Document:-
A/CN.4/SR.246

Summary record of the 246th meeting

Topic:
Nationality including statelessness

Extract from the Yearbook of the International Law Commission:-
1954 , **vol. I**

would be pointless to provide for deprivation of nationality as well. On the other hand, if the traitor was abroad, to deprive him of nationality was of somewhat nominal advantage.

56. Mr. HSU felt that there was no necessity for introducing the concepts of treason and desertion into the relevant provision.

57. Mr. CÓRDOVA, Special Rapporteur, stressed that the convention on the reduction of statelessness was an attempt to secure the co-operation of States which would not be prepared to accede to the convention on elimination of statelessness. It was an effort to diminish the evil of statelessness. Admittedly, it was desirable to eradicate the evil altogether, but that would probably be impracticable in the case of some countries which had strong views on certain issues and might refuse to sign a convention on elimination of statelessness. Accordingly, the convention on the reduction of statelessness was taking the wishes of those countries into account, and he hoped that they would accede to it.

58. The CHAIRMAN said he fully agreed with that policy.

59. Faris Bey el-KHOURI said that the terms used in the amendment required definition. It would be necessary to determine whether "desertion" was concerned with wartime cases or was intended to cover also desertion from the armed forces in peacetime. With regard to treason, it was unfortunately all too common for a revolutionary régime to regard as traitors all persons who did not agree with it. It would be most undesirable if it were suggested that such a régime could deprive all its political opponents of their nationality.

60. Mr. CÓRDOVA, Special Rapporteur, said that the redraft of article 7, paragraph 2, had been settled at a previous session,[6] and there was no need to discuss it further. The final text would read: "In the case to which paragraph 1 above refers, the deprivation shall be pronounced in accordance with due process of law which will always provide for recourse to a judicial authority."

Article 8 (resumed from the 244th meeting)

61. The CHAIRMAN read the proposed redraft of article 8: "The parties shall not deprive any person of his nationality, so as to render him stateless, on racial, ethnical, religious or political grounds."

62. Mr. LAUTERPACHT pointed out that the Commission had already voted against the addition of the words: "so as to render him stateless."

63. The CHAIRMAN confirmed Mr. Lauterpacht's observation.[7]

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

[6] *Vide supra*, 243rd meeting, para. 57.

[7] *Vide supra*, 244th meeting, para. 10.

246th MEETING

Monday, 14 June 1954, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS

Chairman: Mr. A. E. F. SANDSTRÖM

Present:

Members: Mr. G. AMADO, Mr. R. CÓRDOVA, Faris Bey el-KHOURI, Mr. F. GARCÍA-AMADOR, Mr. S. HSU, Mr. H. LAUTERPACHT, Mr. C. SALAMANCA, Mr. G. SCELLE, Mr. J. SPIROPOULOS.

Secretariat: 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 5 of the agenda) (*continued*)

REPORT ON THE ELIMINATION OR REDUCTION OF PRESENT STATELESSNESS (A/CN.4/81)

GENERAL DEBATE AND BEGINNING OF DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE REDUCTION OF PRESENT STATELESSNESS

1. The CHAIRMAN said that at its previous meeting the Commission had failed to obtain a quorum for voting and hoped that every effort would be made by members to be present at meetings. He proposed that the Commission consider the Special Rapporteur's third report on the elimination or reduction of statelessness, containing proposals regarding the elimination or reduction of *present* statelessness (A/CN.4/81).[1]

2. Mr. CÓRDOVA, Special Rapporteur, recalled that his first report on the elimination or reduction of statelessness (A/CN.4/64)[2] had contained a recommendation that the Commission should discuss the problem of present statelessness which was of capital importance both to the United Nations and to individual Governments. At its fifth session, the Commission had been unable to consider his second report on the elimination or reduction of statelessness (A/CN.4/75),[3] and he had therefore taken it as a basis for the report he was submitting to the Commission at its current session. The latter report contained, as Part I, a "Protocol to

[1] Reproduced in *Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1954*, vol. II.

[2] See *Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1953*, vol. II.

[3] *Ibid.*

the Convention on the Elimination of Future Statelessness, for the elimination of present statelessness", which he had been able to simplify and shorten in the light of criticism received concerning a similar protocol appended to the second report (A/CN.4/75).

