

Document:-
A/CN.4/SR.2421

Summary record of the 2421st meeting

Topic:
<multiple topics>

Extract from the Yearbook of the International Law Commission:-
1995, vol. I

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

52. Mr. AL-BAHARNA said he had not asked for the text to be changed. He had simply tried to draw a parallel with article 5, paragraph 2, and specify that, failing an agreement, either party could submit the dispute to an arbitral tribunal.
53. Mr. YANKOV (Chairman of the Drafting Committee) said that he took note of Mr. Al-Baharna's explanation. Again, with reference to article 5, Mr. Razafindralambo had proposed the addition at the end of each of the article's two paragraphs of a formulation specifying that the parties were free to choose the kind of arbitral tribunal to which they submitted their disputes. That was not necessary. It went without saying that the parties had such freedom of choice. The most one could do would be to emphasize it in the commentary.
54. Unlike article 6, on which no proposal had been made, article 7 had been the subject of much comment. To begin with, he suggested that the title should be changed to the one previously adopted by the Drafting Committee, namely "Validity of an arbitral award", for that was what the whole article was about. As to the proposal by Mr. Bennouna and several other members to insert a time-frame after the word "If", in the first line of paragraph 1, he would suggest that the idea could be developed in the commentary. However, it was his understanding that several members wanted to make further comments on that point.
55. Mr. AL-BAHARNA said it might be better to clarify the meaning of the word "timely", which was employed in article 7, paragraph 1.
56. Mr. ROSENSTOCK said that a clarification might be given in the commentary.
57. Mr. ARANGIO-RUIZ (Special Rapporteur) said that, to make the paragraph more logical and specify the time from which the period of three months was to commence, the word "award", in the second line, could be replaced by "challenge".
58. Mr. PELLET said that, in his opinion, it was a substantive change and he could not agree to it.
59. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the existing formulation should be adopted. Every word had been weighed carefully by the Drafting Committee.
60. Mr. BENNOUNA, supported by Mr. ROSENSTOCK, said that the Special Rapporteur's proposal would indeed have the merit of making things more logical. It would be clear that the three-month period commenced when the award was challenged. However, the challenge itself should not take place too long after the award was made, but that could be explained in the commentary.
61. Mr. EIRIKSSON said that, in view of the Special Rapporteur's explanations, he saw no reason why the word "award" should not be replaced by "challenge". It was in fact a minor drafting change.
62. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that members agreed to the change. He invited the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to continue his summing-up of the discussion.
63. Mr. YANKOV (Chairman of the Drafting Committee) said that two points had arisen in connection with paragraph 2 of article 7. The first was a drafting matter. Further to the comments by Mr. Al-Baharna, supported by a number of other members, the Special Rapporteur had suggested that, at the beginning of the paragraph, the words "The issues in dispute" should be replaced by "Any issue in dispute". The change seemed to command unanimity and he would take it that the Commission had agreed to it.
64. A second, more important, point concerned the reference to article 6 at the end of the paragraph. It had been pointed out that the reference could well lead to confusion and that it would be better to refer to article 2 of the annex. Mr. Razafindralambo, on the other hand, had thought it preferable to reformulate the paragraph. The proposal was attractive, but it could raise further problems. Accordingly, in view of the fact that the Commission would revert to the draft articles on second reading, he would suggest that, for the time being, the Commission should take note of Mr. Razafindralambo's comments so that they would be borne in mind at the next session and that only the first drafting change proposed for the paragraph should be adopted.
65. Mr. AL-BAHARNA said that, for greater clarity, it would be better to replace the words "The issues in dispute" by "Any issues in dispute". In addition, if the Commission decided to replace "award" by "challenge", that should be taken into account in the title of the article, which should then logically read "Challenge to the validity of an arbitral award".
66. Mr. BENNOUNA said that the French version of article 7, paragraph 1, was clumsy. The words "*par l'une ou l'autre*" should be replaced by "*du fait de l'une ou de l'autre*".
67. The CHAIRMAN said that he endorsed the proposal by the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to revert to Mr. Razafindralambo's suggestion on second reading of the draft articles. At that time, Mr. Al-Baharna's comments could also be looked at more closely.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

2421st MEETING

Tuesday, 18 July 1995, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Pemmaraju Sreenivasa RAO

Present: Mr. Al-Baharna, Mr. Al-Khasawneh, Mr. Arangio-Ruiz, Mr. Barboza, Mr. Bennouna, Mr. Bowett, Mr. de Saram, Mr. Eiriksson, Mr. Fomba, Mr. Güney, Mr. He, Mr. Idris, Mr. Jacovides, Mr. Kabatsi, Mr. Kusuma-Atmadja, Mr. Lukashuk, Mr. Mahiou, Mr. Mikulka, Mr. Pambou-Tchivounda,

Mr. Pellet, Mr. Razafindralambo, Mr. Rosenstock, Mr. Thiam, Mr. Tomuschat, Mr. Vargas Carreño, Mr. Villagrán Kramer, Mr. Yamada, Mr. Yankov.

State responsibility (concluded) (A/CN.4/464/Add.2, sect. D, A/CN.4/469 and Add.1 and 2,¹ A/CN.4/L.512 and Add.1, A/CN.4/L.513, A/CN.4/L.520, A/CN.4/L.521 and Add.1)

[Agenda item 3]

DRAFT ARTICLES PROPOSED BY THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE²
(concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to introduce certain proposals for amendments to the annex to part three of the draft on the settlement of disputes (A/CN.4/L.513).

2. Mr. YANKOV (Chairman of the Drafting Committee) said Mr. Al-Baharna had proposed that the word "or", in the second sentence of article 1 of the annex, should be replaced by the word "and". At that late stage in the session, however, he would himself suggest that the text should be retained as drafted, on the understanding that the point could be reconsidered on second reading. Mr. Al-Baharna had also proposed that the word "common", in article 2, paragraph 1, should be deleted. Again, it would, in his view, be preferable if the formulation was retained in its present form. Mr. Al-Baharna had further proposed that the words "may not be nationals", in the penultimate line of paragraph 2, should be replaced by "shall not be nationals". The original wording had, however, been taken from certain other instruments such as the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, and he would advise that it should be retained. Mr. Al-Baharna had also suggested a number of drafting changes to paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, which could perhaps be dealt with when the draft was considered on second reading, as well as the addition, in paragraph 7, of the words "present and voting" after the words "five members". As he himself read paragraph 7, however, the Arbitral Tribunal, if made up of five members, would in any event be a duly constituted tribunal; he trusted therefore that Mr. Al-Baharna would not insist on that point.

3. Mr. Razafindralambo had also made a proposal concerning article 5 and might wish to explain it to the Commission.

4. Mr. RAZAFINDRALAMBO said that his proposal was simply that provision should be made at the end of paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 5 for the parties to a dispute to have recourse to an arbitral tribunal other than that constituted "in conformity with the Annex to the present articles".

5. Mr. YANKOV (Chairman of the Drafting Committee) said that Mr. Razafindralambo's proposal might have implications for subsequent stages of the mechanism provided for in the draft. In his opinion, it would be preferable to bear the point in mind for discussion at a later stage.

6. Mr. ROSENSTOCK said that the point had been discussed at some length in the Drafting Committee when it had been agreed that article 5, paragraph 1, was without prejudice to the freedom of action of States as to the form and timing of the arbitration, and that that should be made clear in the commentary. In the circumstances, there would seem to be no need for Mr. Razafindralambo's proposed amendment.

7. Mr. PELLET said that Mr. Razafindralambo's proposal underlined the need for serious thought to be given to the interplay between the draft articles and dispute settlement methods provided for elsewhere. The aim, after all, was to encourage recourse to a system for the settlement of disputes, and not necessarily to the particular system set out in the draft. Hence there was no reason to insist on that system. To that extent, Mr. Razafindralambo's proposal was perfectly reasonable. However, he would have preferred the proposal made by Mr. Rosenstock in the Drafting Committee, namely, that, where conciliation did not succeed, recourse could be had either to arbitration or to ICJ. That would avoid endless, complicated procedures. It had been said that, with the session drawing to a close, there was not enough time to deal with the matter, which could in any event be covered in the commentaries. That was not a valid argument. The issue was important and the Commission must take time to discuss it—if not at the current session then at the next one.

8. The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. Razafindralambo's proposal was not being rejected for lack of time. His own understanding of the position was that the point was already covered, since the parties to a dispute were not denied the freedom to establish the forum of their choice. There was nothing to prevent them from exercising such a right or from opting for the scheme provided for in the draft. The main question was whether that should be made clear in the body of the article or in the commentary.

9. Mr. de SARAM said he failed to see what the problem was. The word "may", in the third line of paragraph 1 of article 5, was permissive and did not preclude other systems for the settlement of disputes. If that had to be explained in the commentary, so be it.

10. Mr. BENNOUNA said that he fully agreed with Mr. de Saram. It was not a question of rushing matters but of achieving a result. Accordingly, he too failed to see where the problem lay.

11. Mr. ARANGIO-RUIZ (Special Rapporteur) said that Mr. Razafindralambo's point could be covered briefly in the commentary.

12. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Commission could agree at that stage to adopt the draft articles proposed by the Drafting Committee for part three, on the

¹ Reproduced in *Yearbook* . . . 1995, vol. II (Part One).

² For the text of the articles of, and the annex to, part three of the draft as proposed by the Drafting Committee, see 2417th meeting, para. 1.

understanding that commentaries to those articles would be provided before the end of the session.

13. Mr. PELLET said that, as he had made plain at the previous meeting, he was opposed to the draft articles submitted in part three. He would therefore insist that the report did not state that part three of the draft had been adopted by consensus. He would also like to receive a guarantee from both the Commission's Rapporteur and the Chairman of the Drafting Committee that his opposition—opposition, not reservation—to the draft articles as a whole, and specifically to article 5, paragraph 2, and to article 7, would be recorded in the Commission's report to the General Assembly.

14. Mr. BENNOUNA said that, if Mr. Pellet was determined to oppose part three of the draft, he should seek a vote, as provided for in the rules of procedure. If, on the other hand, the matter could be settled without a vote, Mr. Pellet's views would be reflected in the summary record.

15. Mr. PELLET said that he did not wish merely to have his views reflected in the summary records. He wished it to be made clear in the report that two members had opposed adoption of the draft articles.

16. Mr. HE said that he would prefer part three of the draft articles to be adopted after parts one and two. If a vote was held at the current meeting, he would abstain.

17. Mr. AL-KHASAWNEH said that he endorsed Mr. Bennouna's views.

18. The CHAIRMAN asked whether members agreed to adopt the draft articles by consensus, with one member opposing.

19. Mr. BENNOUNA said that he firmly opposed the breaking of rules of procedure that had been established for decades. Mr. Pellet should either join in the consensus, with his views being reflected in the record, or request a vote.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that if Mr. Pellet wished to maintain his opposition, the Commission would proceed to a vote.

21. Mr. PELLET, replying to Mr. Bennouna, said that the Commission broke its rules of procedure every day, rules which made no provision for consensus. His own position had been meant to be flexible, but if the members insisted he would request a vote.

22. Mr. MIKULKA said that neither the Special Rapporteur nor the Chairman of the Drafting Committee had found it necessary to reply to the question he had raised at the previous meeting, namely whether they intended to return to the problem of the relationship between the system of dispute settlement contained in the draft articles and systems envisaged in other instruments. Referral to *lex specialis* was not sufficient. The question that arose was which *lex specialis*? In a case of diplomatic protection, for example, many instruments might apply. Indeed, if the Commission did not look into that problem itself, the General Assembly would tell it to do so. The

answer to his question would affect the way he intended to vote.

23. Mr. ARANGIO-RUIZ (Special Rapporteur) said it was his impression that he had replied to Mr. Mikulka, not only by referring to *lex specialis* but by indicating that it was clear in some of the articles that other possibilities were open to the parties. The parties were in a strait-jacket, as it were, only in given situations such as the ones envisaged in article 3 and article 5, paragraph 2. In any case, he was the first to maintain that the Commission's work on dispute settlement within the framework of the draft on State responsibility was not completed. That could be seen clearly from the paragraphs which constituted the introduction to the commentary to the articles, which he hoped would be issued the following day. Considering the connection he had established from the outset between article 12, of part two, and part three, and considering also other problems in part three and the need to look into article 7, it was plain that the Commission must take up the issue in the future. In doing so, it would consider the general problem to which Mr. Mikulka had referred.

24. He, as well as Mr. Calero Rodrigues, had always objected to the Drafting Committee's examination of article 12 separately from part three. That method did not make it clear that there was a problem of coexistence between means of dispute settlement to which States were bound independently of the future convention, which had been his intention in article 12, and the means which were established directly in the convention by part three.

25. Mr. YANKOV (Chairman of the Drafting Committee) said he agreed that the Commission should return to the issue of the relationship between the proposed convention and other international instruments, and indeed a number of other issues as well. However, that should not be an obstacle to taking a decision now on draft articles that it had worked on for nearly two months. He wished to appeal to members' wisdom and sense of responsibility in that regard.

26. Mr. AL-BAHARNA said that he was reluctant to proceed to a vote.

27. Mr. MAHIU said that there appeared to be a misunderstanding between Mr. Mikulka, on the one hand, and the Special Rapporteur and Chairman of the Drafting Committee, on the other. The latter both agreed that the problem raised by Mr. Mikulka needed further study.

28. Mr. ROSENSTOCK pointed out that commentaries were obviously the commentaries of the entire Commission. In the case in point, the commentary could only relate to the version of article 12 that had twice been approved by the Drafting Committee. He could not accept the introduction of other versions of article 12 into the commentary on part three, something that would plainly lead to voting on the commentary as well.

29. Mr. MIKULKA said that he was satisfied with the replies by the Special Rapporteur and Chairman of the Drafting Committee, regarding them as a promise that the problem would be taken up again. Accordingly, he would experience no difficulty regarding the adoption of the articles.

30. Mr. ARANGIO-RUIZ (Special Rapporteur) said that, in replying to Mr. Mikulka, he had acknowledged that there was a problem of the relationship between the dispute settlement means in part three and those to which the parties were bound in other relevant international instruments. Unfortunately, every time article 12 was mentioned, Mr. Rosenstock raised an objection.

31. With reference to the doubts expressed as to the feasibility of the draft articles becoming a convention, he did not see the point of the Commission working for many years on such a project without proposing a convention to States.

32. Mr. ROSENSTOCK, speaking on a point of order, said that he had never raised any objection to the Special Rapporteur saying or writing whatever he wished. He had merely said that it must be borne in mind that the commentaries of the Commission were the common property of the Commission.

33. Mr. ARANGIO-RUIZ (Special Rapporteur) said that he did not know to which commentaries Mr. Rosenstock was referring. He had been working on commentaries, and he saw no reason why those commentaries should be known to Mr. Rosenstock any more than to other members of the Commission. In those commentaries, he pointed out precisely the fact that there was the problem of the relationship between part three and article 12 of part two, both as he had originally conceived it and as it currently stood. The fact that he mentioned article 12 did not mean that he wanted to impose his own solutions. He merely meant that the Commission must take a further look at part three together with article 12 in whatever form it ultimately took. The commentaries were undeniably the Commission's common property. However, the Commission could not in all conscience fail to state in the commentaries that there was a problem outstanding.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the members agreed to proceed to a vote on part three of the draft articles on State responsibility, relating to the settlement of disputes (A/CN.4/L.513).

Part three of the draft articles was adopted by 17 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

35. Mr. AL-KHASAWNEH, speaking in explanation of vote, said that the articles in part three had called for compromise on all sides. Actually, he considered part three to be too weak. In particular, the fact that compulsory arbitration was confined to situations in which countermeasures had already been taken encouraged States to take the law into their own hands, in other words, to take countermeasures.

36. Mr. de SARAM said that he agreed with the views expressed by Mr. Al-Khasawneh and also earlier by Mr. Jacovides. The excellent mechanism provided for in part three gave States an opportunity at every juncture to choose their mode of dispute settlement. It was an achievement of which the Commission could be rightly proud.

Draft report of the Commission on the work of its forty-seventh session (*continued*)*

CHAPTER III. *State responsibility* (continued)* (A/CN.4/L.512 and Add.1)

B. *Consideration of the topic at the present session* (*continued*)*

37. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to resume its consideration of chapter III of the draft report, beginning with paragraph 38.

Paragraph 38 (*concluded*)*

38. Mr. AL-BAHARNA proposed that the word "continually" should be deleted from the last sentence of the paragraph.

39. Mr. ARANGIO-RUIZ (Special Rapporteur) and Mr. MAHIOU said they would prefer the original wording to stand: the adverb "continually" reflected what had actually happened during the debate.

40. Mr. YANKOV said that, as a general principle, the Commission should not change wording which reflected views expressed in plenary.

41. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, because many members were dissatisfied with the second sentence of paragraph 38 and since the ideas expressed in it were repeated elsewhere, the sentence should be deleted.

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 38, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 39 to 42

Paragraphs 39 to 42 were adopted.

Paragraph 43

42. Mr. PELLET, supported by Mr. MAHIOU, said that the reference, at the beginning of the first sentence to the "Special Rapporteur's position" made it unclear whether the Special Rapporteur or the members had expressed the view described.

43. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the words "A number of members expressed agreement with the Special Rapporteur's position that", in the first sentence, should be replaced by "A number of members considered that".

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 43, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 44 to 46

Paragraphs 44 to 46 were adopted.

* Resumed from the 2419th meeting.

Paragraph 47

44. Mr. YANKOV said that the reference to the views of the Special Rapporteur, in the first sentence, was unnecessary and should be deleted.

43. Mr. ARANGIO-RUIZ (Special Rapporteur) said that he had expressed the view reflected in paragraph 47 and had even produced an informal text dealing with the matter.

44. Mr. MAHIOU said that he, too, had expressed views on the subject dealt with in paragraph 47.

45. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the phrase "In response to a view expressed" should be inserted at the beginning of the first sentence. The reference to the Special Rapporteur would be retained.

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 47, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 48 to 57

Paragraphs 48 to 57 were adopted.

Paragraph 58

48. Mr. TOMUSCHAT said that he objected to the fourth sentence of paragraph 58, which stated that "aggression was often committed by industrialized democracies".

49. Mr. ARANGIO-RUIZ (Special Rapporteur) said the assertion that aggression was often committed by industrialized democracies might appear to contradict the statement earlier in the same sentence that "aggression was a wrongful act frequently perpetrated by dictators or otherwise despotic governments". Nevertheless, it could not be said to be untrue and, since it expressed a member's opinion, it should be left as it stood.

50. Mr. BOWETT suggested that the words "was often", in the fourth sentence, should be replaced by "could be".

51. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the best solution would be to delete the entire sentence.

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 58, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 59

52. Mr. HE proposed that the words "consequences of the crime", in the fourth sentence, should be replaced by "consequences of a crime".

Paragraph 59, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 60

53. Mr. BOWETT proposed that the phrase "on the basis that the right to self-determination justifies it"

should be inserted after "it would be inconceivable for a judicial body to sever part of a State's territory", in the fourth sentence, in order to make the point more clear to the reader.

Paragraph 60, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 61 to 73

Paragraphs 61 to 73 were adopted.

Paragraph 74

54. Mr. HE, supported by Mr. PELLET, suggested that the words "Some members, on the other hand", in the first sentence, should be replaced by "Other members".

Paragraph 74, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 75

55. Mr. PELLET said that the first sentence in the French version should be changed to reflect the English version accurately.

Paragraph 75 was adopted on that understanding.

Paragraph 76

56. Mr. ROSENSTOCK proposed that after the words "was viewed as incompatible with Article 27, paragraph 3", in the second sentence of paragraph 76, subparagraph (iii), the following words should be inserted: "bearing in mind, *inter alia*, that the Security Council would often be acting under Article 39 of Chapter VII".

57. Mr. PELLET proposed that, in the penultimate sentence, the words "in which case they were moot" should be replaced by "in which case they could not be adopted".

Paragraph 76, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 77 to 90

Paragraphs 77 to 90 were adopted.

Paragraph 91

58. Mr. HE suggested that the following phrase should be added at the end of the paragraph: "when both the questionable notion of 'State crime' contained in article 19 of part one and its legal consequences could be dealt with at the same time".

Paragraph 91, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 92 and 93

Paragraphs 92 and 93 were adopted.

Paragraph 94

59. Mr. PELLET proposed the deletion of the English terms appearing in the French text of the paragraph, which was perfectly satisfactory without them.

Paragraph 94, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 95 to 105

Paragraphs 95 to 105 were adopted.

Paragraph 106

60. Mr. HE proposed that, in order to reflect the minority views more precisely, the order of the last two sentences should be reversed and that the words "It was furthermore argued that the Commission was missing an opportunity" at the beginning of what was now the penultimate sentence should be replaced by "It was furthermore proposed that the Commission should defer the consideration of this question until the second reading, when it would have an opportunity", the remainder of the sentence remaining unchanged.

61. Mr. ARANGIO-RUIZ (Special Rapporteur) noted that a sentence to the same effect had already been added to paragraph 91.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that, if the point had been made twice in the discussion, it could be reflected twice in the report.

63. Mr. PELLET remarked that the quality of the report was not enhanced by repetitions.

64. Mr. ARANGIO-RUIZ (Special Rapporteur) said that, if Mr. He's amendment was to be adopted, he would wish to add a passage indicating his disagreement with the views reflected in the sentences in question.

65. Mr. ROSENSTOCK said that he had no objection to the proposed addition but did not consider it essential to wait for the second reading before considering at the same time the issues raised by the concept of crime and the consequences to be drawn therefrom.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that, unless he heard any objections, he would take it that the Commission agreed to the amendment proposed by Mr. He.

Paragraph 106, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 107

67. Mr. JACOVIDES said that the expression "blank cheque" in the last part of the paragraph was unfortunate and could give rise to misinterpretations. Perhaps the words "would be tantamount to giving the Committee a blank cheque" might be replaced by "would be devoid of meaning".

68. Mr. MIKULKA said that he had employed the expression referred to and would prefer the text to be maintained as it stood.

Paragraph 107 was adopted.

Paragraph 108

69. Mr. HE recalled that, after the vote referred to in the paragraph, two members of the Commission, Mr. Yamada and Mr. Thiam, had made statements explaining that their affirmative vote should not be interpreted as an endorsement of the draft articles proposed by the Special Rapporteur. He wondered whether a sentence to that effect should not be added to paragraph 108.

70. Mr. YAMADA said that the statement he had made in explanation of his vote was correctly reflected in the summary record of the 2406th meeting. He did not think a further reference in the report was necessary.

71. Mr. de SARAM suggested that the words "on the subject", at the end of the paragraph, should be replaced by "in the Commission".

Paragraph 108, as amended, was adopted.

72. The CHAIRMAN said that a short addendum to chapter III of the report, consisting of two or three paragraphs and reflecting the decision taken by the Commission earlier in the meeting, would be issued separately and placed before the Commission. He hoped members would be prepared to consider that document, as well as others still outstanding, even if they could not be made available in more than one or, at most, two languages before the end of the session.

73. Mr. PELLET said that a short addendum consisting of only two or three paragraphs would hardly suffice to reflect the lengthy discussion which had led up to the decision taken earlier in the meeting.

74. Mr. MAHIU said that, while he understood the difficulties faced by the secretariat in having to translate so many documents at so late a stage in the session, he failed to see how members of the Commission who, like himself, had a less than perfect knowledge of English could adopt important decisions on the basis of documents available only in that language.

75. Mr. de SARAM said that he shared the concern expressed by Mr. Mahiou. Commentaries to draft articles, which the Commission would be called upon to consider during the remainder of the session, were even more important than the Commission's report and the full participation of members who did not use English as their working language was essential.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.