TWO HUNDRED AND TENTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Tuesday, 29 November 1949, at 11.15 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. LACHS (Poland).

Designation of non-member States to which a certified copy of the Revised General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes shall be communicated by the Secretary-General for the purpose of accession to this Act: report of the Secretary-General (A/941)

1. The CHAIRMAN opened the debate and asked members of the Committee to consider whether it was opportune to invite non-member States to become parties to the Revised General Act, although no Member State had yet acceded to it.

2. Mr. WENDELEN (Belgium) stated that his delegation had felt oliged to submit a draft resolution (A/C.6/L.108) on the designation of non-member States to be invited to accede to the Revised General Act of 1928, since it was Belgium that had taken the initiative of submitting a proposal for the revision of that Act in the Interim Committee. As the accession of Belgium and Australia to the Act before the next session of the General Assembly was assured, he thought there could be no objection to the adoption of his draft resolution.

3. He pointed out that, in the operative part of the draft resolution, the words "States which are . . . members of one or more specialized agencies" should read: "States *which are or will become . . . active* members of one or more specialized agencies".

4. He considered that the discussion held on the previous day made it unnecessary for him to explain the meaning of the word "active".[1] The Belgian delegation had merely adopted the criterion which appeared in the Cuban and Australian resolution on the accession of non-member States to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.[2] That criterion consisted in the expression of a desire to advance international co-operation by means of active participation in the activities of specialized agencies. The Belgian delegation had been unable to agree with any of the wider criteria proposed on the previous day by various delegations, as it considered that the States parties to an important legal instrument like the General Act had the right to expect that the parties to be invited should have a high concept of international co-operation. The Act provided various methods for the pacific settlement of international disputes and constituted a kind of supplement to Chapter VI of the Charter. Another argument in favour of the adoption of a restrictive criterion was the fact that the General Assembly of the League of Nations had confined itself, in

[1] See the summary records of the 208th and 209th meetings, *passim*.

[2] See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly, Annex to the Plenary Meetings*, document A/1168.

its resolution of 26 September 1928,[1] to addressing invitations to States Members of the League of Nations and to certain other States designated by name which were now all Members of the United Nations.

5. In conclusion, Mr. Wendelen hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a lengthy debate.

6. Mr. GOTTLIEB (Czechoslovakia) recalled that, during the second part of the third session of the General Assembly, the question of the revision of the General Act of 1928 had been included in the agenda of the Interim Committee, a special political organ, instead of being referred to the Sixth Committee, which would not have failed to point out the redundancy of that Act in view of the existence of the United Nations Charter. A comparison between certain provisions of the Act, especially those of chapter IV on arbitration, with the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter, clearly showed that, if the provisions of the Charter were applied in good faith, the re-entry into force of the General Act would constitute a retrograde measure, even from a strictly legal point of view. The Czechoslovak delegation had pointed out at the third session of the Assembly that the Act had proved to be ineffective in settling the increasing difficulties in European and world relations between 1930 and 1940.[2] It still considered that the re-entry into force of the Act would not increase its authority. That statement was confirmed by facts, since, six months after the adoption of the resolution to restore to the Act its original efficacy, not a single Member State had acceded to it. That circumstance was the more eloquent when it was remembered that certain representatives had asserted that the Revised General Act represented one of the most important instruments of international political co-operation.

7. Mr. Gottlieb stated that not only had the question of the restoration of the efficacy of that Act had been submitted to an organ that was not competent in the matter, but another unqualified organ, namely the Sixth Committee, was now being asked to designate the non-member States which could accede to the Act. That was a purely political question with which the Sixth Committee was not competent to deal. It was not for that Committee to devise new methods for promoting international co-operation in the political field by inviting non-member States to bring into force an international instrument to which Member States were not prepared to accede, knowing as they did that it was ineffective.

8. The Czechoslovak delegation, therefore, considered that the item should be deleted from the agenda of the General Assembly.

9. Mr. CHAUMONT (France) stated that the French delegation's attitude to the question was identical with that it had adopted on the previous day with regard to the resolution on gencide:[3] it recommended, purely and simply, that the question be postponed, since no Member State had yet acceded to the Revised General Act. Under article 44 of the Act, the accession of two contracting parties was sufficient for its entry into force. If non-member States were invited to accede to it, the paradoxical result would be that the accession of two non-member States would make the Act effective. Such a situation would be inadmissible, since it would damage the prestige of the United Nations. The French delegation would make no formal proposal on the postponement of the question, but would support any initiative in that direction.

