

Document:-  
**A/CN.4/SR.401**

**Summary record of the 401st meeting**

Topic:  
**Diplomatic intercourse and immunities**

Extract from the Yearbook of the International Law Commission:-  
**1957 , vol. I**

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

duties were concerned, while in other countries they enjoyed full diplomatic privileges and immunities. Thirdly, there were servants, who could also be recruited locally, or brought from the sending State. Fourthly, there were wives and families; in that connexion, some countries distinguished between married and unmarried daughters. Fifthly, other *closé* relatives were also granted certain privileges and immunities, as a matter of courtesy in some countries, such as France, and as a matter of right in others, such as the United States of America. Finally, there were various minor special categories, such as personal chaplains to ambassadors.

78. If the Commission accepted the old theory of extra-territoriality, or even if it accepted the modern theory of "representative character", it followed that all those categories should enjoy full diplomatic privileges and immunities. On the other hand, if it accepted the "demands of the office" theory, the situation was obviously different.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

### 401st MEETING

Tuesday, 21 May 1957, at 9.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jaroslav ZOUREK.

#### Diplomatic intercourse and immunities (A/CN.4/91, A/CN.4/98) (continued)

[Agenda item 3]

#### CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT FOR THE CODIFICATION OF THE LAW RELATING TO DIPLOMATIC INTERCOURSE AND IMMUNITIES (A/CN.4/91) (continued)

##### ARTICLE 17

1. Mr. SANDSTRÖM, Special Rapporteur, introduced article 17 of his draft (A/CN.4/91) and said he proposed to omit the phrase "shall accord him all necessary facilities for the exercise of his functions" which had been transferred to article 16, paragraph 1.

2. He had been in two minds as to whether to include a provision that diplomatic agents should not be subject to any constraint, arrest, extradition or expulsion, on the lines of article 7 of the resolution adopted by the Institute of International Law in 1929,<sup>1</sup> but had decided not to do so, because he considered that such acts were covered by article 20 on immunity from jurisdiction. He was willing to include such a provision if the Commission so desired.

3. Mr. VERDROSS observed that the previous articles dealt with "heads of missions". To make it clear that sub-section B of section II dealt with diplomatic agents in general, he thought it might be better to use the plural throughout.

4. Mr. SPIROPOULOS drew attention to article 24, which stated that the privileges and immunities set forth in articles 12 to 20 applied equally to the staff of the mission. He therefore proposed that the Commission refer for the moment to "heads of missions" in article 17 and subsequent articles, and leave the final drafting to the Drafting Committee. Another possible alternative was to amend article 24.

5. Mr. AGO said that, if article 17 and those immediately following it were made to refer to heads of mis-

sions only, it would be necessary to refer to other diplomatic agents later on.

6. He proposed that the first sentence in paragraph 1 should be redrafted to read: "The person of the diplomatic agent is inviolable", a wording more in line with that of previous articles.

7. Mr. SANDSTRÖM, Special Rapporteur, accepted Mr. AGO's proposal.

8. In reply to Mr. Spiropoulos, he said that he had chosen the term "diplomatic agent" because of its more general sense.

9. Mr. PADILLA NERVO suggested including an article similar to article 2 of the 1929 resolution of the Institute of International Law, showing what categories were entitled to the various immunities.

10. Mr. SANDSTRÖM, Special Rapporteur, pointed out that article 24 performed the same function in a different way.

11. Mr. LIANG, Secretary to the Commission, observed that the whole of sub-section B consisted of provisions covering all diplomatic members of missions. If the term "heads of missions" were substituted for "diplomatic agent" in the group of articles, it would be necessary to have a similar group of articles referring to subordinate members of missions, and that would be a rather clumsy arrangement. The idea of making the articles apply to heads of missions and then pointing out in article 24, paragraph 1, that they applied to the staff of the missions as well, was not a particularly happy one either. It implied too sharp a distinction between the head of the mission and the rest of his diplomatic staff. He wondered whether the whole sub-section could not be preceded by some general provision indicating what categories of diplomatic staff were entitled to the various privileges and immunities.

12. Mr. TUNKIN thought that whatever term was adopted would only be provisional. He noted that the terms "members of a diplomatic mission" and "members of the diplomatic staff" were used in the draft articles already prepared by the Drafting Committee.

