

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**SIXTH COMMITTEE, 1170th  
MEETING**

Thursday, 4 December 1969,  
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 88: Report of the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	365
Agenda item 87: Draft Convention on Special Missions ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	366

**Chairman:** Mr. Gonzalo ALCÍVAR (Ecuador).

**AGENDA ITEM 88**

**Report of the Special Committee on the Question of  
Defining Aggression (*concluded*) (A/7620; A/C.6/L.785,  
A/C.6/L.786)**

1. Mr. NALL (Israel) said that the report of the Special Committee on its 1969 session confirmed his delegation's earlier misgivings concerning the wisdom of extending the Special Committee's mandate. Its misgivings had arisen from the lack of clear purpose and objectivity that would be required to reach a satisfactory definition.

2. The problem was not simply that of listing the obvious instances of direct aggression. The crux of the matter was to find the correct balance between a number of cardinal principles of international law and international relations, which were also formalized in the United Nations Charter. Of those, the inherent right of self-defence was one of the most important. The proper achievement of such a balance led directly to the question of so-called "indirect aggression". A closer examination of the debate in the Special Committee conveyed the impression of a desire to produce a definition of aggression that was narrow enough to allow a certain aggressive policy such as the cultivation of international tension through the encouragement of subversive activity or acts of terrorism from the territory of one State to another, while at the same time strict enough to make effective counter-action by way of self-defence superficially illegitimate. That would clearly be contrary to the established law of nations and the provisions of the Charter. Under the latter, when the territorial integrity or political independence of a State was endangered by threats or acts of aggression, appropriate measures of self-defence were admissible, irrespective of whether a purely doctrinal classification would place those threats or acts in the category of direct or indirect aggression.

3. After reading the report on the 1969 session, his delegation greatly feared that if the Special Committee continued to work along the same lines, so much ambiguity would be created that the result might jeopardize the basic

rights enshrined in the Charter, as well as the Charter provisions relating to the powers and functions of the various organs of the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, whose powers and functions were not limited to cases of so-called "direct aggression".

4. His delegation felt that there was absolutely no point in burdening Governments and the Secretariat with the work and the expense of continuing the search for the elusive definition of aggression. Accordingly, it had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.6/L.785, not as a matter of principle but because it entertained serious doubts as to the practicability of the recommendation contained in it.

5. Mr. MacKERNAN (Ireland) said that his delegation had earlier expressed doubts concerning the possibility and usefulness of defining aggression. The deterrent value of a definition was dubious, since history showed that States which had launched armed attacks on other States and occupied their territory had always found specious arguments to justify their actions, claiming for example that their purpose was to save the people from themselves or to suppress revolution or counter-revolution. However, his delegation was not opposed in principle to an exhaustive definition which would provide a safeguard for the independence of small countries. The likelihood that the Special Committee would be able to produce such a definition had in the past seemed remote. However, the 1969 session had shown significant progress, in that those States which had previously been indifferent or opposed to the formulation of a definition had themselves prepared a draft proposal. There now appeared to be general agreement in the Special Committee that the definition of aggression was desirable. His delegation was not indifferent to the progress that had been made and accordingly hoped that the Special Committee would continue its work. It had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution. He could not agree that the question of defining aggression was a matter of urgency, and he had therefore abstained in the separate vote on the wording of the fifth preambular paragraph. For reasons of economy, his delegation would have preferred New York as the venue of the 1970 session and had therefore been unable to support the retention of the wording of operative paragraph 1.

6. Mr. ROBERTSON (Canada) said that at the twenty-third session his delegation had supported General Assembly resolution 2420 (XXIII), which decided on the continuation of the Special Committee's work, and it regretted that it had found some features of the draft resolution unacceptable. However, although it had been obliged to vote against the wording of the fifth preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 1, and hence to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, it nevertheless looked forward to participating actively in the work of the Special Committee at its next session.

