

Document:-
A/CN.4/L.34

**Decision Taken by the Commission on 3 July 1952 - incorporated in the summary records of
the 156th meeting**

Topic:
Arbitral Procedure

Extract from the Yearbook of the International Law Commission:-
1952, vol. I

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

the draft code of offences against the peace and security of mankind, the Commission had not felt itself bound by the principles recognized by the Nürnberg Tribunal. The Commission's task was to codify international law as it understood it, and not in accordance with the concepts put forward by other organs. If it decided to prepare a draft convention, the Commission should examine the substance of the subject.

45. Mr. el-KHOURI said that to the best of his recollection the Commission had decided to take up the question of nationality of married women as part of the whole problem of nationality, including statelessness. It could not therefore confine itself to the mere drafting of a text for whose content it would be taking no responsibility.

46. Mr. HUDSON said that if the Commission refused to draft a convention it would be guilty of misleading the Economic and Social Council as to its intentions.

47. Mr. YEPES said that if the Commission followed the procedure proposed by Mr. Hudson it would do so in violation of article 1 of its Statute.

48. Mr. ZOUREK considered that the Commission had decided to accede to the Council's request in accordance with article 17, paragraph 2, of its Statute.

49. Mr. HUDSON suggested that the Chair take the sense of the Commission by putting to the vote the following proposal:

"The Commission decides, complying with the proposal of the Economic and Social Council, to draft a convention embodying the principles recommended by the Commission on the Status of Women.

"In doing so, it does not express any approval of those principles."

Mr. Hudson's proposal was rejected by 8 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

50. Mr. LAUTERPACHT said that out of respect for the Commission's previous decision and the work done by Mr. Hudson, the Commission should hold a short general discussion on the problem of nationality of married women to enable it to decide whether it could draft a convention at a subsequent session.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

156th MEETING

Thursday, 3 July 1952, at 9.45 a.m.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Arbitral procedure (item 2 of the agenda) (A/CN.4/18, A/CN.4/46, A/CN.4/57, A/CN.4/L.33 and Add. 1 to 9) (resumed from the 155th meeting)	
Action to be taken in respect of the draft articles (resumed)	103

	<i>Page</i>
Nationality, including statelessness (item 6 of the agenda) (A/CN.4/50) (resumed from the 155th meeting)	
General (resumed)	106
Section VI of Annex III: Statelessness; points for discussion	106

Chairman : Mr. Ricardo J. ALFARO.

Present :

Members : Mr. Gilberto AMADO, Mr. Roberto CORDOVA, Mr. J. P. A. FRANÇOIS, Mr. Shuhsi HSU, Mr. Manley O. HUDSON, Faris Bey el-KHOURI, Mr. F. I. KOZHEVNIKOV, Mr. H. LAUTERPACHT, Mr. A. E. F. SANDSTRÖM, Mr. Georges SCELLE, Mr. J. M. YEPES, Mr. J. ZOUREK.

Secretariat : Mr. Ivan S. KERNO (Assistant Secretary General in charge of the Legal Department), Mr. Yuen-li LIANG (Director of the Division for the Development and Codification of International Law, and Secretary to the Commission).

Arbitral procedure (item 2 of the agenda) (A/CN.4/18, A/CN.4/46, A/CN.4/57, A/CN.4/L.33 and Add. 1 to 9) (resumed from the 155th meeting)

ACTION TO BE TAKEN IN RESPECT OF THE DRAFT ARTICLES (resumed)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to continue its discussion of the action which was to be taken with regard to the draft articles which had been tentatively adopted. He recalled that three proposals had been made. Mr. Hudson had proposed

"That the draft on arbitral procedure be included, with explanations to follow on each article, in the report of the Commission this year as a tentative provisional draft."

2. Mr. Lauterpacht had proposed

"1. That after the end of this session the draft articles shall be submitted to governments with explanations.

"The Special Rapporteur, with the assistance of the Standing Drafting Committee and any other member of the Commission, shall prepare a draft of explanations to every article adopted by the Commission and circulate that draft among members of the Commission for comment. After receiving that comment the Special Rapporteur shall finally prepare his explanations to be appended to the draft articles;

"2. That after the end of the 1953 session the draft articles shall be submitted to the General Assembly accompanied by a full commentary in accordance with article 20 of the Statute of the Commission."