13. After further discussion, Mr. SPIROPOULOS withdrew his proposal.

14. Mr. AMADO said he would have preferred the wording "all necessary steps" to "all reasonable steps", which was rather subjective.

15. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as a member of the Commission, doubted the wisdom of stating that diplomatic agents were never subject to expulsion. There had been cases, admittedly very rare, where receiving States had been obliged to order a diplomatic agent to leave the country after the sending State had refused to recall him.

16. Mr. AMADO remarked that the text presumably referred to a formal measure of expulsion, as practised in the case of criminals and undesirables.

17. Mr. MATINE-DAFTARY considered the statement that the person of a diplomatic agent was inviolable to be quite sufficient. Elaboration merely detracted from its force.

18. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the following amended text for paragraph 1, subject to drafting changes:

<sup>1</sup>Harvard Law School, *Research in International Law*, I. *Diplomatic Privileges and Immunities* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932), pp. 186 and 187.

"The person of a diplomatic agent shall be inviolable. He shall not be subject to any constraint, arrest, extradition or expulsion. The receiving State shall ensure his treatment with due respect and take all reasonable steps to prevent any offence against his person, freedom or dignity."

*The text was adopted unanimously on that understanding.*

19. The CHAIRMAN observed that paragraph 2 appeared to be somewhat elliptic and open to a variety of interpretations. It was not clear whether it referred to the legitimate defence of the receiving State or to the legitimate defence of an individual. It might perhaps be better to omit the paragraph and deal with the matter in the commentary.

20. Mr. VERDROSS considered the reference to the right of self-defence to be insufficient. The police had the right to take coercive action to prevent diplomatic agents from committing illegal acts, such as entering prohibited areas or photographing fortifications. He would suggest adding the following provision: "Acts of constraint are permitted only in order to prevent the commission of an offence by the diplomatic agent."

21. Mr. SPIROPOULOS said that he did not favour either the Special Rapporteur's provision or Mr. Verdross's. It went without saying that private persons were entitled to defend themselves when attacked by diplomatic agents. It would be better to say nothing at all on the subject.

22. Mr. SANDSTRÖM, Special Rapporteur, pointed out that a similar provision to his own was to be found in other drafts. The paragraph was not absolutely necessary, however, and he would be content to deal with the question in the commentary.

23. Mr. EL-ERIAN said that, since the principle of the right of self-defence clearly applied only between two individuals or two States, but not between an individual and a State, he would like it to be specified in the commentary that the inviolability of diplomatic agents did not preclude the receiving State from taking all the necessary steps in the event of an imminent threat to its security from a diplomatic agent.

24. Mr. SPIROPOULOS doubted whether it was necessary to mention such extreme cases as those referred to by Mr. Verdross and Mr. El-Erian. When dealing with the question of the inviolability of the premises of the mission in article 12, the Commission had decided against qualifying the general principle.

25. The CHAIRMAN proposed deleting paragraph 2 of article 17, and dealing with the question of the right of self-defence in the commentary, in the light of the observations made during the discussion.

*It was so agreed.*

#### ARTICLE 18

26. Mr. TUNKIN, referring to paragraph 1 of article 18, suggested that the Drafting Committee be asked to consider the advisability of substituting the words "the same inviolability" for the words "the same freedom from intrusion".

*It was so agreed.*

*Paragraph 1 was adopted unanimously on that understanding.*

27. Mr. EL-ERIAN remarked that the word "property" in paragraph 2 was rather too general a term. It might be interpreted as applying to the assets of a diplomatic agent who also engaged in commerce.

28. Mr. SPIROPOULOS agreed with Mr. El-Erian. As the provision was worded, it would be an offence even to cross land which had been acquired in the territory of the receiving State by a diplomatic agent before his appointment.

29. Mr. BARTOS said that case law on the question was fairly well developed, particularly in France, where the assets of a diplomatic agent, with the exception of bank accounts, were not entitled to protection. The position with regard to bank accounts was far from clear, but current accounts were generally immune from seizure because they were essential for the day-to-day existence of the diplomatic agent. Land was entitled to protection if the diplomatic agent lived on it while performing his functions, but in that case the immunity sprang not from the fact of his ownership, but from the fact of its use by him. Furniture and other personal effects were always regarded as entitled to protection.