3. Statelessness presented a very serious problem. There were in Europe some 400,000 refugees known to be stateless and at least another 400,000 in the Middle East. In fact he believed the figures were considerably higher both for *de facto* and *de jure* stateless persons. The distinction between the two categories was difficult to establish and placed the Commission before a very delicate problem.

4. Criticism of his report included the argument that in most cases the protocol would be applicable to adult persons without any link whatsoever with the State conferring its nationality, and that it would be easier for Governments to deal with cases of children not yet born. The protocol dealt with three different categories of stateless persons: those who were born in the territory of one of the parties to the protocol before the entry into force of the Convention on the Elimination of Future Statelessness; those who were born in the territory of a State not a party to the protocol; and, finally, those who, not having been born in the territory of any of the parties nor having parents possessing the nationality of any of the parties, nevertheless resided in the territory of one of the parties. All the proposals were based on the assumed readiness of Governments to make certain amendments to their existing legislation.

5. A further objection which had been raised was that no matter how undesirable the stateless alien might be he would nevertheless have to be accepted by the State. If, however, that principle were rejected the whole purpose of the protocol, the elimination of statelessness, would not be attained. Inasmuch as an undesirable stateless alien residing in the country was not likely to be deported, the eventual grant of nationality would be a formality having for the State no directly practical consequence. States might be allowed to retain the right to legislate with a view to refusing nationality to undesirables, but such a provision would be acceptable only if the object was the reduction of statelessness, not its elimination.

6. Mr. Weis of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees had expressed the view that as it was hardly realistic to assume that existing statelessness could be eliminated or even reduced to any great extent, it was very important to give stateless persons some form of protection and to improve their legal status.[4]

7. While agreeing with the need to provide protection, he (Mr. Córdova) believed that such action did not fall within the Commission's terms of reference. The Commission should restrict itself to principles and to devising juridical solutions.

8. He had given much consideration to the possibility of conferring on stateless persons a kind of "international nationality" as suggested by Mr. Scelle.[5] The stateless alien would receive the protection not of a nation, but of an international body such as the United Nations. In theory, there could be few objections to the proposal, particularly in view of the modern tendency to restrict national sovereignty. There were, however, two practical objections: firstly, stateless persons on whom the United Nations might confer "international nationality" would still find themselves in every country in an inferior situation as compared to nationals; and secondly, it would not be easy to define their rights and obligations, particularly in the matter of military service.

9. An entirely new approach to the matter had been suggested by Mr. Lauterpacht and Faris Bey el-Khouri. Mr. Lauterpacht[6] had advanced the idea that nationality should be granted to stateless persons who had had their residence in the territory of one of the parties for ten years, subject to certain qualifications. Faris Bey el-Khouri[7] had proposed that the party in whose territory a stateless person resided should grant to that person a certificate of registration describing him as a "protected subject" or "protected citizen". Such a certificate would entitle the person in question to the protection of the State pending the final settlement of his case.

10. While he agreed with the principle of granting stateless persons some form of protection, he rejected the idea of "a provisional nationality", as such a proposal did not solve the problem, but merely postponed its solution. With regard to the proposed formula of "protected citizen", it would be necessary to determine the scope of the rights and duties attaching to that status. He was in favour of granting stateless persons obtaining that status all civil rights with the exception of political rights, while their children should have full nationality with unrestricted civil rights. That compromise should reassure Governments which feared that a large number of stateless persons might exercise an undue influence on the political situation of the country. That danger hardly existed where children were concerned, as they would probably have been assimilated.

11. In the light of the suggestions of Mr. Lauterpacht and Faris Bey el-Khouri he had drafted an alternative convention on the elimination of present statelessness and also another alternative convention on the reduction of present statelessness (part III and part IV, respectively, of the present report A/CN.4/81).

12. Another important but delicate question was that of *de facto* stateless persons whose circumstances were frequently more tragic than those of *de jure* stateless persons. They had not been formally deprived of their nationality, but were neither in a position to make effective use of it, nor officially able to renounce it. He therefore proposed that *de facto* stateless persons

[4] Cf. A/CN.4/81, para. 15.

[5] *Ibid.*, para. 21.

[6] *Ibid.*, para. 29.

[7] *Ibid.*, para. 30.

should be treated as juridically stateless on the condition that, to qualify for the benefit of the convention, they renounced the nationality which was still theirs in theory.