7. Mr. DOYLE (New Zealand) said that his delegation had voted against the wording of the fifth preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 1 and had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. It had been prompted to do so by mainly budgetary reasons, feeling it essential to make every effort to stem the constant increase in United Nations expenditure. The choice of Geneva for the venue of the next session of the Special Committee was uneconomical, nor was his delegation greatly impressed by the references made to the urgency or the ultimate utility of defining aggression.

8. Mr. JOHNSON (Sweden) said that his delegation had had misgivings concerning some of the wording of the draft resolution, especially the reference in the fifth preambular paragraph to urgency. Although his delegation had voted in favour of the deletion of that reference it had gathered from the statement made by the Ghanaian representative (1168th meeting) that the wording chosen had been meant merely as a general encouragement to the Special Committee. Accordingly, his delegation had been able to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

9. Mrs. DALYANOGLU (Turkey) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because of the inclusion of references to urgency and to the venue of the 1970 session. In view of the arduous and delicate nature of the Special Committee's task, it was undesirable to stress its urgency, and her delegation had abstained in the separate vote on the wording of the fifth preambular paragraph. While her delegation was not opposed to the choice of Geneva as the venue of the 1970 session, it had wished to express its concern that savings be effected wherever possible. Accordingly, it had abstained also in the separate vote on the wording of operative paragraph 1.

### AGENDA ITEM 87

**Draft Convention on Special Missions (concluded)\***  
(A/6709/Rev.1 and Corr.1, A/7375; A/C.6/L.747, A/C.6/L.778 and Add.1 and Corr.1, A/C.6/L.778/Add.5 and Corr.1, A/C.6/L.779 and Add.1 and Corr.1, A/C.6/L.779/Add.5, A/C.6/L.780, A/C.6/L.782, A/C.6/L.783)

*Report of the Drafting Committee on co-ordination and review of the drafting of the titles and texts adopted by the Sixth Committee, and text of the draft Convention as a whole, co-ordinated and reviewed by the Drafting Committee*

10. Mr. YASSEEN (Iraq), Chairman of the Drafting Committee, said that, in its task of co-ordination and review, the Drafting Committee had been obliged to combine meticulousness with speed. The revised text of the draft Convention as a whole (A/C.6/L.778/Add.5) had been distributed on 30 November 1969, so as to give delegations and Governments an opportunity to study it. Over that weekend, the members of the Drafting Committee had re-examined the text individually, and had met on 1 December to make some fresh drafting changes, which were contained in documents A/C.6/L.778/Add.5/Corr.1-5, i.e. one corrigendum for each of the official languages. Corrigenda had likewise been prepared to complete the lists of

drafting changes by language contained in documents A/C.6/L.778/Add.1-4. Documents A/C.6/L.778/Add.5/Corr.6 and A/C.6/L.778/Add.4/Corr.2 contained the minor changes in the Russian text decided upon by the Drafting Committee at its 40th and final meeting on the previous day.

11. All the drafting changes made by the Drafting Committee related to the co-ordination and revision of the text and titles. Most of them had been made for the purpose of uniformity of terminology, good usage and concordance of the various language versions. However, three of the drafting changes, which affected the texts of all five official languages, went somewhat further, although they did not affect the substance. First, in the seventh preambular paragraph, the words "relating to special missions", had been inserted after the words "privileges and immunities", because the text might otherwise seem to imply that the purpose of privileges and immunities in general was to ensure the efficient performance of the functions of special missions, which was of course not the intention. The privileges and immunities of the head of a diplomatic mission, for example, were not granted for that purpose. In that connexion, he pointed out that the corresponding preambular paragraph of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations referred specifically to diplomatic privileges and immunities.

12. Secondly, article 11, paragraph 1 (f), had been reworded to read:

"(f) The location of the premises occupied by the special mission and of the private accommodation enjoying inviolability under articles 30, 36 and 39, as well as any other information that may be necessary to identify such premises and accommodation."

