

Document:-
A/CN.4/SR.618

Summary record of the 618th meeting

Topic:
Consular intercourse and immunities

Extract from the Yearbook of the International Law Commission:-
1961 , vol. I

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

in cases in which one, the sending state, had appointed a consul by means of a commission signed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and in which the receiving State declined to admit the consul on the ground that the document should be signed by the head of State.

107. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as a member of the Commission, said that the debate had convinced him of the usefulness of the article.

108. Mr. BARTOŠ also supported the Special Rapporteur's views. Some States whose consular commissions were always signed by the head of State declined to accept commissions not signed by the Head of State of the sending State, on grounds of hierarchical symmetry.

Article 9 was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

618th MEETING

Monday, 26 June 1961, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Grigory I. TUNKIN

Consular intercourse and immunities (A/4425; A/CN.4/136 and Add. 1-11; A/CN.4/137)

(continued)

[Agenda item 2]

DRAFT ARTICLES (A/4425) : SECOND READING *(continued)*

ARTICLE 10 (formerly article 14) (Provisional admission)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to continue its second reading of the draft on consular intercourse and immunities.

2. The Drafting Committee had submitted the following draft of article 10:

"Pending delivery of the exequatur, the head of a consular post may be admitted on a provisional basis to the exercise of his functions and to the benefit of the present articles."

Article 10 was adopted.

ARTICLE 11 (formerly article 15) (Obligation to notify the authorities of the consular district)

3. The CHAIRMAN said the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 11:

"As soon as the head of a consular post is admitted to the exercise of his functions, the receiving State shall immediately notify the competent authorities of the consular district. It shall also ensure that the necessary measures are taken to enable the head of the consular post to carry out the duties of his office and to have the benefit of the provisions of the present articles."

Article 11 was adopted.

ARTICLE 12 (formerly article 16) (Temporary exercise of the functions of head of a consular post)

4. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 12:

"1. If the position of head of post is vacant, or if the head of post is unable to carry out his functions, an acting head of post may act provisionally as head of the consular post. He shall as a general rule be chosen from among the consular officials or the diplomatic staff of the sending State. In the exceptional cases where no such officials are available to assume this position, the acting head of post may be chosen from among the members of the administrative and technical staff.

"2. The name of the acting head of post shall be notified, either by the head of post, or, if he is unable to do so, by any competent authority, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the receiving State or to the authority designated by it. As a general rule, this notification shall be given in advance.

"3. The competent authorities shall afford assistance and protection to the acting head of post and admit him, while he is in charge of the post, to the benefit of the present articles on the same basis as the head of the consular post concerned."

Paragraph 1 was adopted.

5. Mr. ERIM said that the words "by any competent authority" as used in paragraph 2 were not sufficiently precise. It should be stated that the authorities in question were those considered competent by the sending State. Otherwise it might be thought that the receiving State could dispute the competence of the authorities notifying it of the name of the acting head of post.

6. Mr. AGO said that Mr. Erim's remark was correct and suggested that the passage in question should be amended to read: "by any competent authority of the sending State".

It was so agreed.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that, at the Vienna Conference, on the suggestion of the United Kingdom delegation, the expression "Ministry for Foreign Affairs" had been adopted in preference to "Ministry of Foreign Affairs". He therefore suggested that the expression adopted at Vienna should be used in the draft under discussion.

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 2 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 3 was adopted.

Article 12, as amended, was adopted as a whole.

ARTICLE 13 (formerly article 17) (Precedence)

8. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 13:

"1. Heads of consular posts shall rank in each class according to the date of the grant of the exequatur.

"2. If, however, the head of the consular post, before obtaining the exequatur, is admitted to the exercise of his functions provisionally, his precedence shall be determined according to the date of the pro-

visional admission; this precedence shall be maintained even after the granting of the exequatur.

"3. The order of precedence as between two or more heads of consular posts who obtained the exequatur or provisional admission on the same date shall be determined according to the dates on which their commissions or similar instruments were presented or of the notice referred to in article 7, paragraph 3.