3. Finally Mr. Kozhevnikov had submitted a proposal worded as follows:

"To prepare a detailed commentary before transmitting it to governments. To submit the commentary to the Commission for consideration at its fifth session. After such consideration, to transmit all the material to governments for their observations. To

take account of the observations of governments with a view to transmitting the final text of the draft to the General Assembly.”

4. Unless there was any proposal to the contrary, he would, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, put those proposals to the vote in that order, which was the order of their submission.

5. Mr. LIANG (Secretary to the Commission) suggested that, in order to bring the wording as far as possible into line with that used in the Statute of the Commission, Mr. Hudson's proposal might be amended to read as follows :

“That the draft on arbitral procedure, accompanied by explanations, be issued as a Commission document and submitted to governments for comment and included in the report of the Commission to the General Assembly this year as a provisional draft.”

6. Mr. HUDSON accepted the Secretary's suggestion.

7. Mr. LAUTERPACHT said that, in view of the fact that certain features of his proposal had aroused the opposition of several members of the Commission during the discussion at the preceding meeting, he would withdraw section 1 thereof in favour of Mr. Hudson's proposal, as amended at the suggestion of the Secretary. He reserved the right, however, to propose, if necessary, rather fuller explanations in respect of certain articles in which he was particularly interested, to replace the explanations which would be submitted to the Commission by the special rapporteur.

8. Mr. YEPES felt that the whole difficulty had arisen from the Commission's failure to recognize that the draft on arbitration procedure was, for much the greater part, a matter of the development of international law, and from its consequent attempt to apply to it the provisions of article 20 of the Commission's Statute, provisions which were perfectly justifiable in the case of drafts dealing with the codification of international law, but which were quite inapplicable in the case of a draft which diverged from the existing law as much as did that submitted by Mr. Scelle.

9. He could, however, accept Mr. Hudson's proposal as amended, although he would suggest that the words “being largely a draft for the progressive development of international law” be inserted after the words “the draft on arbitral procedure”.

10. Mr. LIANG (Secretary to the Commission) pointed out that Mr. Yepes' proposal would add an element of juridical appreciation to what was a purely formal, procedural resolution. Moreover, not all members of the Commission might be prepared to agree without discussion that the draft on arbitral procedure was largely one for the progressive development of international law.

11. Mr. YEPES said that he would not press his amendment, although he was personally convinced that the draft submitted by Mr. Scelle, even in the form in which

it had been tentatively adopted by the Commission, was far more concerned with the progressive development of international law than with its codification.

12. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General) pointed out that it was immaterial whether the draft was mainly concerned with the progressive development or with the codification of international law, since the wording proposed by Mr. Hudson, as amended, was in accordance both with article 16 and with article 21 of the Commission's Statute. As he had pointed out at the preceding meeting, the procedure laid down in article 21 came before that proposed in article 20, chronologically speaking. If Mr. Hudson's proposal, as amended, was adopted, the draft articles would be submitted to the General Assembly at its forthcoming session, but for information only; on the other hand, governments would be required to submit their comments on those articles during the forthcoming year. Under Mr. Kozhevnikov's proposal they would not be required to do so until after the 1953 (fifth) session.

13. Mr. SCELLE said that the question under discussion had an important bearing on the way in which the Commission would organize all its future work. From what Mr. Lauterpacht had said at the preceding meeting concerning the uselessness of anything other than a full commentary, he would have expected him to favour Mr. Kozhevnikov's proposal rather than Mr. Hudson's. It was essential that all members of the Commission should appreciate the issues at stake.

14. Mr. LAUTERPACHT said that if he supported Mr. Hudson's proposal rather than Mr. Kozhevnikov's, he did so because he considered that it was absolutely vital that the Commission should succeed in completing its work on at least one or two topics of codification by the time the term of office of the present members came to an end. For that reason, it was necessary that the draft articles on arbitral procedure should be submitted to governments already in 1952.

15. The fullness of explanations was a matter of degree. He accepted the special rapporteur's assurance that it would be quite impossible to prepare a commentary that would meet all the requirements laid down in article 20 of the Commission's Statute, but he still hoped that the explanations would be full enough to show governments what the Commission had been attempting to do. As he had already suggested, individual members of the Commission could help the special rapporteur in that respect by submitting explanations or articles in which they were particularly interested.