13. One of the purposes of the notifications provided for by that sub-paragraph was to facilitate the execution by the receiving State of its obligation to respect and protect private accommodation enjoying inviolability. The text previously adopted by the Sixth Committee had referred only to "the premises occupied by the special mission and . . . the private accommodation of the representatives of the sending State and of the members of the diplomatic staff of the special mission". The new text took into account not only the inviolability provided under article 30 for the private accommodation of the representatives of the sending State and the members of its diplomatic staff but the inviolability accorded under articles 36 and 39—both of which referred back to article 30—to the private accommodation of the administrative and technical staff of the special mission and that of members of the families of the various categories of persons in the special mission.

14. Thirdly, in paragraph 4 of article 42 (the former article 43), the expression "the obligations" had been changed to "its obligations" to make it quite clear that the reference was to the obligations of the third State. It had been pointed out in the Drafting Committee that the persons mentioned in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of article 42 were not all members of the special mission. Paragraph 1 made reference to the members of the family and paragraph 3 to the couriers of the special mission. The Drafting Committee had therefore inserted at the end of para-

\* Resumed from the 1153rd meeting.

graph 4, after the words "special mission", the phrase, "members of their families or couriers,".

15. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee approved the report of the Drafting Committee on co-ordination and review of the drafting of the titles and texts adopted by the Sixth Committee for the draft Convention on Special Missions and the text of the draft Convention as a whole, co-ordinated and reviewed by the Drafting Committee.

*It was so decided.*

*Report of the Drafting Committee on co-ordination and review of the drafting of the draft Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, adopted by the Sixth Committee, and text of the draft Optional Protocol, co-ordinated and reviewed by the Drafting Committee*

16. Mr. YASSEEN (Iraq), Chairman of the Drafting Committee, introducing the relevant report of the Drafting Committee, said that the final changes made dealt only with minor drafting points which required little further comment.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee approved the report of the Drafting Committee on co-ordination and review of the drafting of the draft Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, adopted by the Sixth Committee and the text of the draft Optional Protocol, co-ordinated and reviewed by the Drafting Committee.

*It was so decided.*

18. Mr. YASSEEN (Iraq), Chairman of the Drafting Committee, expressed appreciation to the Chairman of the Sixth Committee and thanked the members of the Drafting Committee and its secretariat for their dedication and zeal.

19. The CHAIRMAN paid a tribute on behalf of the Sixth Committee to the Chairman and members of the Drafting Committee and its secretariat.

#### *Draft resolutions*

20. Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), introducing his delegation's amendment (A/C.6/L.783) to draft resolution A/C.6/L.782 concerning the adoption of the Convention, said that although much constructive work had been done in the preparation of the draft Convention, the Committee had not yet done everything it could to ensure the Convention's success. As his delegation had maintained throughout the discussions, the participation formula in article 50 was too restrictive to be in the best interests of world peace and international co-operation. The Soviet Union's amendment was based on the formula used in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and paved the way for consideration of the question of wider participation during the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly. Since the Convention on Special Missions would be particularly useful in situations where no diplomatic or consular relations existed between countries, there was little merit in the argument that it formed a trilogy with the

Vienna Conventions on diplomatic and Consular Relations and should therefore use the same participation formula.

21. The amendment went no further than the Declaration on Universal Participation in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (see A/7592, explanatory memorandum, para. 5) and was in line with the Committee's decision (1153rd meeting) to consider the question of participation in that Convention in 1970.

22. Mr. DADZIE (Ghana) said that since 1961 his own and other delegations had endeavoured to achieve a formula that would open the way for States outside the category used in article 50 of the draft Convention to participate in multilateral conventions, if invited to do so by the General Assembly. His delegation thought that the adoption of the Soviet Union proposal would be a logical follow-up to the formula used in the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations and the Declaration on Universal Participation in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Without prejudice to the General Assembly's decision as to which States should be invited, the Committee should take the opportunity now before it to implement articles 50 and 52, which it had agreed to include in the Convention on Special Missions. The Soviet Union's amendment should be welcomed by all who supported the principle of universality and it deserved to be adopted.