"4. Acting heads of posts rank after all heads of posts in the class to which the heads of posts whom they replace belong, and, as between themselves, they rank according to the order of precedence of these same heads of post.

"5. Heads of posts, of whatever designation, have precedence over consular officials not holding such rank."

Paragraph 1 was adopted.

9. Sir Humphrey WALDOCK proposed the deletion of the word "even" from paragraph 2. Provisional recognition was precisely intended to enable the consular official concerned to rank for the purposes of precedence from the date of that recognition.

10. Mr. AGO supported that amendment.

The amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted.

11. Mr. ERIM said that paragraph 3 did not solve all problems of precedence. Two heads of post might present their commissions on the same date.

12. Mr. ŽOUREK, Special Rapporteur, pointed out that no government had put forward any objections to former article 17. The question raised by Mr. Erim was not likely to arise frequently in practice. It could also arise in the case of diplomatic agents and no attempt had been made to solve it in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. The rare cases that might occur could be left to be decided in accordance with the usage prevailing in the receiving State.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that since there were no specific proposals before the Commission, he would take it that the Commission accepted paragraph 3 as drafted.

It was so agreed.

14. Sir Humphrey WALDOCK said that, everywhere in the draft and in particular in paragraphs 4 and 5 of article 13 "heads of posts" should be corrected to read "heads of post".

It was so agreed.

Paragraphs 4 and 5, as amended, were adopted.

Article 13, as amended was adopted as a whole.

ARTICLE 14 (formerly article 18) (Performance of diplomatic acts by the head of a consular post.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 14:

"In a State where the sending State has no diplomatic mission, the head of a consular post may, with the consent of the receiving State be authorized to, perform diplomatic acts."

Article 14 was adopted.

ARTICLE 15 (formerly article 7 bis) (Appointment of the same person by two or more States as head of a consular post)

16. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 15:

"Two or more States may appoint the same person as head of a consular post in another State, unless this State objects."

Article 15 was adopted.

ARTICLE 16 (formerly article 21)
(Appointment of the consular staff)

17. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 16:

"1. Subject to the provisions of articles 17, 19 and 20, the sending State may freely appoint the members of the consular staff.

"2. The sending State may, if such is required by its law, request the receiving State to grant the exequatur to a consular official appointed to a consulate in conformity with paragraph 1 of this article who is not the head of post."

Paragraph 1 was adopted.

18. The CHAIRMAN said that while he had no objection to paragraph 2, its purpose did not seem quite clear to him. As formulated, the provision did not seem to imply any obligation at all.

19. Sir Humphrey WALDOCK said that in some cases the law of certain countries, particularly that of England, did not recognize an act performed by a consular official abroad unless that official had an exequatur from the receiving State. In practice, the States concerned solved that type of problem without difficulty even in the absence of a provision along the lines of paragraph 2.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that he recalled the discussion on the matter, but did not feel that the provision laid down any very positive rule.

21. Mr. ŽOUREK, Special Rapporteur, said that the provision had been introduced as an indication, so as to serve as a basis for a useful practice. The Drafting Committee had avoided laying down any obligation upon the receiving State because there were some States which gave an exequatur only to the head of post, and those States would not accept a provision which laid down obligations conflicting with their law and practice.

Paragraph 2 was adopted.

Article 16 as a whole was adopted.

ARTICLE 17 (formerly article 22)
(Size of the staff)

22. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 17:

"In the absence of an express agreement as to the size of the consular staff, the receiving State may require that the size of the staff be kept within reasonable and normal limits, having regard to circumstances and conditions in the consular district and to the needs of the particular consulate."

23. Mr. ŽOUREK, Special Rapporteur, drew attention to the Netherlands objection, based on very sound

a matter for objective criteria, but was political. If a consulate had a larger staff than the receiving State thought desirable, it would have to express its disapproval or else reach an agreement beforehand. States which had reservations about unduly large diplomatic staffs would certainly be even more reluctant to admit large consular staffs, for whereas the central authorities could exercise some supervision over diplomatic staffs the consular staffs were likely to be distant from the capital and subject to supervision only by local authorities. It would be easier for the States concerned to discuss what were the reasonable and normal limits for the size of the staff than to take a dispute to the International Court of Justice. The receiving State would, of course, have quite as much knowledge as the sending State of the circumstances and conditions in the consular district and the needs of the particular consulate, especially with regard to trade and the protection of nationals. The doubts of the receiving State might not be justified, but if they existed, they were good grounds for requiring a prior agreement between the parties concerned. For all those reasons he considered that the formula used in the Vienna Convention should be followed.

60. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the proposal that draft article 17 be amended to read "... within limits considered by it to be reasonable and normal ...".

The amendment was rejected by 8 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

61. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Drafting Committee's text for article 17.

That text was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

62. Mr. AMADO said that he had abstained from voting as he had previously announced. He hoped that the Commission's representative to the General Assembly would make it clear that a number of members had not been in favour of the formula used in article 11 of the Vienna Convention but had thought that the Commission should present a text of its own.

63. Sir Humphrey WALDOCK expressed the hope that the Special Rapporteur would not say anything in his commentary that might suggest that the Commission considered the Vienna formulation to be devoid of all legal meaning. If it were left entirely to the receiving State to decide what were the reasonable and normal limits of the consular staff, that decision could be completely arbitrary. The Commission should not go so far. The decision must be made in good faith in accordance with the criteria laid down in the convention. That was also particularly important with reference to the provisions in the draft forbidding discrimination.

64. Mr. MATINE-DAFTARY said that in the second vote he had abstained in deference to the majority of the Commission, but he was almost sure that the future conference would adopt a formulation based on article 11 of the Vienna Convention.

ARTICLE 18 (Order of precedence
as between the officials of a consulate)

65. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 18:

"The order of precedence as between the officials of a consulate shall be notified by the head of post to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the receiving State or to the authority designated by the said Ministry."

Article 18 was adopted.

ARTICLE 19 (formerly article 11)
(Appointment of nationals of the receiving State)

66. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 19:

"1. Consular officials should in principle have the nationality of the sending State.

"2. Consular officials may not be appointed from among persons having the nationality of the receiving State except with the consent of that State, which may be withdrawn at any time.

"3. The receiving State may reserve the same right with regard to nationals of a third State who are not also nationals of the sending State."

Article 19 was adopted.

ARTICLE 20 (formerly articles 20 and 23) (Withdrawal
of exequatur; persons deemed unacceptable)

67. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 20:

"1. If the conduct of the head of a consular post or of a member of the consular staff gives serious grounds for complaint, the receiving State may notify the sending State that the person concerned is no longer acceptable. In that event, the sending State shall, as the case may be, either recall the person concerned or terminate his functions with the consulate.

"2. If the sending State refuses or fails within a reasonable time to carry out its obligations under paragraph 1 of this article, the receiving State may, as the case may be, either withdraw the exequatur from the head of post concerned or cease to recognize him as a member of the consular staff.

"3. A person may be declared unacceptable before arriving in the territory of the receiving State. In any such case, the sending State shall not proceed with his appointment."

68. Mr. AGO suggested that in paragraph 2 the words "head of post" should be replaced by the word "person".

It was so agreed.

69. Sir Humphrey WALDOCK suggested that in paragraph 3 the words "withdraw his appointments" be substituted for "shall not proceed with his appointment".

70. Mr. GROS suggested that in French the phrase should read *retirer sa nomination*.

The drafting amendments were adopted.

Article 20, as amended, was adopted.

ARTICLE 21 (formerly article 24) (Notification of the
appointment, arrival and departure of members of the
consulate, members of their families and members of
the private staff)

71. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 21:

"1. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the receiving State, or the authority designated by that Ministry, shall be notified of:

"(a) The appointment of members of the consulate, their arrival after appointment to the consulate, as well as their final departure or the termination of their functions with the consulate;

"(b) The arrival and final departure of a person belonging to the family of a member of the consulate and, where appropriate, the fact that a person becomes or ceases to be a member of the family of a member of the consulate;

"(c) The arrival and final departure of members of the private staff in the employ of persons referred to in sub-paragraph (a) of this paragraph and, where appropriate, the fact that they are leaving the employ of such persons;

"(d) The engagement and discharge of persons resident in the receiving State as members of the consulate or as members of the private staff entitled to privileges and immunities.