10. With regard to the Belgian draft resolution, he considered that it was open to the same criticism as the draft resolution on genocide. It would indeed be an abnormal state of affairs that the designation of non-member States for participation in an instrument as important as the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes should be based on their participation in technical institutions.[4] That showed even more clearly the artificial nature of the criterion adopted on the previous day.

11. Nevertheless, if the Committee wished to settle the problem at the present session and to decide on the Belgian resolution, he proposed the addition of a paragraph to that resolution, similar to that proposed on the previous day by the Philippine delegation,[5] to read as follows:

"Remains convinced of the necessity of inviting Member States to accede as soon as possible to the Revised General Act."

12. Mr. FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom) agreed to some extent with the arguments of the Czechoslovak representative, although he would not go so far as to suggest that the item be deleted from the agenda. There was always room in international relations for an instrument of that kind, although the Charter and the Statute of the International Court of Justice rendered it less essential. While it was true that the General Act had not been applied between the two wars owing to the existence of the League of Nations and the Permanent Court of International Justice, it was nevertheless an admirable instrument, to which States should accede. The United Kingdom delegation considered, however, that the question of the designation of the non-member States who could become parties to the Act should be postponed until it had been ratified by two or more Member States. It was hardly appropriate for the United Nations to ask non-member States to accede to a convention to which Member States themselves had not yet become parties.

13. With regard to the Belgian draft resolution, the Belgian delegation had wished that draft to conform in every way with that adopted on the previous day with regard to genocide. In that case, the United Kingdom representative could not see why it was provided that only States which were members of one or more specialized agencies "on 1 January 1950" should be invited, since no such specific date was mentioned in the resolution on genocide. There was no reason to assume that the States which would become members of specialized agencies after 1 January 1950 would not have the requisite qualifications to be invited to accede to the Act.

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series* No. 2123, article 43, paragraph 1 (volume XIIIC, page 361).

[2] See the *Official Records of the third session of the General Assembly, Part I, Ad Hoc* Political Committee, 27th meeting.

[3] See the summary records of the 208th meeting, paragraphs 18, 19 and 24.

[4] *Ibid.*, paragraphs 21 to 23.

[5] *Ibid.*, paragraph 15.

14. Although he did not object in principle to the French proposal, he considered that the insertion of a paragraph on Member States in a resolution relating to non-member States should be avoided.

15. Mr. FERRER VIEYRA (Argentina) supported the draft resolution of the Belgian delegation, because the Revised General Act related more closely to the interests of non-member States than to those of Member States. Under Chapters IV, VI and VII of the Charter, Member States had a full set of legal provisions providing for the pacific settlement of their disputes. Non-member States, on the other hand, had no such legal system to apply in case of need. Consequently, the Revised General Act was of greater importance to them than it was to Member States. It was for the United Nations to give them the opportunity of acceding to that Act, in order that they might settle their disputes by pacific methods.

16. He supported the United Kingdom representative's objection to the mention of the date of 1 January 1950 in the resolution, since he considered that all States which played their part in international co-operation were qualified to accede to the Act, irrespective of the date on which they became members of a specialized agency.

17. Finally, he supported the French proposal for the addition of a new paragraph to the draft resolution.

18. Mr. MAÚRTUA (Peru) pointed out that the failure to ratify the Act might be attributed to the fact that certain States had hesitated to take the dangerous course of bringing ino force instruments which it had proved impossible to apply in the past. The events that had taken place after the Act had been drawn up clearly showed the course that should be followed: the existing document should not be mechanically adhered to, but should be revised in the light of the experience acquired after the war, which had shown the many weaknesses of methods of conciliation.

19. The present procedure was not calculated to facilitate the development of international law or methods of codification. The prestige of the United Nations demands that a careful study should be made of all new factors that might ensure international co-operation and the development, within the framework of the Charter, of a whole modern system of pacific settlement which would be acceptable to the various nations. The procedure that had been followed, however, had led to a real crisis in the development of the principles of the Charter and had shown that there was a regrettable absence of initiative.