23. His delegation suggested that the vote on the Soviet Union's amendment should be taken first, followed by the vote on the draft Convention itself and the draft Optional Protocol and, finally, a vote should be taken on draft resolution A/C.6/L.782.

24. Mr. COLEMAN (United States of America) said his delegation believed that draft resolution A/C.6/L.782, of which the sponsors were Algeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ghana, Iraq, Italy, Pakistan, Peru and the United States of America, contained a perfectly satisfactory procedure for the adoption of the draft Convention and it regretted the appearance of the Soviet Union's amendment, which was propagandist, if not misleading.

25. His delegation had voted for the Declaration on Universal Participation in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties as part of a compromise, and since no such compromise existed now, it had no intention of voting for a proposal that neither broadened the accession clause nor added any useful element to the draft Convention but attempted to instruct the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session how to conduct its business.

26. The only source of satisfaction was that the Soviet Union had apparently agreed that the Vienna formula was satisfactory and viable, and because of that, his delegation would abstain rather than vote against the amendment.

27. Mr. DELEAU (France) regretted the introduction of the Soviet Union's amendment, which injected controversy into what his delegation had hoped would be a harmonious meeting to vote for the adoption of the draft Convention on Special Missions. The issue revived in the amendment had already been settled, and there was no point in confusing draft resolution A/C.6/L.782 by introducing

wording which had been adopted in different circumstances at another time and place. His delegation would abstain in the vote, and hoped that the Committee would not support the amendment.

28. Mr. LIANG (China) challenged the logic of the second preambular paragraph of amendment A/C.6/L.783, which had been introduced at a late stage in the Committee's work on the draft Convention. It seemed odd to use the word "convinced", when the discussion of universal participation had been postponed until 1970. It was also inappropriate to take up a matter that was to be placed on the agenda of the twenty-fifth session. However, the amendment was innocuous, and unless a separate vote was taken on the second preambular paragraph, he would not vote against it.

29. Mr. SANCHEZ CABRAL (Dominican Republic) said it was wrong to make it difficult for States outside the category mentioned in article 50 of the draft Convention to accede to multilateral conventions. His delegation would therefore vote for the Soviet Union amendment and deplored the practice of abstaining, which was an evasion of the responsibility of United Nations Members to take decisions.

30. Mr. DARWIN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation regarded the matters raised in the two new preambular paragraphs proposed in the Soviet Union amendment as having been settled, and considered it unnecessary to repeat them. As the wording had been originally proposed in the context of an over-all settlement to save the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, his delegation felt under no obligation to support those paragraphs. His delegation did not oppose the first of the proposed new preambular paragraphs, which was wholly compatible with the Vienna formula but was unnecessary. It also saw no need to take an immediate decision, as proposed in the new operative paragraph, since under article 50 the General Assembly was expressly authorized at any time to invite any other State to become a party to the Convention. Even if a decision was taken during the current session, the final decision on what items were to be included in the agenda for 1970 lay with the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, and so did the question how the matter should be discussed. Consequently, his delegation would abstain when the amendment was put to the vote; it would vote for the adoption of the draft Convention, subject to further examination of the text and without prejudice to the United Kingdom Government's decision on signature and ratification, and it would also vote for the procedural draft resolution A/C.6/L.782.

31. Mr. POLLARD (Guyana) requested a separate vote on the phrase beginning "or the object" and ending with the words "as a whole", in the second preambular paragraph of amendment A/C.6/L.783.