"2. Where possible, prior notification of arrival and final departure shall also be given."

72. Mr. AGO asked whether the expression "member of the family of a member of the consulate" (paragraph 1 (b)) was used consistently throughout the draft.

73. Mr. ŽOUREK, Special Rapporteur, thought that the expression had had to be varied in some cases. The text closely followed that of the Vienna Convention, which, incidentally, was based on the former article 24 of the draft on consular intercourse.

74. Mr. AGO suggested that the Commission should adopt paragraph 1 (b) provisionally pending concordance with other articles.

75. Mr. ŽOUREK, Special Rapporteur, supported Mr. Ago's suggestion.

76. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee would look into the matter.

Subject to that understanding, article 21, paragraph 1, was adopted provisionally.

Article 21, paragraph 2, was adopted.

ARTICLE 22 (formerly article 25) (Modes of termination of the functions of a member of the consulate)

77. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 22:

"1. The functions of the head of a consular post come to an end in particular:

"(a) On notification by the sending State to the receiving State that the functions of the head of post have come to an end;

"(b) On the withdrawal of the exequatur.

"2. Except in the case referred to in paragraph 1 (b) of this article, the functions of a member of the consulate other than the head of post come to an end on the same grounds. In addition, his functions shall cease on notification by the receiving State to the sending State that, in conformity with article 20, paragraph 2, the receiving State refuses to recognize him as a member of the consular staff."

78. The CHAIRMAN remarked that the drafting was far too complicated, especially that of paragraph 2; it should be possible to state in simple language the idea that, as far as members of the consular staff were concerned, their functions terminated if the receiving State, in conformity with article 20, paragraph 2, refused to recognize them as members of the consular staff in certain circumstances. It should be noted that the provision in paragraph 1 (b) might also refer to members of the consulate other than the head of post.

79. Mr. AGO asked whether it was correct to say that, when the State of residence ceased to consider a person as a member of the consular staff, his functions were terminated, and whether the person concerned thereupon ceased to be regarded as a member of the consulate by the sending State.

80. Mr. YASSEEN said that what was meant was that the person concerned ceased to exercise consular functions. That point might be expressed more clearly.

81. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as a member of the Commission, agreed. The functions were terminated and therefore the person concerned was no longer in a position to exercise them.

82. Mr. ERIM agreed with the Chairman, especially in the light of the new article 16 (Appointment of the consular staff), under paragraph 2 of which the exequatur might be granted to a consular official who was not the head of post.

83. Mr. MATINE-DAFTARY asked what the phrase "on the same grounds" meant in paragraph 2; there was no reference to "grounds" in paragraph 1. It would be simpler to state that paragraph 1 (a) applied to members of the consulate other than the head of post. The phrase seemed to have been reproduced inadvertently from article 25 of the 1960 draft.

84. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as a member of the Commission, said that the withdrawal of the exequatur did not necessarily mean that the person concerned ceased to exercise consular functions if he was not the head of post, for his exequatur might have been granted for specific purposes.

85. Sir Humphrey WALDOCK supported Mr. Matine-Daftary's objection to the phrase "on the same grounds". He also pointed out that in the United Kingdom and other countries which required an exequatur for subordinate staff, its withdrawal meant the termination of functions. If, as indicated by the title of the article, it was intended to deal with ways in which the functions of a member of the consulate were terminated, paragraph (b) would apply to junior members of a consulate in such instances.

86. Mr. PAL considered that article 22 should be referred back to the Drafting Committee as the text was not at all satisfactory.

87. Mr. AGO suggested that paragraph 2 might be replaced by a third sub-paragraph (c) incorporating the substance of the second sentence in that paragraph.

88. Mr. ŽOUREK, Special Rapporteur, pointed out that paragraph 1 (b) was applicable to the head of post only.

89. Mr. ERIM supported Mr. Ago's suggestion but thought it would be more logical to combine into one his suggested sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) since they both dealt with modes of termination initiated by the receiving State.

90. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the article should be referred back to the Drafting Committee for redrafting in the light of the foregoing discussion.

It was so agreed.

ARTICLE 23 (formerly article 27) (Right to leave the territory of the receiving State and facilitation of departure)

91. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 23:

"The receiving State must, even in case of armed conflict, grant facilities in order to enable persons enjoying privileges and immunities, other than nationals of the receiving State, and members of the families of such persons irrespective of their nationality, to leave at the earliest possible moment. It must, in particular, in case of need, place at their disposal the necessary means of transport for themselves and their property."

92. Mr. FRANÇOIS noted that the proviso at the beginning of former article 27, paragraph 1, had been dropped and that the words "irrespective of their nationality" had been added in the new article 23. Had those changes been made deliberately and, if so, had they been made on the Commission's express instructions?

93. Mr. ŽOUREK, Special Rapporteur, explained that the Drafting Committee had omitted the proviso on the ground that it was self-evident.

94. The addition to which Mr. François had referred derived from article 44 of the Vienna Convention. Personally he did not find it particularly satisfactory.

95. Mr. AGO, amplifying the Special Rapporteur's explanation, pointed out, in regard to the first change, that the Drafting Committee had thought it undesirable to refer to article 40 since it was obvious that a consul who had been detained by the receiving State would not be allowed to leave. It would be extremely unfortunate if a receiving State were to be encouraged at times of armed conflict to detain members of a consulate in order to prevent their departure.

96. The other change was of far greater significance; it was designed to ensure that, for example, a consul's wife who had retained the nationality of the receiving State could leave with him. On that point there were no grounds whatever for deviating from the Vienna Convention.

97. Mr. ŽOUREK, Special Rapporteur, considered that such an addition would only be justifiable if the draft clearly defined which persons were to be regarded as members of the family. Since the members of the consulates of the sending State established in the territory of the receiving State were often more numerous than the members of a diplomatic mission, he thought it extremely unlikely that States would accept an international obligation to allow their own nationals to leave the

country. A very important issue of principle was involved which should be carefully considered by the Commission.

98. Mr. AGO said that States would probably interpret the expression "members of the family" narrowly.

99. Mr. FRANÇOIS said that he was not opposed to article 23. However, he hoped that the Commission would be informed of any important changes introduced by the Drafting Committee in any of the other articles.

100. Mr. ERIM referred the Commission to the decision taken earlier on article 27 (595th meeting, para. 14); the directive given to the Drafting Committee was certainly not very precise.

101. Mr. BARTOŠ supported the text proposed by the Drafting Committee because it upheld the principle of the unity of the family.

Article 23 was adopted.

ARTICLE 24 (formerly article 28) (Protection of consular premises and archives and of the interests of the sending State in exceptional circumstances)

102. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 24:

"1. In the event of the severance of consular relations between two States:

"(a) The receiving State shall, even in case of armed conflict, respect and protect the consular premises, together with its property and archives;

"(b) The sending State may entrust the custody of the consular premises, together with its property and archives, to a third State acceptable to the receiving State;

"(c) The sending State may entrust the protection of its interests and those of its nationals to a third State acceptable to the receiving State.

"2. In the event also of the temporary or permanent closure of a consulate, the provisions of paragraph 1 of the present article shall apply if the sending State has no diplomatic mission and no other consulate in the receiving State.

"3. If the sending State, although not represented in the receiving State by a diplomatic mission, has another consulate in the territory of that State, that consulate may be entrusted with the custody of the archives of the consulate which has been closed and, with the consent of the receiving State, with the exercise of consular functions in the district of that consulate."

103. Sir Humphrey WALDOCK pointed out that the phrase "together with its property and archives" was rendered slightly differently in paragraph 1(a) and (b) in the French text. He asked whether the variation was intentional.

104. The CHAIRMAN observed that the French text followed that of article 45 of the Vienna Convention.

105. Mr. GROS said that the different status of consular premises would justify a departure from the text of the Vienna Convention. He thought that in the French text the latter part of paragraph 1(a) should be redrafted so as to follow the wording of paragraph 1(b).