20. The document was far from being complete. For instance, it did not take into account the principles laid down in the Pact of Bogota,[1] which all the American States had signed. That was a grave omission, which must needs affect the unity and universality of international law.

21. In view of those considerations, which doubtless explained why States had failed to ratify the Act, the Peruvian delegation would vote against the Belgian draft.

22. Mr. SPIROPOULOS (Greece) did not think it an opportune moment to invite non-member States to become parties to the Revised General Act, since Member States had not yet acceded to it. The prestige of the United Nations necessitated that Member States should begin by adhering to a convention themselves before calling upon others to do so. The position as regards the Revised General Act was different from that in the case of the Convention on Genocide which had been signed by twenty-eight States and ratified by four, whereas the Revised General Act had not yet received a single signature and legally did not exist. In the circumstances, it was not for non-member States to implement it.

23. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) stated that his Government intended to accede to the Revised General Act, which it was carefully studying. However, the importance which the restoration to the Act of its original efficacy might have from the point of view of international co-operation was not such as to warrant, for either legal or political reasons, that non-member States should adhere to it.

24. In fact, according to article 17 of the General Act, "All disputes with regard to which the parties are in conflict as to their respective rights shall, subject to any reservations which may be made under Article 39, be submitted for decision to the Permanent Court of International Justice . . ." It followed that accession to the Act gave a State the right to bring such disputes before the Court. It could certainly be said that that provision marked some progress in the sense that it provided for a legal settlement of disputes. However, Article 35, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice contained the provision that "The conditions under which the Court shall be open to other States [that is to say, States not parties to the Statute] shall, subject to the special provisions contained in treaties in force, be laid down by the Security Council". That Article therefore provided for a special procedure so that the Court should be open to States which were not parties to the Statute. The treaties in question were those in force at the time of the ratification of the Charter in San Francisco. Thus, by permitting States to bring their disputes before the Court without the previous sanction of the Security Council, the Statute of the Court was being violated, and consequently the Charter itself, of which the Statute was an integral part.

25. If the General Assembly had wanted to revise the General Act and to adopt it as its own, that was no reason for claiming that it had thereby wished to ignore Article 35 of the Statute of the Court.

26. Furthermore, it should not be overlooked that, in accordance with Article 94, paragraph 2, of the Charter, the Security Council was the guarantor of the judgements of the Court. To permit a State to bring its disputes before the Court without having previously consulted the Security Council would constitute an attack upon the prestige of the Council.

27. The delegation of Yugoslavia was in favour of submitting the question at the following session of the General Assembly, since that would enable those non-member States which might be invited to accede to the Act to become, in the meantime, parties to the Statute of the Court.

[1] A name given to the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement.

28. Mr. Bartos asked the representative of the Secretary-General how the provisions of article 17 of the General Act could be reconciled with those of Article 35 of the Statute.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that it was not the responsibility of the Secretary-General but of the organs of the United Nations themselves to interpret the documents which had governed the establishment of the United Nations or which were drawn up under its auspices.

30. Mr. WENDELEN (Belgium), replying to the remarks of the United Kingdom representative, explained that he had proposed that only those States which were participating on 1 January 1950 in the work of the specialized agencies should be invited, so that the Secretary-General could automatically implement the resolution. However, he did not insist upon that date and was willing to suppress it.

31. With regard to the proposal to submit the question at the following session, it should be noted that if the General Act was of no great practical importance, it nevertheless constituted a notable evolution in the sphere of international co-operation. That Act had been discussed by an organ of the General Assembly, having as its terms of reference the application of Article 13, paragraph 1 *a* of the Charter, which provided that the General Assembly should initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of "promoting international co-operation in the political field and encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification". The Revised General Act was the first concrete result of that study. It had the advantage of drawing the attention of Member States and non-member States to the necessity of applying, in their mutual relations, the procedure of conciliation as well as arbitrary and judiciary rules.

32. Mr. Wendelen observed that when it had been drawn up in 1928, the Act had not produced any immediate reactions and that it had taken three years for nineteen States to accede to it. Among these States were the United Kingdom, Greece and Peru, which were now opposing the immediate accession of non-member States.