32. Mr. CEAUSU (Romania) said it was most important that all States should be able to participate in multilateral treaties and thus take part in the codification of international law on relations between States. Universal participation was in the interests of peace and international co-operation, and would help the United Nations to achieve success in its legislative work. It was wrong for an

out-of-date and discriminatory legal formula, which undermined the principle of sovereign equality of States, to be included in the Convention on Special Missions, and he deplored the policy of some States of preventing universal participation in multilateral conventions by refusing to recognize others. Diplomatic relations existed between many States Members of the United Nations and other States which might be prevented from taking part in the Convention. Furthermore, negotiations now in progress would result in an increase in such relations and would be much facilitated if the parties had acceded to the Convention.

33. There was no need for the Convention to follow the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations, because, as article 7 stated, the existence of diplomatic or consular relations was not necessary for the sending or reception of a special mission.

34. It had already been decided to consider the question of participation in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, and he now urged the Committee to end the present controversy by taking the same course of action with regard to the Convention on Special Missions by adopting amendment A/C.6/L.783.

*Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

35. Mr. YASSEEN (Iraq) said that multilateral treaties which dealt with the codification and progressive development of international law should be open to universal participation. If it was not possible to include a provision to that effect in the text the draft Convention under consideration, the same procedure should be adopted as had been followed in the case of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and the General Assembly should be requested to consider the question at its twenty-fifth session. He would vote for the USSR amendment.

36. Mr. TEJA (India) supported the concept of universal participation in conventions such as the one under consideration, which made a positive contribution to the codification and development of international law. A restrictive interpretation of such conventions would not be in the interests of the international community. His delegation would therefore vote for the USSR amendment.

37. Mr. KUTB (Southern Yemen) reiterated his delegation's support for the principle of universality; instruments such as the Convention on Special Missions should be open to all States. He would vote in favour of the USSR amendment.

38. Mr. JACOVIDES (Cyprus) pointed out that a decision on the question at issue had already been taken when the relevant articles of the draft Convention had been discussed. However, those articles did provide for the possibility of inviting other States to become parties to the Convention. In addition, the adoption of the USSR amendment would facilitate wider acceptance of the Convention, without prejudicing the substantive position of States regarding specific invitations.

*Mr. Alcívar (Ecuador) resumed the Chair.*

39. Mr. MOTZFELDT (Norway) said he would have preferred the existing text of the draft resolution, but he had no objection to the USSR amendment, since it did not affect the text of the Convention. He would abstain in the separate vote requested by the representative of Guyana and in the vote on the USSR amendment as a whole, but would vote for the draft resolution.

40. Mr. HYERA (United Republic of Tanzania) considered that multilateral treaties which dealt with the codification and progressive development of international law, or the object and purpose of which were of interest to the international community as a whole, should be open to the participation of all States. He would support the USSR amendment, which reflected a viewpoint shared by many delegations.

41. Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the remarks made by the Ghanaian representative concerning the procedure to be followed in the vote, which would enable the draft resolution to be adopted unanimously; he requested a roll-call vote on his delegation's amendment.

42. Mr. SOFIANOPOULOS (Greece) thought that the USSR amendment in fact constituted a new proposal. In addition, the Committee could not make recommendations concerning invitations to States to become parties to the Convention before it had actually adopted the Convention.

43. Mr. SALDIVAR (Paraguay) supported that view. The Committee should first take a decision on the draft resolution in document A/C.6/L.782 before considering the USSR amendment.

44. The CHAIRMAN declared the closure of the debate on the draft resolution and invited the Committee to proceed to a vote.

45. Mr. MONTENEGRO MEDRANO (Nicaragua) said that the procedural question raised by the representatives of Greece and Paraguay should first be decided.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 131 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee should vote first on the USSR amendment to the draft resolution. He invited the Committee to vote separately, as requested by the representative of Guyana, on the phrase "or the object and purpose of which are of interest to the international community as a whole", in the second of the new preambular paragraphs proposed by the USSR delegation.

*The phrase was adopted by 45 votes to 2, with 45 abstentions.*

47. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the USSR amendment as a whole.

*At the request of the USSR representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Venezuela, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Denmark, France, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Malaysia, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

*The USSR amendment (A/C.6/L.783), as a whole, was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 48 abstentions.*

48. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had already adopted the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes at its 1153rd meeting, and invited it to vote on the draft Convention on Special Missions, as a whole, forming part of the annex to draft resolution A/C.6/L.782.

*The draft Convention as a whole was adopted by 94 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

49. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution, as amended.

*The draft resolution (A/C.6/L.782), as amended, was adopted by 94 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

50. Mr. ROBERTSON (Canada) recalled that at the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties a proposal similar to the one in the USSR amendment had been submitted as part of a complex and interrelated set of proposals. Canada had supported that "package deal" and had voted for the Declaration on Universal Participation in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. However, there was no element of compromise in the USSR amendment just adopted, and the Canadian delegation had therefore been unable to support it. It had abstained in the separate vote on one phrase in the amendment, because it had not wished to express a view on the subject, for the reasons given by the representative of China.

51. Mr. SPERDUTI (Italy) explained that he had abstained in the vote on the USSR amendment; it had the commendable aim of ensuring wide participation in the Convention, but it introduced quite extraneous elements into a purely procedural draft resolution. He reserved the position to be taken by the Italian delegation when the General Assembly came to consider the question raised in



the new operative paragraph proposed by the USSR delegation.

52. Mr. SALDIVAR (Paraguay) said he had abstained in the vote on the USSR amendment for procedural reasons; the amendment in fact constituted a new proposal and should have been treated as such. He had also abstained in the vote on the draft resolution, because the adoption of an amendment which was null and void would also nullify the text of the draft resolution; but he had voted for the draft Convention on Special Missions. He announced that Paraguay was planning to accede to the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations.

53. Mr. MIRAS (Turkey) said that since the majority of delegations supported the draft Convention on Special Missions, his delegation had voted for it, although it felt that the privileges and immunities granted were in excess of those required for the proper functioning of special missions. Its vote did not prejudice the position to be taken by the Turkish Government when it came to study the final text of the Convention.

54. Mr. OWADA (Japan) explained that he had abstained in the vote on the USSR amendment because, particularly in the light of the remarks made by the USSR delegation, the amendment introduced an element of political controversy and concerned a matter which the Committee had already settled. The Convention would be applicable regardless of whether diplomatic relations existed between the States concerned and would not apply to entities which were not considered to be States. The disadvantage of the Vienna formula was that it was difficult to decide what entities constituted States. The language adopted for article 50 was satisfactory in that regard and the USSR proposal only created confusion at a late stage in the Committee's work.

55. Mr. ALVAREZ TABIO (Cuba) said that he had voted for the USSR amendment, which represented an important step towards the attainment of the goal of universality. He had also voted for the draft Convention, which was generally a positive text. His delegation had reservations, however, about certain articles in that text and in particular article 25, under which it would be possible for the premises of a special mission to be entered without the consent of the head of the mission.

56. Mr. GARCIA ORTIZ (Ecuador) introduced draft resolution A/C.6/L.780, which conveyed to the International Law Commission the congratulations expressed by many delegations on its valuable contribution to the codification and progressive development of international law.

57. Mr. SANTISO GALVEZ (Guatemala), Mr. SALDIVAR (Paraguay) and Mr. EL HUSSEIN (Sudan) expressed support for the draft resolution.

*Draft resolution A/C.6/L.780 was adopted unanimously.*

58. The CHAIRMAN thanked the Observers for Switzerland for the useful contribution they had made to the Committee's work on the draft Convention on Special Missions.

59. Mr. TURRETTINI (Observer for Switzerland) expressed his Government's gratitude to the Committee for allowing Switzerland to participate in its work. The Convention just adopted was extremely important and would have direct repercussions so far as Switzerland was concerned. His country hoped that it would continue to be associated in the work on the codification of international public law, in which the Sixth Committee played a very useful role.

*The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.*