13. It could be said that the Commission was not competent to deal with the problem of *de facto* statelessness, but, in his opinion, the argument was not a valid one. Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stated that everyone had the right to a nationality and in its resolution 116 D (VI) the Economic and Social Council had interpreted it as signifying "an effective right to a nationality".[8] He believed that the interpretation given by the Council was correct, and that consequently the Commission should consider the matter.

14. Mr. HSU was glad that the Commission was discussing the problem of present statelessness. He was impressed by certain suggestions contained in the report before the Commission, and congratulated the Special Rapporteur on introducing the delicate problem of *de facto* statelessness. He was sure that many members would be interested in that aspect of the problem and hoped that a new article referring to it would be added to the draft Convention on the Elimination of Future Statelessness, similar to that introduced into the draft Convention on the Elimination of Present Statelessness.

15. He had certain doubts about the terms "protected subject" and "protected citizen" which would have to be carefully defined. The "protected" status proposed for stateless persons was of an intermediate nature and not in fact necessarily that of either a "citizen" or a "subject". It had further been implied that stateless persons enjoying the benefits of some such "protected" status would be liable to military service. If that "protected" status did not include the exercise of political rights the proposal, he felt, was hardly fair.

16. He was interested in Mr. Scelle's proposal and suggested that the Commission should devise a compromise solution granting stateless persons a "protected" status within a particular country, and the protection of an international body such as the United Nations, outside the frontiers of their country of residence.

17. Mr. LAUTERPACHT paid a tribute to the work accomplished by the Special Rapporteur. He pointed out, however, that the problems of existing statelessness did not lend themselves to complicated solutions and in that respect the draft submitted was too detailed; what was more serious, some of the proposals it contained were unpractical. The draft Convention on the Elimination of Present Statelessness was so drastic and so unlikely to be accepted by governments that it might even jeopardize the fate of the draft Conventions on the Elimination or Reduction of Future Statelessness. The main problem was not the formulation of a general rule of international law in the matter of statelessness; it was rather the solution, by reference to broad humanitarian considerations, of a practical problem of some magnitude.

18. The introduction of the concept of *de facto* statelessness complicated the matter still further. It was not an easy concept and was insufficiently explained in the report. He thought that it would be very difficult in practice to make a clear distinction between *de facto* and *de jure* statelessness, and if the problem of *de facto* statelessness was to some extent urgent, it was not extremely urgent. What criteria would a State have for deciding that a person, though having the nationality of a friendly State, was in fact stateless? What criteria would a tribunal have for deciding that question and imposing on a State the duty to grant to such persons the very substantial rights contemplated in the proposal? It was not correct to say that the *de facto* stateless represented the bulk of stateless persons, as the overwhelming majority of stateless persons had been formally deprived of their nationality. He was therefore opposed to complicating the existing draft conventions by the addition of the problem of *de facto* statelessness.

19. With regard to the draft Convention for the Reduction of Existing Statelessness submitted by the Special Rapporteur,[9] he suggested that it might well be replaced in its entirety by the following three articles drafted by himself:

"*Article I*

"The parties agree to confer their nationality upon stateless persons who have been resident within their territory for a period of ten years or more provided that such persons fulfil the conditions which the law provides for acquisition of nationality by naturalization.

"*Article II*

"The parties may, instead of granting nationality to the persons referred to in article I, confer upon them the status of protected citizens assimilating them in respect of all rights, except those of a political character, to their own nationals. Such persons shall comply with all obligations, including the duty of allegiance, resting upon other nationals. The parties agree that any State which has acted upon the provisions of this article shall be entitled to grant to such persons international protection to the extent to which it is entitled to grant it to its nationals.

"*Article III*

"The effects of status conferred under the preceding articles shall extend to the children of the persons concerned and to their wives, if the latter so desire."

[8] *Resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council during its sixth session from 2 February to 11 March 1948*, p. 18 (United Nations publication, Sales No. 1948.I.5).

[9] Part IV of A/CN.4/81.

A convention in the form in which he now submitted it would be simpler, and therefore perhaps more acceptable to governments.