33. By adopting, with regard to the Act, a solution different from that adopted in the case of the Convention on Genocide, it might be thought that the General Assembly was opposed to the principles upon which the Act was based. Moreover, there was no reason to adopt a different solution, since both the Convention on Genocide and the Revised General Act, which were not enforced at present, would soon be implemented.

34. Those considerations operated in favour of the adoption of the Belgian draft resolution; indeed, in not taking such a position the General Assembly would seem to be revoking its own decision.

35. In conclusion, Mr. Wendelen stated that he would not reply to the statements of the Yugoslav representative at the moment, since they concerned the root of the problem.

36. Mr. SOTO (Chile) said that his delegation was convinced of the need to refer the discussion of the question to the next session of the General Assembly, for the reasons expressed by the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and Yugoslavia. He felt he must emphasize how the question under discussion differed from that of the invitations to be extended to non-member States with a view to their acceding to the Convention on Genocide. In the first place, the latter was more a technical than a political document, as was not the case with the General Act. Secondly, it had received four ratifications whereas no Member State had as yet acceded to the Revised General Act. It might lower the prestige of the Members of the United Nations somewhat and of the United Nations itself if non-member States were to accede to the General Act before any Member State became a party to it. The representative of Chile formally proposed that the question under discussion should be referred to the fifth session of the General Assembly. He asked for his proposal (A/C.6/L.109) to be put to the vote first, as a preliminary question before the Belgian draft resolution, concerning which he reserved the right to make observations and submit amendments if his own motion for postponement was rejected.

37. Mr. RENOUF (Australia) supported the Belgian draft resolution and was opposed to referring the question to the next session, as the delegation of Chile had proposed. The Australian delegation did not think that the prestige of United Nations required that several Member States should accede to the Revised General Act before non-member States could be invited to do so; such a solution, moreover, would be contrary to the letter and spirit of article 44, which made the entry into force of the Revised General Act dependent on two accessions being deposited, whether the States in question were Members or non-members of United Nations. It would, of course, be preferable for Member States to set a good example, but if they did not do so, it was no reason for holding up the accession of non-member States.

38. Mr. GARCÍA AMADOR (Cuba) also declared himself in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Belgium (A/C.6/L.108).

39. Some delegations had maintained that the General Act had not proved very effective during the period in which it was in force and that there would, therefore, be no point in reviving it in a revised form. Such an argument, which might be called a realistic one, and which had already been used against other international acts, hardly seemed convincing. The tendency of the United Nations had usually been to favour the re-implementation of international conventions adopted earlier, which they thought advisable to revive.

40. In the case in question, from the point of view of procedure to be followed for the pacific settlement of disputes, one was forced to recognize that the Revised General Act filled an undeniable need. Article 33 of the Charter of United Nations merely listed the pacific methods of settling disputes; nowhere in that document were detailed rules laid down for the various procedures contemplated, except perhaps where legal settlement was concerned, in which case procedure was given in detail in the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

41. It should be remembered in that connexion that the American States had not confined themselves to signing the Charter of the Organization of American States, although chapter IV of that document contained more detailed provisions as

to the basic principles for the pacific settlement of disputes than did the Charter of the United Nations; they had also considered it necessary to conclude, under the name of the Pact of Bogota, an American Treaty on Pacific Settlement which laid down in considerable detail the various procedures for settling disputes which might arise between the American States. The need for a similar instrument was even greater in the case of the Charter of United Nations, since it dealt with the question far more briefly than did the Pact of Bogota; the Revised General Act was intended to fill precisely that gap.

42. It was, consequently, important for the Act to come into force as soon as possible; the Cuban delegation would, therefore, vote for the Belgian draft resolution although, in the opinion of the Cuban delegation, the draft resolution should be made to conform with the resolution adopted at the previous meeting on the similar question of invitations to be sent to non-member States for their accession to the Convention on Genocide.

43. Mr. AMADO (Brazil) was unable to vote for the Belgian draft resolution proposing that non-member States should be invited to accede to the Revised General Act, when none of the Member States had as yet acceded.

44. Those States had not abstained without reason. The Act, which an attempt was being made to resuscitate, had, after raising the greatest hopes in the minds of statesmen and in public consciousness in 1928, proved valueless during the historical events which followed. From that time on, one could only speak of it as a thing of the past; particularly since the Charter of the United Nations and that of the Organization of American States had meanwhile seen the light, and a new international law was in the making; and all the more since no one today would think of appealing to the clauses of the General Act, as the dramatic discussions which took place almost daily in the political bodies of the United Nations showed only too well. The legal and realistic instincts of the members of the Sixth Committee should keep them from selecting precisely that moment for inviting non-member States to accede to the Revised General Act. The only logical solution was to postpone the question until later.

45. Mr. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that some of those in favour of postponement based their view on criticism of the Revised General Act itself, while others considered merely that it was not an appropriate moment to invite the accession of non-member States.

46. The attitude of the USSR delegation towards the proposal to restore its original efficacy to that international instrument was quite clear. The USSR had always regarded the Interim Committee, which had carried out the revision of the Act, as an illegal organ, whose establishment was contrary to the provisions of the Charter and which was solely designed to detract from the role which the Security Council was called upon to play in the maintenance of international peace and security. It was therefore not surprising that the work of that Committee should share its illegal character and should conform to the tendency which had governed its establishment. The Peruvian representative had been able to refer to a crisis of the Charter, because blow after blow had been struck against it by the Interim Committee and the revival of the General Act could be described as one of the heaviest blows it had yet struck against the essential organ of the United Nations, the Security Council, appointed by the Charter to safeguard peace.

47. For that reason, therefore, the USSR delegation could give no support to a draft resolution inviting non-member States to accede to the Act.

48. Mr. IMRU (Ethiopia) supported the Chilean representative's proposal of postponement. Although the question had certain points of similarity with that of inviting non-member States to accede to the Convention on Genocide, the purpose of accession was very different. The General Act, which had never been invoked during the period in which it was in force, appeared to have a relative usefulness only, and there was no urgency in designating non-member States, which might become parties to it.

49. Mr. LEQUERICA (Colombia) outlined the main reasons for which he would support the proposal to postpone the question until the following session.

50. In the first place, the General Act was old and somewhat out of date. In order to become an effective instrument for the implementation of the General Assembly's aims, it required adaptation to the new international situation. It was admittedly true that the provisions of Chapters IV, VI and VII of the Charter and those of the Statute of the International Court of Justice were, *in practice, inadequate to effect the peaceful settlement* of international disputes. A special document giving a detailed indication of the methods by which the fundamental principles of the Charter should be applied would, therefore, be extremely valuable. It was essential, however, that the Act should conform to the needs of the time, which was faced with political, economic and social problems that did not exist in 1928.

51. Certain regional documents, in particular the Charter and the Pact of Bogota might usefully be studied with a view to ascertaining which of their provisions might be adapted to the General Act to bring it into line with the needs of the time. Such a study would require time, which was an additional argument in favour of postponement.

52. Finally, Mr. Lequerica agreed with the United Kingdom representative that it would not be in keeping with the dignity of the United Nations to invite non-member States to accede to an instrument to which its own Members had so far abstained from becoming parties.

53. If, however, the Committee should take an immediate decision on the designation of non-member States which might become parties to the Act, the Belgian draft resolution would be really acceptable only if, in addition to the deletion of the date, 1 January 1950, the last paragraph was amended to conform with the action taken at the previous meeting on the draft resolution of Australia and Cuba on the accession of non-member States to the Convention on Genocide.

54. Mr. WENDELEN (Belgium) pointed out that the Brazilian representative's arguments would have found their appropriate place in the debate

preceding the adoption of General Assembly resolution 268 (III). Since the Committee had a General Assembly decision before it, it was only required to decide a purely procedural question and not to express its views on the value or merits of the Revised General Act.

55. Unlike the representative of the USSR, Mr. Wendelen did not regard the signing of the Act as an attack upon the Charter or upon the role which the Security Council was called upon to play in the maintenance of international peace and security. To invite the largest possible number of States to accede to the Act could only serve to strengthen the authority of the United Nations, since the intention was in fact to encourage recourse to pacific methods of settling international disputes.

56. The Belgian delegation considered that the difficulties to which the Yugoslav delegation had drawn attention could easily be overcome, if it was borne in mind that the provisions of the Charter and hence of Article 35 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, which formed an integral part of the Charter, must take precedence over those of the General Act in the event of any dispute.

57. The majority of the Committee appeared to be in favour of postponing the question to a later session of the General Assembly. Although the Belgian delegation had no fundamental objection to the Chilean delegation's proposal, it would nevertheless vote against it, considering that the arguments in favour of adopting the Belgian proposal had not been adequately refuted.

58. Mr. SPIROPOULOS (Greece) stated that his Government approved the General Act as revised by the General Assembly and looked forward with satisfaction to its entry into force. He wondered, however, whether it was wise to decide there and then that the question should appear on the agenda of the next session of the General Assembly. The Greek delegation was of the opinion that it would be wrong to over-burden the agenda of the following session of the Assembly without serious reason, because there was no means of foreseeing what the situation would be in a year's time. His delegation therefore proposed that consideration of the question should be deferred *sine die*. He would like to point out that the adoption of his proposal would in no way exclude the possibility of discussing the question at the fifth session of the General Assembly, for the Secretary-General would always be entitled to include the matter in the agenda for that session should it prove that a considerable number of States had in the meanwhile adhered to the Revised General Act.

59. It appeared that the question had been sufficiently discussed; and he therefore proposed the closure of the discussion.

The motion to close the discussion proposed by the representative of Greece was adopted by 36 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

60. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote, as a preliminary matter, the principle of referring to a subsequent session of the General Assembly the question of the nomination of non-member States to which the Secretary-General should communicate the Revised General Act.

61. He pointed out that if the Committee decided in favour of such reference, it would then have to choose between the Chilean motion, which advocated reference to the succeeding session of the General Assembly, and the Greek motion, which recommended that the question be deferred *sine die*.

It was decided by 27 votes to 7, with 9 abstentions, to defer consideration.

62. Mr. FERRER VIEYRA (Argentina) explained that he had voted against the principle of adjournment, because he considered that reference of the matter to another session of the General Assembly would in no way improve the contents of the Revised General Act, which was open to the criticisms made by several members of the Committee, and particularly by the representative of Brazil. The same objections would be valid, whatever session of the Assembly had the question on its agenda.

63. The Argentine delegation was of the opinion that better results would be obtained if the question was referred to a juridical body like the International Law Commission with instructions to draw up a new General Act more in acordance with modern trends so far as concerned the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

64. Mr. PÉREZ PEROZO (Venezuela) said he would like to state that his delegation's vote to defer consideration of the question did not imply any opposition to the methods of settlement provided for in the Revised General Act. It was solely for reasons of expediency that the Venezuelan delegation preferred that the General Assembly should wait until a sufficient number of Member States had adhered to the Act before inviting non-member States to do so.

65. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) explained that in voting to defer consideration of the question, his delegation had not registered any objection either to the contents of the General Act or to the principle of an application of its provisions which would be as universal as possible.

66. Recalling the legal difficulty to which he had referred in his previous speech, he expressed the hope that the Secretary-General would find it possible to prepare for the next session of the General Assembly a memorandum on the procedure to be adopted for bringing the provisions of article 17 of the General Act into accordance with those of Article 35 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

67. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) said he had voted for the principle of deferring consideration of the question because it had clearly appeared from the discussion that public opinion in every country in the world had been sharply disappointed with the results of the General Act, on which it had based such hopes. It was not sufficient, however, to refer the matter to the next session of the General Assembly or to a later session, for the Revised General Act would always have the same defects and omissions and would always be ineffective. In the opinion of the Ecuadorean delegation, the International Law Commission or some other competent body should be asked to draw up a text which would not have the same faults.

68. Mr. GARCÍA AMADOR (Cuba) had voted against the principle of deferring consideration

because he was a supporter of the Belgian draft resolution. While it was true that the General Act was not the perfect solution of the problem of the peaceful settlement of international disputes, it had nevertheless been approved by the General Assembly and all efforts should be made therefore to obtain as many accessions as possible.

69. Mr. MATTAR (Lebanon) said he had voted for deferment of consideration of the question for the reasons explained by the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and Yugoslavia.

70. He added that his attitude had also been motivated by the fact that it seemed difficult to him to admit that non-member States of the Organization could be invited to adhere to the revised General Act before the Member States had done so themselves.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.