16. Mr. KOZHEVNIKOV had thought that his proposal was in accordance with the general trend of discussion at the preceding meeting. The majority of members of the Commission had appeared to be opposed to the Commission's considering itself bound by any rigid time-table, and to have taken their stand on the principle that it was the Commission's task to produce authoritative work and on the practical consideration that governments should be given an

opportunity of apprehending clearly the significance of its drafts. His proposal was in accordance with that point of view, but some members of the Commission appeared to have changed their opinion, for some reason which he did not understand.

After further discussion, *Mr. Hudson's proposal was put to the vote, as amended, and was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.*

17. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Commission had still to take a decision on section 2 of Mr. Lauterpacht's proposal, as well as on those parts of the proposal made by Mr. Kozhevnikov which had not been disposed of by the vote just taken.

18. Mr. HUDSON felt that the wording proposed by Mr. Lauterpacht was somewhat peremptory, and suggested that it be replaced by the following text:

"That the Special Rapporteur be invited to prepare and to present to the Commission at its next session a full commentary on the draft on arbitral procedure, with a view to the submission of the final draft and commentary to the General Assembly in 1953".

19. After some discussion, Mr. LAUTERPACHT pointed out that the only urgent question had been that of the explanations which were to be appended to the draft articles in the Commission's report on its present session. There was no need at all to decide forthwith the question of the procedure to be followed in drawing up the full commentary. That question was of vital importance, and, as Mr. Scelle had rightly pointed out, the decision taken on it would affect the Commission's future methods of work as a whole. It was his intention to submit a working paper concerning that question, if the Commission so desired, and he therefore formally moved that the present discussion, as well as the votes on the remaining proposals before the Commission, be deferred until that working paper had been circulated.

20. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that under rule 115 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly two members of the Commission could speak in favour of Mr. Lauterpacht's motion, and two against it, after which it would be put to the vote.

21. Mr. FRANÇOIS supported the motion for adjournment, since the Commission would not be in a position to decide until the end of the present session what items it wished to place on the agenda for its next session.

22. Mr. CORDOVA also supported Mr. Lauterpacht's motion, since the working paper which the latter intended to submit would relate, as he (Mr. Córdova) understood it, to the procedure in respect of all items on the Commission's agenda in the case of which it would be necessary to prepare full commentaries. There was therefore no point in taking a separate decision in respect of arbitration procedure.

23. Mr. YEPES said that he looked forward with interest to seeing the working paper submitted by Mr. Lauterpacht, but thought that it should be considered in connexion with the item relating to revision

of the Commission's Statute. He therefore opposed the motion.

24. Mr. el-KHOURI agreed with Mr. Yepes. If, as a result of Mr. Lauterpacht's working paper, some general procedure were agreed on which differed from that agreed on for arbitration procedure, the decision with regard to arbitration procedure could be modified accordingly.

Mr. Lauterpacht's motion was rejected by 5 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

25. Mr. SANDSTRÖM, explaining his vote, said that he feared that the present discussion would only be repeated when the Commission took up the question again.

26. Mr. HUDSON said that he had voted against the motion because he saw no need for any general rule, or for specifying the procedure by which the commentary was to be prepared. If the special rapporteur needed help in that respect, he had only to ask for it.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that as the motion for adjournment of the debate had been rejected, he would put to the vote the wording proposed by Mr. Hudson to replace section 2 of Mr. Lauterpacht's proposal.

28. Mr. ZOUREK asked whether Mr. Hudson would be prepared to delete the reference to the date by which the final draft and commentary had to be submitted to the General Assembly.

29. Mr. HUDSON pointed out that the wording he had proposed read: "...with a view to the submission...". It did not therefore bind the Commission in advance to submitting the final draft and commentary in 1953, if for some reason or another it was not satisfied with them.

Mr. Hudson's proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

30. The CHAIRMAN asked whether Mr. Kozhevnikov wished his proposal to be put to the vote, since several of the questions it raised had already been decided by the votes already taken.

31. Mr. KOZHEVNIKOV replied in the affirmative.

32. Mr. ZOUREK pointed out that Mr. Kozhevnikov's proposal referred to two points which were not covered by either of the two texts so far adopted by the Commission, namely: the question of a detailed commentary being transmitted to governments; and the question of observations of governments being taken into account in the preparation of the final text.

Mr. Kozhevnikov's proposal was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

33. The CHAIRMAN indicated that the Commission had completed its work on arbitration procedure until such time as the Standing Drafting Committee reported back on the articles already tentatively adopted by the Commission.