20. Mr. CÓRDOVA, Special Rapporteur, said that, in view of the fears expressed that the protocols in annex I of his third report (A/CN.4/81) might not be acceptable to States, he would be prepared to adopt a different method of dealing with present statelessness. For that purpose he submitted the draft alternative Convention on the Reduction of Present Statelessness reproduced in annex II of his third report. He was willing to accept drafting changes to allow for the remarks made by Mr. Hsu, Mr. Lauterpacht and Mr. Scelle; nevertheless it was difficult to give the United Nations responsibility for the international protection of stateless persons while leaving their protection in the different countries to the States where these persons resided.

21. He added that although *de jure* stateless persons might be more numerous than *de facto* ones, the latter were in a much worse position: it was absolutely essential to give them an effective nationality.

22. Mr. SCELLE said that the discussion was somewhat academic, for the draft conventions themselves were just as hypothetical as the protocols: he did not think for a moment that Governments would be prepared to make the fundamental changes in their nationality legislation necessary to embody in it the principles laid down in the draft conventions and protocols. The concept of nationality was a very subjective one: each country had its own ideas on nationality, largely based on sentiment, and it was practically impossible to change those ideas. The suggestion that Governments should restore their nationality to persons who had been deprived of it by juridical decisions would encounter even stronger opposition, as it implied an impairment of the internal sovereignty of States.

23. Whereas the international sovereignty of States was the subject of much justified criticism on the part of international lawyers, the internal sovereignty of States had never been seriously challenged. It was unfortunately only too true that, as international law now stood, a State was free to deal as it pleased with its own nationals. And there was an even worse position than statelessness *de jure* and statelessness *de facto*: it was what he would term "internal statelessness"—namely, the case of persons deprived of their nationality, but prevented from leaving their country of origin. The only remedy would have been the old-fashioned process of humanitarian intervention, as applied in the 19th century when the United States, for example, had protested to Romania against the anti-Jewish pogroms. But that remedy had fallen into disuse.

24. It was clear that if too much was asked of the States, there would be very few signatories to the conventions and still fewer ratifications.

25. He went on to explain that his proposal did not commit Governments to any positive action of any kind. Stateless persons would remain stateless, but would be linked to a legal order—namely, that of the United Nations; they would receive a juridical status under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. As all jurists knew, once considerations of sentiment were put aside, nationality was no more than the linking of an individual to a certain particular legal order. It was, therefore, not at all paradoxical to speak of an international nationality, as he had done. It would be to the everlasting credit of the United Nations to enable many millions of persons to lead a normal life.

26. Mr. Lauterpacht's proposal would encounter an almost insurmountable obstacle: States only granted their nationality or their protection to persons of whom they approved. Most stateless persons would not benefit from a remedy on the lines of naturalization.

27. The problem of determining to whom the stateless persons owed allegiance in so far as military service was concerned could be solved by incorporating them in a United Nations security force.

28. He would be prepared to accept any proposal agreed upon by the majority as he considered that some decision should be taken.

29. Mr. CÓRDOVA, Special Rapporteur, said that to a large extent Mr. Scelle's criticisms applied to all the work of the Commission on future statelessness, and not only to the work on present statelessness. He agreed that it would be difficult to enlist the support of Governments for the Commission's proposals, but it was better even to build castles in the air than to ignore the terrible problem of statelessness.

30. He felt that the modern tendency to impose military obligations on foreigners resident in a country was justified, and that, in view of that tendency, stateless persons would in all probability be asked to serve in the armies of the host countries; it was therefore clear that there would be no question of conferring on them rights without corresponding duties. It would be difficult to reconcile the suggestion of Mr. Lauterpacht and Faris Bey el-Khouri on the one hand with those of Mr. Scelle on the other; for his part, he would prefer the stateless persons to be absorbed in the communities in which they lived.

31. Mr. SCELLE said that, at one time, foreigners in Belgium were compelled to serve in the national guard which was responsible for internal security, but were not required to serve in the army: a somewhat similar system could be adopted for stateless persons. States no longer had the right to resort to war and it was to be hoped that the day would come when an international police force (in which stateless persons could serve) would replace national armies.

32. Mr. AMADO agreed with Mr. Lauterpacht that the Commission should concentrate on the draft conventions which were concerned with its main aim, namely, that of eliminating—or at least reducing the occurrence of—future statelessness, and not insist on the draft protocols concerning the secondary issue of present statelessness.