30. Some definition of the term "property" ought to be included, either in the article or in the commentary. The matter could, however, be referred to the Drafting Committee.

31. Mr. YOKOTA, noting that private immovable property was dealt with under article 20, drew the conclusion that the property referred to in article 18 must be movable property. He saw no objection to the principle that the movable property of a diplomatic agent should enjoy immunity, but thought it should be specified that it was the property "in his residence". Furthermore, he would welcome an explicit reference to "papers and correspondence", since that kind of property was most in need of protection.

32. Mr. PAL remarked that, even if Mr. Yokota's qualification "in his residence" were added to the text, it would still not exclude all commercial assets. The diplomatic agent might very well store his stock-in-trade in his residence. Some other means must be found of confining the term to the personal possessions of the diplomatic agent entitled to protection.

33. Mr. SPIROPOULOS said that, although it was of fundamental importance to specify what was meant by "property" in the context, it would waste too much time to hammer out a definition there and then. The best course would be to request the Special Rapporteur to prepare another, more specific, text.

34. Mr. TUNKIN agreed that a new text should be prepared, but thought it preferable to hear the views of the members of the Commission first, and then refer the matter direct to the Drafting Committee.

35. He found it difficult to accept Mr. Yokota's conclusion, for some types of property other than movable property were also entitled to protection. He suggested adding the qualification "not constituting a source of income" after the word "property".

36. He had no objection in principle to including an explicit reference to "papers and correspondence", but was not sure that they were not already covered by other articles. That again was a matter for the Drafting Committee to explore.

37. Sir Gerald FITZMAURICE agreed that the paragraph needed clarification. If its purpose was to extend

protection to the property in the diplomatic agent's private residence, it should not be difficult to redraft it accordingly. He presumed that the article was established on the analogy of article 12, the first paragraph of which enunciated the principle of the inviolability of the premises of the mission, and the second the principle of the duty of the receiving State to protect them. If, on the other hand, the Special Rapporteur had in mind a provision of broader scope, other considerations would be involved and the paragraph would need qualification.

38. Mr. EL-ERIAN said that, if the titles of sub-section B and of the article itself were any guide, it was hardly possible to accept the view that the paragraph referred exclusively to the private residence of the diplomatic agent. Mr. Yokota's contention that article 18 must relate to movable property, because immovable property was dealt with under article 20, was not conclusive. The two articles dealt with different matters: article 18 with inviolability and article 20 with immunity from jurisdiction.

39. Mr. SANDSTRÖM, Special Rapporteur, said that the "protection" he had in mind in article 18 was merely protection from attack. Immunity from jurisdiction was dealt with in article 20. By "property" he had had in mind the personal property of the diplomatic agent in his private residence, but had interpreted the term rather liberally so as to include such things as his motor car, even when not in the garage.

40. Mr. GARCIA AMADOR drew attention to article 14 of the Havana Convention,<sup>2</sup> which dealt with the question in a very satisfactory manner. The manner of wording the article clearly implied that only the personal property of the diplomatic agent was involved. The Drafting Committee might be requested to consider adopting a similar presentation of the subject.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. García Amador's observations would be taken into account by the Drafting Committee.

42. Mr. BARTOS said that only property necessary to the diplomatic agent for the exercise of his functions, or of use to him in his private life, was entitled to protection. Thus, property used for professional purposes, even though the professional services might be rendered free of charge, was excluded from the benefit of the provision.

43. Mr. AMADO was opposed to any attempt to specify the types of property entitled to protection, since such lists could never be exhaustive. The formula adopted in the Havana Convention was very satisfactory. It would be better to frame the provision in general, but not vague, terms, e.g., by referring to "property attaching to the private residence of the diplomatic agent", a formula which would include such things as motor cars.

44. Mr. SANDSTRÖM, Special Rapporteur, observed that, in the past, it had been customary to include the "equipage" of the ambassador in the property entitled to protection.

45. The CHAIRMAN proposed that paragraph 2 should be referred to the Drafting Committee.

*It was so agreed.*

<sup>2</sup> Convention regarding Diplomatic Officers, signed at Havana on 20 February 1928. See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, Vol. CLV, 1934-1935, No. 3581.

#### ARTICLE 19

46. Mr. TUNKIN proposed the insertion of the phrase "in accordance with the provisions of sub-section B" after the words "its protection" in article 19. The term "protection" being rather vague, a reference to sub-section B was advisable in order to make clear what obligations were implied.

47. Sir Gerald FITZMAURICE considered that third States were under an obligation to provide rather more than mere protection to diplomatic agents passing through their territory. It was, after all, a general duty of States to protect all persons on their territory, including foreigners, whether performing diplomatic functions or not.

48. He noted in that connexion that the Special Rapporteur in his commentary on the article (A/CN.4/91, para. 47) had referred to the claim that the diplomatic agent should enjoy all his privileges and immunities when on the territory of a third State in the circumstances indicated in the text of the article, but had taken the view that the claim was excessive and found no support in practice. He could not entirely agree with that view. He considered it an established rule that, when a diplomatic agent was travelling to or from the country to which he was accredited, the third States through which he passed, provided they were duly notified of his intentions, were at least under the obligation to take no action which might prevent his continuing his journey. In other words, he should enjoy not only protection but immunity from arrest, and even from criminal jurisdiction, though perhaps not from civil jurisdiction. Paragraph 303 of the memorandum prepared by the Secretariat (A/CN.4/98) appeared to bear him out on that point, even if the claim made by Sir Cecil Hurst that a diplomatic agent in such circumstances was "exempt from the jurisdiction of the courts"<sup>3</sup> might, perhaps, be thought rather too wide.

49. The formulation of the principle in article 15 of the Harvard draft<sup>4</sup> struck him as preferable to that adopted by the Special Rapporteur. Sir Gerald would, if necessary, submit an amendment on those lines, but would first like to hear the Special Rapporteur's reasons for framing the article as he had.

50. Mr. SPIROPOULOS agreed with Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice that diplomatic agents in transit through third States, in the circumstances mentioned in the article, were immune from arrest and criminal jurisdiction. They were, in fact, often accorded immunity from civil jurisdiction too, though purely as a matter of courtesy.

51. He wondered, however, whether the article was in its right place. All the other articles in sub-section B referred to the duties of the receiving State. Would it not be better to assemble all the provisions involving third States in a group of articles which might be placed at the end of the draft?

52. Mr. FRANÇOIS agreed with Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice that a diplomatic agent should enjoy full diplomatic privileges and immunities while passing through the territory of a third State in order to take up his post or return to his own country. On the other hand, it did not seem necessary for him to enjoy them whenever he visited a third State, on holiday, for example. The

<sup>3</sup> *International Law—The Collected Papers of Sir Cecil Hurst* (London, Stevens and Sons Limited, 1950), p. 279.

<sup>4</sup> Harvard Law School, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-25.

words "or is temporarily on such territory while occupying his post" should therefore be deleted, or at any rate qualified.

53. He asked the Special Rapporteur whether his article 19 was intended to apply also in case of war.

54. Mr. SANDSTRÖM, Special Rapporteur, said that he had deliberately left aside the question what should happen in time of war, except in the instances where he had specifically referred to it. In the present instance, he did not think the question was of much practical importance.

55. He had intended the term "protection" to cover freedom of passage, and if it did not, he agreed that it should be changed; but the reference in the Harvard draft to "such privileges and immunities as are necessary to facilitate his transit"<sup>5</sup> was far from satisfactory, since the question inevitably arose what such privileges and immunities comprised.

56. Mr. VERDROSS said that in support of the principle that diplomatic agents were entitled to full diplomatic privileges and immunities while on the territory of third states, the situation of United Nations delegates under the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations might be mentioned.

57. Mr. EDMONDS pointed out that, quite apart from the question of what happened in war-time, article 19, as it was drafted, placed a third State under an obligation to accord protection to the diplomatic agents of States with which it was not in diplomatic relations. Though he had no doubt that in ordinary circumstances the third State would accord such protection, it was, in his view, essential to include either in the article or in the commentary something along the lines of the proviso in the Harvard draft, "provided that the third State has recognized the Government of the sending State".<sup>6</sup>

58. Mr. BARTOS said that, in his view, a State was under a legal obligation to grant another State's diplomatic agents freedom of passage across its territory, even if the two States were not in diplomatic relations with each other. The obligation resulted from the duty of all States to further friendly international relations, and also from the fact that it was in accordance with existing practice; Yugoslavia, for example, allowed Spanish diplomats to cross its territory to and from eastern Europe, even though it had broken off diplomatic relations with Spain during the Second World War.