Nationality, including statelessness (item 6 of the agenda) (A/CN.4/50) (resumed from the 155th meeting)

GENERAL (resumed)

34. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Commission that it had before it a proposal by Mr. Lauterpacht,¹ which was now available in writing. It read:

“The Commission will proceed with a general discussion of the *Draft Convention on Nationality of Married Women* with a view to enabling the Commission, at a subsequent session and after receiving a report in conformity with article 17 of its Statute, to determine whether it is in a position to draft a convention.”

35. Mr. LAUTERPACHT said that on further reflection he had decided to withdraw his proposal.

36. Mr. el-KHOURI asked that the Chairman communicate the Commission's decision concerning the draft convention on the nationality of married persons to the President of the Economic and Social Council, together with the draft prepared by Mr. Hudson.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. el-Khouri's request would be complied with.

38. Mr. LIANG (Secretary to the Commission) observed that the Commission's decision to reject Mr. Hudson's proposal concerning the draft convention on the nationality of married persons did not conflict with the decision it had taken at its second session. He did not think it sufficient, however, that the Commission should transmit to the President of the Council the text of Mr. Hudson's draft alone, and suggested that it be accompanied by the summary record of the proceedings at the preceding meeting so that the Council might be informed of the views expressed by members of the Commission on the question as a whole.

It was so agreed.

39. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Commission must now discuss how it would deal with item 6 of the agenda.

40. Mr. HUDSON said that, if it were the Commission's pleasure, he would propose that it first take up Annex III to his report, since the urgent problem of elimination of statelessness could usefully be discussed.

41. Mr. YEPES said that, as Annex I embodied certain general principles on which Annex III itself was based, it was impossible to consider them separately.

Mr. Hudson's proposal was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

42. Mr. AMADO said that, before the Commission began its discussion of Annex III to Mr. Hudson's report, he would like to clear up one point raised in Annex I, section II, 3 (bb), where Mr. Hudson quoted “collective naturalization” practised under the Brazilian

Constitution of 1891 as an example of imposed nationality.

43. In fact, Article 69, paragraphs 4 and 5, of the Constitution of Brazil laid down, first, that all aliens in Brazilian territory on 15 November 1889 would be regarded as Brazilian citizens unless they declared their intention of retaining their own nationality within a period of six months, and secondly, that the same would apply to aliens possessing real estate in Brazil or who had Brazilian children.

44. That provision had never been interpreted as implying imposition of nationality, as was suggested by Mr. Hudson. The very opposite was true, and what was known in Brazil as “*grande naturalisation*” was designed to facilitate naturalization for the thousands of immigrants who arrived in Brazil. Furthermore, those who wished to retain their own nationality could do so under the provision he had cited.

45. He emphasized that rulings of the Supreme Court of Brazil had completely rejected the notion that Article 69 entailed imposition of nationality. Indeed, the decisions of the Court had even restricted the over-generous scope of the provision, so that naturalization under the terms of that article only took place when the interested party obtained naturalization papers according to the normal procedure. Obviously, an alien applying for those papers would only do so voluntarily, and there could thus be no question of enforced naturalization.

46. He had wished to elucidate that point in order to show that the Brazilian Constitution of 1891 had always been regarded as enabling aliens who wished to acquire Brazilian nationality to do so without being subjected to the bureaucratic difficulties associated with the normal processes of naturalization.

SECTION VI OF ANNEX III : STATELESSNESS ; POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

47. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Commission might take as the framework for its discussion the nineteen points listed in section VI of Annex III to Mr. Hudson's report (A/CN.4/50), starting with the two general rules laid down in paragraph 2 thereof, aimed at precluding future additions to the number of stateless persons. Those rules were:

“(i) If no other nationality is acquired at birth, every person shall acquire at birth the nationality of the State in whose territory he is born. This would extend *pro tanto* the application of the *jus soli* rule in many countries.

“(ii) No person shall lose his nationality unless such person acquires another nationality.”

48. Mr. KOZHEVNIKOV suggested that, if the Commission were to have no general discussion, it might at least hold a preliminary exchange of views before passing to the consideration of Section VI of Annex III point by point.

49. Mr. YEPES agreed that a general discussion was necessary.

¹ See summary record of the 155th meeting, para. 50.

50. The CHAIRMAN said that from his long experience he had learnt that, however general a debate, it must be anchored to some specific point or points. Otherwise, it tended to become diffuse. He was somewhat at a loss to determine how the Commission should approach the problem of nationality, including statelessness, and had therefore suggested that it might focus its attention on the grave problem of how statelessness was to be eliminated. At the same time, of course, each member was entitled to draw attention to any general aspects of the matter.

51. Mr. YEPES said that, as he had indicated at the preceding meeting, there were certain principles contained in Annex I to Mr. Hudson's report with which he could not agree, notably that in section II, 4. He could not agree that the power of States to cancel or withhold nationality was, in the absence of treaty obligations, not limited by international law. Surely, according to Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, everyone had a right to a nationality, and should neither be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change it.² It was inadmissible that States should impose deprivation of nationality as a penalty. He therefore proposed that a rule in that sense be formulated.

52. Mr. AMADO pointed out that the practical application of Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would give rise to a great number of difficulties, since it conflicted with the municipal law of a number of countries. No purpose would be served by enunciating pious principles, the possibility of whose acceptance was very slender.

53. Mr. KOZHEVNIKOV wished to make certain general remarks on the whole subject of nationality and on Mr. Hudson's report.

54. Nationality could only be approached in the light of the democratic principles of international law. And in that field, as in any other, normal relations between States were impossible unless founded on the reciprocal recognition of the principle of sovereignty and of non-interference in domestic affairs, as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations. Despite that, certain States had been guilty of the grossest violations of those principles on the pretext that they were acting in defence of human rights. The problem of nationality was thus being exploited by reactionary and aggressive forces.

55. The task of the Commission was to find a solution to the problem in accordance with the democratic principles of international law.

56. As some members had referred to the domestic legislation of their countries, he intended to do the same and to point out that the Stalin Constitution of the Soviet Union was based on the equality of all citizens in every sphere. No direct or indirect limitation of rights was admitted, and any kind of discrimination based on race or nationality was condemned by law.

57. Women enjoyed full equality of rights with men, and their position was guaranteed by their having the right to work, to equal pay, to holidays, to social security, to education, to special protective measures for mothers and children etc.

58. A special nationality law existed in the Soviet Union enabling aliens, whatever their nationality or race, to acquire Soviet Union citizenship. No special conditions had to be fulfilled for that purpose.

59. Despite the differences of legislation in various countries, he did not think that the situation was hopeless, since a way out might be found through bilateral or multilateral agreements freely entered into on a basis of equality.

60. Turning to Annex III, he said that he could not agree with the considerations put forward by Mr. Hudson since, in the light of the existing international situation and wide variations in the domestic laws of different countries, it would be quite unrealistic to base a draft convention on the two rules suggested in point 2 of Section VI of Annex III. Their acceptance would call for radical changes in the municipal law of a large number of States. Experience in the time of the League of Nations had shown that such proposals were unlikely to yield any practical results; and that outcome was not fortuitous, since the problems involved were for the most part of a purely domestic character which each State was free to regulate as it pleased within the general democratic framework of international law. Clearly, certain States, and notably Nazi Germany, had enacted regulations which violated those democratic principles and which could not be regarded as of internal significance alone. They impinged on the sovereignty of other States, and were therefore contrary to international law.

61. In conclusion, he stated that the considerations put forward by Mr. Hudson were inadequate, and therefore would not contribute to the solution of the problem.

62. Mr. HUDSON suggested that paragraph 3 of section VI in Annex III had escaped Mr. Kozhevnikov's notice. That paragraph stated:

"The universal or general adoption of the rules stated in paragraph 2 seems to be improbable, even if the rules were thought to be desirable."

63. Mr. HSU agreed with the view put forward by Mr. Hudson in the paragraph just quoted, but wondered what the latter part of it meant. If Mr. Hudson thought that the general adoption of such rules was not desirable, he should surely give reasons for his belief. For his own part, he believed that, however impracticable, it was the Commission's duty to recommend what was desirable.

64. Mr. HUDSON said that he did not fly so high. If there was little possibility of a principle being adopted by States, there seemed little purpose in pursuing it.