33. Mr. LAUTERPACHT said he wished to make it clear that unlike Mr. Scelle, he was not at all pessimistic concerning the prospects of the proposed conventions for the elimination or reduction of future statelessness; the differences between the two were not substantial. The attitude of the Governments of the United Kingdom and Norway towards the draft Convention on the Elimination of Future Statelessness showed there was no warrant for regarding it as utterly impracticable. No draft convention that was rational and in accordance with basic principles of international law could be considered as fruitless; on the contrary it was bound to become the starting point of beneficent changes. For that reason he deprecated the view underlying Mr. Scelle's proposal that, as the proposed conventions were in any case impracticable, the Commission was at liberty to consider a purely ideal solution such as proposed by Mr. Scelle.

34. With regard to the status of *de facto* stateless persons, it seemed to him that the 1951 Convention relating to the status of refugees[10] dealt with most problems by giving the persons concerned a treatment for most purposes similar to that of nationals within their countries of residence, while at the same time affording them a substantial measure of freedom in international travel.

35. With regard to military service, he quoted the case of France, where the National Assembly had recently adopted a resolution, probably as a reaction to a parallel measure in the United States, to compel all aliens residing in France for more than a year to serve in the French army. Australia had adopted a similar measure.

36. He did not share Mr. Scelle's view that as nationality was obviously a matter of national sentiment, the notion of its regulation by international law was impracticable. Nationality was rapidly emerging from the stage when it was considered only in the light of sentiment; a more rational approach had, in particular, led to nationality being treated as a proper subject for international regulation, as evidenced by The Hague Convention on the subject. Some of the ideas incorporated in The Hague Convention of 1930 on certain questions relating to the conflict of nationality laws had been widely followed both by States which had ratified it and by others.[11] Doctrines such as the subordination of the nationality of married women to that of their husbands, which had previously been regarded by some States as fundamental and immutable principles of national law, had been changed by those very States—in some cases with a thoroughness going beyond that of the measures contemplated in The Hague Convention. The same applied to the question of expatriation and loss of nationality of origin as the result of naturalization.

37. Finally, he suggested, as a practical proposal, that his proposal for granting stateless persons naturalization after ten years' residence should be combined with that of giving them the status of protected persons if the State concerned so preferred.

38. Mr. CÓRDOVA, Special Rapporteur, said that as in most countries foreigners could be naturalized after five years' residence, it seemed to him that Mr. Lauterpacht's proposal, by suggesting a ten-year period, would be a retrograde step. The stipulation of a residence qualification should be omitted so that stateless persons could obtain a nationality without delay.

39. In the draft alternative Convention on the Reduction of Present Statelessness (annex II of third report, A/CN.4/81) article 1, paragraph 2, laid down that: "The national legislation of the party may exclude from the application of paragraph 1 only those stateless persons who are undesirable or whose admission as protected subjects might constitute a threat to the internal or to the external security of the party." It was therefore possible, under that provision, for a State to exclude from the benefit of naturalization any person it had good reasons to regard as undesirable.

40. The CHAIRMAN inquired from the Special Rapporteur whether it was his intention to drop the proposals contained in annex I of his third report (A/CN.4/81).

41. Mr. CÓRDOVA, Special Rapporteur, said that was so, and that he would only proceed with the draft alternative Convention on the Reduction of Present Statelessness reproduced in the second column of annex II of his third report (A/CN.4/81). He would like to have some time to study Mr. Lauterpacht's proposal and compare it with his draft convention in order to see how he could incorporate Mr. Lauterpacht's ideas and perhaps follow his advice and simplify the draft.

42. The CHAIRMAN noted that the protocols contained in annex I of the third report (A/CN.4/81) had been discarded.

43. Mr. CÓRDOVA, Special Rapporteur, pointed out that the three articles drafted by Mr. Lauterpacht contained no reference to a special agency or to a tribunal.

44. Mr. LAUTERPACHT stressed that his draft convention was no more than an abridged version of Mr. Córdova's. Perhaps a fourth article might be added providing for an agency and a tribunal, although he felt some doubts as to the advisability of such a provision. The convention on existing statelessness had to be made as simple and untechnical as possible.

45. Mr. CÓRDOVA, Special Rapporteur, drew attention to article 3 of the draft convention on the reduction of present statelessness (A/CN.4/81, annex II) which laid down that "Descendants of protected nationals shall obtain full citizenship, including political rights, on reaching the age of majority". That was an important difference from Mr. Lauterpacht's draft, which, in its article III, laid down that "The effects of status conferred under the preceding articles

[10] United Nations publication, Sales No. 1951.IV.4.

