "in the light of any views expressed in the General Assembly" should be added at the end of the sentence as thus reworded.

It was so agreed.

Subparagraph 3 (c), as amended, was adopted.

Subparagraph 3 (d)

45. Mr. KOROMA proposed that the words "stability of political régimes", in the first sentence, should be replaced by "stability of Governments".

It was so agreed.

Subparagraph 3 (d), as amended, was adopted.

Subparagraph 3 (e)

46. Mr. USHAKOV proposed the deletion of the words "serious violations by diplomats of law and order in the country to which they are accredited".

47. Mr. THIAM (Special Rapporteur) proposed that the words in question should be replaced by a comma and the abbreviation "etc.".

It was so agreed.

Subparagraph 3 (e), as amended, was adopted.

Subparagraph 3 (f)

Subparagraph 3 (f) was adopted.

Paragraph 55, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 24 and 25 (concluded) and paragraph 25 bis.

48. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to resume its consideration of paragraphs 24 and 25 and to examine the revised text of those paragraphs, together with a new paragraph 25 bis, as proposed by the informal group set up at the 1870th meeting.

49. The paragraphs in question read:

"24. With regard to the content *ratione materiae* of the draft code, the Commission had well in mind General Assembly resolution 38/132, which invited it to elaborate, as a first step, an introduction in conformity with paragraph 67 of its report on its thirty-fifth session, as well as a list of the offences in conformity with paragraph 69 of that report. It considered, however, that this mandate, which lists in their logical order the elements of the final result which the Commission's work is expected to yield, does not necessarily establish an order of priority for their elaboration, and that a question of method obliges it, at the present stage, to begin by preparing a list of international crimes and to take up the drafting of the introduction as a second step. Although the final draft will necessarily have to include such an introduction, it would be premature at the present stage to prepare a general part containing a definition of an offence against the peace and security of mankind and deducing the general principles and rules applicable.

"25. Some members were, however, of the view that preparation of an introduction should proceed in parallel with the establishment of the list of offences, which in any case was desirable in response to General Assembly resolution 38/132. The view was expressed that more precise criteria for identifying offences against the peace and security of mankind should be established. Among the several possible criteria suggested were the following: the inspiration of the criminal act (for example, an act based on racial, religious or political conviction); the status of the victim of the criminal act (for example, a State or a private individual); the nature of the law or interest infringed (the interest of security appearing more important than a purely material interest); or lastly, the motive, etc. Interesting as those suggestions were, none of the criteria proposed sufficed by itself to identify an offence against the peace and security of mankind.

The seriousness of an act was judged sometimes according to the motive, sometimes according to the end pursued, sometimes according to the particular nature of the offence (the horror and reprobation it arouses), sometimes according to the physical extent of the disaster caused. Furthermore, these elements seemed difficult to separate and were often combined in the same act.

"25 bis. It was also thought that the introduction should contain a statement of principles in regard to the content of which the following were among observations made by one member: the notion of individual criminal responsibility should be one of the basic principles of the code; offences against the peace and security of mankind constituted international crimes whose prosecution was a universal duty; the non-applicability of statutory limitation in respect of crimes committed by individuals; criminal responsibility may be attributed to States, although they cannot as such be subject to any international criminal jurisdiction; the need to draw further upon the Nürnberg Principles in the preparation of the introduction. The above-mentioned approach would, in the view of that member, be consistent with the Commission's decision "that the deductive method should be closely combined with the inductive method ..."—a decision which was overwhelmingly endorsed by representatives in the Sixth Committee during the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly."

50. The CHAIRMAN noted that there were no comments on the proposed paragraphs. He would therefore take it that the Commission agreed to adopt them.

It was so agreed.

Paragraphs 24 and 25, as amended, and paragraph 25 bis were adopted.

Section B, as amended, was adopted.

Chapter II of the draft report, as amended, was adopted.

CHAPTER III. Status of the diplomatic courier and the diplomatic bag not accompanied by diplomatic courier (A/CN.4/L.372 and Add.1)

51. Mr. McCAFFREY said that it was not desirable to include in chapter III of the Commission's report (A/CN.4/L.372 and Add.1) material drawn from the summary records of the Commission's meetings, a course that had made chapter III unduly lengthy and created an imbalance in the draft report as a whole. Moreover, it meant that the same article was dealt with in five or six places in chapter III. He proposed that, in line with the Commission's usual practice, all the material in section B (A/CN.4/L.372) dealing with draft articles on which the Commission had taken action should be deleted, since the background was fully explained in the relevant commentaries in section C (A/CN.4/L.372/Add.1). The remaining material in section B could be rearranged in two subsections: the first dealing with the fifth report (A/CN.4/382) and the draft articles as a whole submitted by the Special Rapporteur, and the second

setting forth the views expressed on specific draft articles, article by article.

52. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as Special Rapporteur, explained that the format of chapter III had been used in order to avoid overburdening the commentaries with particulars of the discussion on each draft article.

53. Mr. FRANCIS proposed that the Commission should deal with chapter III as submitted and consider Mr. McCaffrey's proposal for rearrangement afterwards.

It was so agreed.

54. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider chapter III of the Commission's draft report, paragraph by paragraph.

A. Introduction (A/CN.4/L.372)

Section A was adopted.

B. Consideration of the topic at the present session (A/CN.4/L.372)

Paragraphs 10 to 14

Paragraphs 10 to 14 were adopted.

Paragraphs 15 to 31

55. Mr. McCAFFREY said he reserved the right to propose the deletion of paragraphs 15 to 18 and paragraphs 22 to 26, since they dealt with draft articles which had been adopted and for which commentaries existed.

Paragraphs 15 to 31 were adopted.

Paragraph 32

56. Mr. OGISO noted that in the last two sentences of paragraph 32 it was stated that the Special Rapporteur's fifth report "elaborated further" on the interpretation of the expression "articles intended for official use". As he recalled, the fifth report of the Special Rapporteur (A/CN.4/382) contained a very useful list of such articles, drawn up on the basis of national practice. He hoped such an enumeration could be included in paragraph 32.

57. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as Special Rapporteur, said that the enumeration in question, which appeared in paragraphs 65 to 69 of his fifth report, had been given by way of illustration. A form of words could be introduced at the end of paragraph 32 referring to that enumeration.

Paragraph 32 was adopted on that understanding.

Paragraphs 33 to 48

Paragraphs 33 to 48 were adopted.

Paragraph 49

58. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as Special Rapporteur, pointed out that the words "in some quarters", in the first sentence, were to be deleted.

59. Mr. McCAFFREY noted that the fourth sentence consisted of two totally different elements. The second, namely "and all the efforts undertaken ..." could be deleted. Alternatively, the two elements could be separated and made into two separate sentences.

60. Mr. RAZAFINDRALAMBO said that the passage in question reflected views he had expressed during the discussion. He therefore preferred the fourth sentence to be divided into two separate sentences. The first sentence would end with the word “hindered”. The conjunction “and” would be deleted and a new sentence would begin with “All the efforts undertaken ...”, and the words “in such a case” would be added after the words “would be meaningless”.

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 49, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 50

Paragraph 50 was adopted.

Paragraph 51

61. Mr. McCAFFREY said that the statement in the first sentence of the paragraph should be preceded by a formula on the following lines: “It was generally felt that ...”.

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 51, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 52 and 52 bis

Paragraphs 52 and 52 bis were adopted.

Paragraph 53

62. Mr. McCAFFREY said he reserved the right to propose the deletion of paragraphs 53 to 55, as well as of paragraphs 57 to 60, for the reasons he had given earlier.

Paragraph 53 was adopted.

Paragraph 54

63. Mr. McCAFFREY noted that paragraph 54 described only two of the views expressed in connection with draft article 21. There was, however, a third view, namely that article 21 should be deleted because it was unnecessary. An additional sentence should therefore be inserted, reading: “Still another view was that the entire article was unnecessary.”

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 54, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 55 to 75

Paragraphs 55 to 75 were adopted.

Paragraph 76

64. Mr. McCAFFREY proposed that the words “secrets of official correspondence”, in the second sentence of the paragraph, should be replaced by “confidentiality of official correspondence”.

65. Mr. LACLETA MUÑOZ supported that proposal. Only a slight change was required in the Spanish text, where the word *de* had to be inserted between *el secreto de la correspondencia y* and *los documentos oficiales*.

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 76, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 77 to 106

66. Mr. McCAFFREY said he reserved the right to propose the deletion of paragraphs 93 to 95 and 97 to 101 for the reasons already stated.

Paragraphs 77 to 106 were adopted.

Paragraph 107

67. Mr. OGISO, referring to the statement in the penultimate sentence of paragraph 107 that the “intention was to refer to articles of a confidential nature”, said it was not clear whether all or only some of the articles for official use contained in the diplomatic bag were of a confidential character.

68. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as Special Rapporteur, explained that the protection was intended to apply to articles for official use of a confidential nature. Other articles for official use, such as furniture for the mission, would be covered by another provision of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, namely article 36.

69. Sir Ian SINCLAIR proposed that the relevant passage should be amended to state: “The protection was designed essentially for articles of a confidential nature, ...”.

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 107, as amended, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

1872nd MEETING

Wednesday, 25 July 1984, at 3.05 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Alexander YANKOV

Present: Chief Akinjide, Mr. Balanda, Mr. Evensen, Mr. Francis, Mr. Koroma, Mr. Laclea Muñoz, Mr. Mahiou, Mr. McCaffrey, Mr. Ni, Mr. Ogiso, Mr. Quentin-Baxter, Mr. Razafindralambo, Mr. Riphagen, Sir Ian Sinclair, Mr. Stavropoulos, Mr. Sucharitul, Mr. Thiam, Mr. Ushakov.

Draft report of the Commission on the work of its thirty-sixth session (*continued*)

CHAPTER III. *Status of the diplomatic courier and the diplomatic bag not accompanied by diplomatic courier* (concluded)
(A/CN.4/L.372 and Add.1)

B. *Consideration of the topic at the present session* (concluded)
(A/CN.4/L.372)

Paragraphs 108 to 114

Paragraphs 108 to 114 were adopted.