65. Mr. FRANÇOIS said that, although from certain points of view it was very desirable to eliminate statelessness, there were grave objections to obliging States

² *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, United Nations publication, Sales No. : 1949.I.3.

to accept as nationals persons who had no ties of allegiance. In that respect, the Convention on Certain Questions Relating to the Conflict of Nationality Laws, signed at The Hague in 1930, had been more circumspect, since it had recognized certain rules with regard to nationality, together with certain limitations to those rules.³

66. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General) said that the Commission must endeavour to find some way of reducing the numbers of stateless persons, even if it were not possible to eliminate statelessness altogether.

67. Mr. HSU observed that according to Mr. François there seemed to be a choice between two evils. On the one hand there was the suffering of countless people deprived of nationality, and on the other the reluctance of governments to adopt a liberal naturalization policy. Nevertheless, he believed that the Commission might put forward the two rules suggested by Mr. Hudson as one possible solution to the problem of statelessness. That proposed solution should not be set aside merely because its chances of acceptance were slight.

68. Mr. ZOUREK said that nothing would be achieved by the enunciation of vague philosophical abstractions. The Commission must take as its starting point the principle that nationality was a matter which lay exclusively within the internal jurisdiction of States, and one which they were free to regulate as they thought fit. That view was confirmed by the comments of governments on the draft of the Convention on Certain Questions Relating to the Conflict of Nationality Laws, by article 1 of that Convention, and by the decisions of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

69. Mr. Hudson had very clearly shown that that was the existing doctrine on the subject. Unless that doctrine was recognized, no useful progress could be made. Indeed, the fate of existing international instruments on the subject was hardly encouraging. The Convention of 1930 had been ratified by very few States, and it was obvious that nationality was a subject concerning which States in general were reluctant to surrender their exclusive competence.

70. Mr. Yepes had mentioned the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but that was in no sense a legal instrument, and its provisions could not be taken as a basis for discussion.

71. The CHAIRMAN called the attention of the Commission to the fact that at the present stage the Commission was not considering a draft convention, but the question of whether it was feasible to prepare such an instrument with a view to the eradication of a great human evil.

72. Mr. SANDSTRÖM said that obviously some preliminary discussion was necessary to enable the Commission to decide whether it should prepare a draft convention for the elimination of statelessness, or one

on nationality. At the present moment he could not say in which of the two the rules set forth by Mr. Hudson could be most appropriately embodied.

73. Mr. el-KHOURI agreed with Mr. Hudson's two rules, but suggested that the first required clarification. It was necessary to decide whether the nationality to be acquired in accordance with the first rule should be regulated by *jus soli* or by *jus sanguinis*.

74. He also believed that the second rule should be more forcibly stated, as in his view no State had the right to deprive a person of his nationality.

75. Mr. FRANÇOIS considered that Mr. Zourek had no grounds for attempting to substantiate his argument that nationality was a matter of purely internal competence by invoking article 1 of the Convention on Certain Questions Relating to the Conflict of Nationality Laws, the second sentence of which read:

"This law shall be recognized by other States in so far as it is consistent with international conventions, international customs, and the principles of law generally recognized with regard to nationality."

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

157th MEETING

Friday, 4 July 1952, at 9.45 a.m.

CONTENTS

	Page
Nationality, including statelessness (item 6 of the agenda) (A/CN.4/50) (<i>continued</i>)	
Section VI of Annex III: Statelessness; points for discussion (<i>continued</i>)	108

Chairman: Mr. Ricardo J. ALFARO.

Rapporteur: Mr. Jean SPIROPOULOS

Present:

Members: Mr. Gilberto AMADO, Mr. Roberto CORDOVA, Mr. J. P. A. FRANÇOIS, Mr. Shuhsi HSU, Mr. Manley O. HUDSON, Faris Bey el-KHOURI, Mr. F. I. KOZHEVNIKOV, Mr. H. LAUTERPACHT, Mr. A. E. F. SANDSTRÖM, Mr. Georges SCELLE, Mr. J. M. YEPES, Mr. J. ZOUREK.

Secretariat: Mr. Ivan S. KERNO (Assistant Secretary General in charge of the Legal Department), Mr. Yuen-li LIANG (Director of the Division for the Development and Codification of International Law, and Secretary to the Commission).

Nationality, including statelessness (item 6 of the agenda) (A/CN.4/50) (*continued*)

SECTION VI OF ANNEX III: STATELESSNESS; POINTS FOR DISCUSSION (*continued*)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to continue its consideration of Annex III to the special

³ See text in League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 179, p. 89.