59. In ordinary circumstances, the third State was, in his view, obliged to grant foreign diplomatic agents freedom of passage for whatever purpose; even in time of war or national emergency, it was obliged to grant them freedom of passage for the purpose of taking up their posts or returning to their own countries.

60. Mr. KHOMAN agreed with Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice that diplomatic agents travelling through a third State should be immune from arrest and from criminal jurisdiction in general. On the other hand, he thought it was obvious that the third State could not be required to grant foreign diplomatic agents freedom of passage through its territory, regardless of the circumstances; that it should be in diplomatic relations with the sending State was a possible qualification, but he was not sure

it was the most appropriate. It might be preferable simply to recognize the third State's right to object to the passage of foreign diplomatic agents across its territory, without attempting to list the circumstances in which it could do so.

61. He suggested that a possible solution would be to change the last word of the text, "presence", to "passage" which would, in any case, be more appropriate—and continue "and has raised no objections thereto".

62. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as a member of the Commission, agreed that diplomatic agents travelling through a third State were entitled to immunity, not only from criminal jurisdiction but also from civil jurisdiction. Regarding other cases where a diplomatic agent was in the territory of a third State, it would probably be necessary to determine whether or not his sojourn was rendered necessary by the exercise of official duties (for example, participation in a conference with a diplomatic agent of the receiving State).

63. Mr. TUNKIN noted that the purpose of his amendment was identical with what Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice had in mind. He would therefore have no objection to withdrawing it, if the Commission preferred to make a specific reference to immunities.

64. He could not altogether agree with Mr. Bartos that there was a legal obligation on the third State to grant free passage across its territory. He recalled that, in connexion with section I of the draft, the Commission had recognized that the receiving State always had the right to refuse to issue an entry visa; having done so, it could not consistently deny the third State's right to refuse a transit visa. It would be better to leave the whole question of entry into the third State's territory aside, and say simply that if a diplomatic agent were on such territory he should enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities.

65. Mr. SPIROPOULOS said that the Commission should at any rate be quite clear about the fact that article 19, in its present form, did not cover the question of freedom of passage across a third State's territory. However, since that question related rather to the very difficult problems of recognition and non-recognition and their effects, he was inclined to agree with Mr. Tunkin that it should be left aside.

66. In his view, the article should state simply that, in cases where a diplomatic agent passed through the territory of a third State in order to take up his post or return to his own country, the third State should grant him diplomatic privileges and immunities, provided it was notified of his presence. It was true that, in practice, the third State gave the same privileges and immunities to a diplomatic agent who visited its territory temporarily while occupying his post, but that was a matter of courtesy.

67. In general, the Commission should beware of arguing from the existence of a practice to the existence of an obligation, particularly in the field of diplomatic intercourse and immunities where courtesy played so large a part.

68. Mr. EL-ERIAN agreed that article 19 could not be regarded as imposing an obligation on the third State to grant a diplomatic agent free passage across its territory, even for the purpose of proceeding to his post or returning to his own country. For the article, like every

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

other article in the draft, could not be considered in isolation, but must be set beside the other accepted principles of international law, including those relating to the admission of aliens. Ever since the First World War, it had been an accepted principle that no individual had the right to enter the territory of any State without its free consent.

69. Sir Gerald FITZMAURICE wondered whether the entry of foreign diplomatic agents really presented a problem at all. The third State either required entry visas for all those entering its territory or, by agreement with a number of other States, it waived the requirement as far as their nationals were concerned. In the first case, a foreign diplomatic agent had to obtain a visa like anybody else; and if the third State objected to him, his visa could be refused. In the second case, where any member of the public was admitted freely, it would hardly be possible to refuse entry to a diplomat. He therefore agreed with Mr. Spiropoulos that the Commission could leave the question of entry aside.

70. Mr. SANDSTRÖM, Special Rapporteur, said he shared that view. On the other hand, he thought it was going too far to grant a diplomatic agent who was passing through the territory of a third State complete immunity from criminal jurisdiction. If the offence was a minor one, the authorities could be expected to overlook it, but if it was serious, there was no reason inherent in the nature of the diplomatic function why they should.

71. Mr. YOKOTA agreed with Mr. Tunkin that, once a diplomatic agent was on the territory of a third State, he should enjoy full diplomatic privileges and immunities, whether the sending State was recognized by the third State or not. The only reason why the Harvard draft contained a proviso regarding recognition was that it dealt not only with the question of privileges and immunities during transit but also with the question of freedom of passage, which included the right freely to enter the country. He was by no means sure that the Commission should not do likewise.

72. At any rate, in his view no final decision should be taken on the matter until the definitive text of article 16, paragraph 4, was adopted, since it would be illogical if the third State were obliged to grant freedom of passage to diplomatic couriers but not to diplomatic agents themselves.

73. Mr. BARTOS felt that, in the light of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, it was undeniable that, generally speaking, a third State was under a legal obligation to allow foreign diplomatic agents free passage across its territory. In particular cases it could refuse to issue the necessary visa, but the question of visas had to be dealt with separately from the main problem, and it was actually reduced to the question of hindering the free exercise of the right to passage by *personae non gratae*. Further, the fact that in war time there existed the right to free passage was *a fortiori* an argument that States must mutually concede that right in time of peace.

74. He agreed that the Commission could not insert in its draft rules which were based only on courtesy. The Commission was, however, elaborating obligatory rules for States, and at the same time drafting rules relating to free passage, which meant that free passage became a legal obligation unless it was stated in the rule that it was not an obligatory rule.

75. Mr. BARTOS proposed that the article be referred to the Drafting Committee for further consideration in the light of the discussion.

76. Mr. MATINE-DAFTARY observed that, before referring the article to the Drafting Committee, the Commission must decide whether it wished it to cover the question of freedom of passage or not. In his view, the article need not do so, and should merely state that, when on the territory of a third State, a diplomatic agent should enjoy, not full immunity, but such immunities as were necessary to facilitate his transit.

77. Mr. AGO felt that, though the question of freedom of passage should not perhaps be dealt with in article 19, it was of such practical importance that it should not be overlooked altogether. In cases where, for example, the receiving State was entirely surrounded by a State or States which had not recognized the sending State, all diplomatic intercourse between the sending and the receiving States might itself be impossible unless the principle of freedom of passage for diplomatic agents as well as diplomatic couriers was respected.

78. Mr. SPIROPOULOS thought that the cases referred to by Mr. Ago were quite exceptional; he also thought no parallel could be drawn between the rules of international law, which applied to the whole international community, and the provisions of a convention, which bound only those States that had ratified it.

79. To get out of the difficulty, however, he wondered whether the Commission could not indicate in the commentary that "as a general rule" the third State should accord freedom of passage—the Conference for the Codification of International Law which was held at The Hague in 1930 had already used that formula with regard to the passage of foreign warships through the territorial sea of a coastal State (article 12 of the articles concerning the legal status of the territorial sea).<sup>7</sup>

80. After further discussion, the CHAIRMAN pointed out that there was no definite proposal before the Commission for dealing with the question of freedom of passage in article 19. In those circumstances before referring the article to the Drafting Committee as Mr. Bartos had proposed, the Commission need merely vote on the proposal, just outlined by Mr. Tunkin and Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice, that reference should be made not only to "protection" but also to diplomatic privileges and immunities.

*The proposal was adopted by 12 votes to 1 with 6 abstentions.*

81. Mr. MATINE-DAFTARY said he had abstained because, in his view, a diplomatic agent in transit through the territory of a third State should not enjoy full diplomatic privileges and immunities but only such as were necessary to facilitate his transit.

82. Mr. KHOMAN said he had abstained because it was not clear whether the third State would have the right to object to a foreign diplomatic agent's passage. If it did not object, he agreed that it should accord him full diplomatic privileges and immunities.

*Article 19 was referred to the Drafting Committee.*

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*

<sup>7</sup> League of Nations publications, *V. Legal*, 1930.V.14 (document C.351.M.145.1930.V), p. 169.