[11] The text of the Convention may be found on p. 172 of *A Study of Statelessness* (United Nations publication, Sales No. 1949.XIV.2).

shall extend to the children of the persons concerned and to their wives, if the latter so desire". That was tantamount to depriving the children of stateless persons of political rights in all cases in which States availed themselves of the right given to them by article II of Mr. Lauterpacht's draft, which provided: "The parties may, instead of granting nationality to the persons referred to in article I, confer upon them the status of protected citizens assimilating them in respect of all rights, except those of a political character, to their own nationals..."

46. Another difference was that Mr. Lauterpacht's draft convention contained no provision similar to article 4 of the draft Convention on the Reduction of Present Statelessness contained in document A/CN. 4/81, annex II, covering *de facto* stateless persons. That provision relating to *de facto* stateless persons he was not prepared to give up and he would defend it until it was adopted or else defeated by an actual vote of the Commission.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. Lauterpacht's draft was a substitute for the Special Rapporteur's and the Commission could not vote on the new proposed draft unless members were given time to consider its implications.

48. Mr. CÓRDOVA, Special Rapporteur, invited the members of the Commission to compare the draft Convention on the Reduction of Present Statelessness (A/CN.4/81, annex II) to Mr. Lauterpacht's draft; he drew attention especially to the fact that, whereas the latter made its benefits subject to a ten-year residence qualification, his own draft did not contain such a provision, but enabled contracting States to exclude undesirable persons from the benefit of the provisions of the convention.

49. Mr. LAUTERPACHT inquired whether it was suggested that a stateless person residing in a country for ten days should acquire the nationality of that country.

50. Mr. CÓRDOVA, Special Rapporteur, said that he agreed that an applicant for naturalization should prove a connexion with the country of his adoption, but he felt that a ten-year period was far too long compared to that of five years which was considered sufficient for naturalization in most countries. It was true that there were some countries like the United States which considered that a person was entitled to naturalization as of right after satisfying the residence qualification; most of them always reserved the right of the authorities to reject an application for naturalization. But whatever system prevailed, it was true to say that a period of ten years' residence was in excess of what most countries considered satisfactory evidence of permanent settlement and presumed assimilation.

51. Faris Bey el-KHOURI said he did not think that it was impossible to eliminate statelessness; if the relevant convention were adopted by States and its provisions carried out by them in good faith, the problem of future statelessness would be disposed of. Existing statelessness was a temporary problem, for the children of persons now stateless would not be stateless if the Commission's proposals were adopted; as the present generation died out, the whole problem of statelessness would be solved.

52. Until such time as the stateless persons were granted a nationality, it was desirable to solve the interim problem by giving them the status of protected persons.

53. He felt that the ten-year residence qualification was most unfair, but was inclined to leave it to the States concerned to provide for such periods as their municipal law stipulated for the grant of naturalization.

54. Stateless persons were not all in the same category; there should be more than one remedy for statelessness so that in each case the remedy corresponded to the cause of the evil. Some persons had become stateless through failure to avail themselves of an option within the legally specified time limit, others because they had failed to register; those persons should be given the right to opt or to register. Certain other persons had been made stateless through deprivation of nationality by way of penalty and, in their case, a full and general pardon was the answer to the problem.

55. Mr. CÓRDOVA, Special Rapporteur, said, in conclusion, that he would follow the plan he had suggested earlier in the meeting, namely, to drop the draft protocols on present statelessness (A/CN.4/81, annex I) as well as the draft alternative Convention on the Elimination of Present statelessness (A/CN.4/81, annex II on the left column) and concentrate on the draft alternative Convention on the Reduction of Present Statelessness (A/CN.4/81, annex II, right column) and Mr. Lauterpacht's proposed draft convention.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

247th MEETING

Tuesday, 15 June 1954, at 9.30 a.m.

CONTENTS

Chairman: Mr. A. E. F. SANDSTRÖM

Present:

Members: Mr. G. AMADO, Mr. R. CÓRDOVA, Faris Bey el-KHOURI, Mr. F. GARCÍA-AMADOR, Mr. S. HSU, Mr. H. LAUTERPACHT, Mr. R. PAL, Mr. C. SALAMANCA, Mr. G. SCELLE, Mr. J. SPIROPOULOS.