106. Mr. SANDSTRÖM said that the text should follow that of the Vienna Convention, for otherwise

motor vehicles of the consulate would not be covered.

107. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the question should be referred to the Drafting Committee.

It was so agreed.

ARTICLE 25 (formerly article 29)

(Use of the national flag and of the State coat of arms)

108. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 25:

"The consulate and its head shall have the right to use the national flag and coat of arms of the sending State on the building occupied by the consulate and at the entrance door and on the means of transport of the head of post."

Article 25 was adopted.

ARTICLE 26 (formerly article 30) (Accommodation)

109. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 26:

"1. The receiving State shall either facilitate the acquisition in its territory, in accordance with its laws, by the sending State of premises necessary for its consulate or assist the latter in obtaining accommodation in some other way.

"2. It shall also, where necessary, assist in obtaining suitable accommodation for the members of the consulate."

110. Mr. ŽOUREK, Special Rapporteur, said that paragraph 1 was modelled on article 21 of the Vienna Convention, but he considered that the latter text was not very clear and that the Commission's own wording of the former article 30 (1960 draft) was preferable. The provision in the Vienna Convention seemed to impose on the receiving State the obligation, alternatively, either of facilitating the acquisition of the premises necessary for the mission or of helping the sending State to obtain accommodation in some other way, whereas in reality, in cases in which the law of the receiving State did not allow a foreign State to acquire the ownership of consular premises, the receiving State had only one obligation, viz, the second of the two mentioned. It had to be borne in mind that some States did not allow foreign States to buy property and the text of the Vienna Convention failed to indicate which of the two States concerned was to decide what alternative would be followed.

111. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as a member of the Commission, found article 26 satisfactory.

112. Mr. ERIM agreed that the text proposed by the Drafting Committee did not imply that the receiving State was obliged to allow the acquisition of premises. Mr. Verdross, in explaining the purport of article 21 of the Vienna Convention (595th meeting, para. 32), had made that perfectly clear.

Paragraph 1 was approved.

113. Sir Humphrey WALDOCK pointed out that in the English text there was no phrase equivalent to *dans la mesure du possible* (para. 2). To the best of his recollection the Commission had decided to insert that phrase

because it might be more difficult to find suitable accommodation for members of a consulate than for diplomatic staff.

114. Mr. ŽOUREK, Special Rapporteur, explained that the Commission had decided not to follow article 21, paragraph 2, of the Vienna Convention strictly so as not to place too onerous an obligation on the receiving State in the case of consular relations.

115. Mr. ERIM considered that the text of the Vienna Convention should be followed faithfully, for in the provision under discussion the authorities of the receiving State were only to "assist" in obtaining suitable accommodation, which involved no absolute obligation.

116. Mr. YASSEEN considered that in practice the addition of the words *dans la mesure du possible* would make no difference at all, for it was always an implied condition that nobody was expected to do the impossible.

117. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as a member of the Commission, believed it advisable to adhere to the text of the Vienna Convention.

118. Mr. AMADO saw no need to depart from the text of the Vienna Convention. After all, the establishment of consulates was in the reciprocal interest and the receiving State stood to benefit as well as the sending State. Hence, the receiving State would not be averse, presumably, to giving the kind of assistance referred to in paragraph 2.

119. The CHAIRMAN suggested that paragraph 2 should be approved as it stood in the English text and that the French should be amended accordingly.

It was so agreed.

Article 26 was adopted, subject to that change.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

619th MEETING

Tuesday, 27 June 1961, at 10.10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Grigory I. TUNKIN

Consular intercourse and immunities
(A/4425; A/CN.4/136 and Add. 1-11; A/CN.4/137)

(continued)

[Agenda item 2]

DRAFT ARTICLES (A/4425): SECOND READING *(continued)*

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to continue its consideration of the text of the draft articles prepared by the Drafting Committee.

ARTICLE 27 (formerly article 31)
(Inviolability of the consular premises)

2. The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee proposed the following text for article 27: