



CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Statement by the Chairman | 3 |
| Election of the Vice-Chairman | 3 |
| Election of the Rapporteur | 3 |
| Order of discussion of agenda items | 3 |

Chairman: Mr. Juliusz KATZ-SUCHY (Poland).

Statement by the Chairman

1. The CHAIRMAN wished to express his gratification at having been unanimously elected Chairman of the Sixth Committee—an honour which, he realized, was a tribute not to himself but to his country, in appreciation of its contribution to the work of the United Nations. He would endeavour to discharge his duties to the general satisfaction.

Election of the Vice-Chairman

[Item 5]*

2. Mr. AMADO (Brazil) nominated Mr. Tabibi (Afghanistan).
3. Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt), Mr. BANERJEE (India), Mr. GARCÍA AMADOR (Cuba) and Mr. CAREY (United States of America) seconded the nomination.
4. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom) nominated Mr. Holmback (Sweden). While he had a high regard for the representative of Afghanistan, he felt that the election of Mr. Holmback would produce a more equitable distribution of offices in the Main Committees.
5. Mr. TAMMES (Netherlands) and Mr. VAN REMOORTELE (Belgium) seconded that nomination.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Miss Roesad (Indonesia) and Mr. Olavarria Gabler (Chile) acted as tellers.

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Number of ballot papers:</i> | 56 |
| <i>Number of abstentions:</i> | 0 |
| <i>Number of invalid ballots:</i> | 0 |
| <i>Number of valid ballots:</i> | 56 |
| <i>Required majority:</i> | 29 |

Number of votes obtained:

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Mr. Tabibi (Afghanistan) | 36 |
| Mr. Holmback (Sweden) | 20 |

Mr. Tabibi (Afghanistan), having obtained the required majority of those present and voting, was elected Vice-Chairman.

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

6. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) thanked the Committee for the honour done to his country and himself.

Election of the Rapporteur

[Item 5]*

7. Mr. CHAUMONT (France) nominated Mr. Spiropoulos (Greece).

8. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia), Mr. HSU (China) and Mr. TARAZI (Syria) seconded the nomination.

Mr. Spiropoulos (Greece) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.

9. Mr. SPIROPOULOS (Greece) thanked the Committee.

Order of discussion of agenda items (A/C.6/341)

10. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the letter dated 17 September 1953 from the President of the General Assembly to the Chairman of the Sixth Committee (A/C.6/341) listing the items which had been allocated to the Sixth Committee. The Committee was not bound to observe the order given in the letter. After conversations with representatives and the Secretariat, he had come to the conclusion that it would be more expedient to take the items listed in the letter in the following order: 2, 5, 3, 6, 1, 7, 4, 8, 9. In that way Committee members would have more time to prepare themselves for the discussion of the more complicated items and of items for which the relevant documents had been circulated rather late.

11. Mr. ROBINSON (Israel) felt that items 1, 5 and 6, all of which concerned multilateral treaties, ought not to be separated. The same applied to items 7, 8 and 9, which all related to the Charter. Since item 4—Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its fifth session (A/2456)—required more preparation than any of the others, he felt that it ought to be taken up last, particularly since the report had only just been distributed, and the complete records of the Commission's fifth session were not yet available. Accordingly he suggested the following order: 2, 3, 5, 6, 1, 7, 8, 9, 4.

12. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) could not agree with the Israel representative, and supported the Chairman's suggestion. The items could be taken in any order, whether or not there was a connexion between them; the place in which the International Law Commission's report came in the order suggested by the Chairman was a good one, because, firstly, there would be sufficient time for preparation, and, secondly, the item would not be postponed to the end of the session when there might not be time to deal with it adequately.

13. Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt) and Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom) supported the Chairman's suggestion, but felt that items 7, 8 and 9 should be taken consecutively and item 4, last.

14. Mr. TAMMES (Netherlands) also felt that items 7, 8 and 9 ought not to be separated.

15. Mr. PÉREZ PEROSO (Venezuela), too, thought that items 7, 8 and 9 overlapped to some extent and should be taken up consecutively. In fact he would go so far as to say that items 8 and 9 should be dealt with together.

16. Mr. FERRER VIEYRA (Argentina), while agreeing that items 7, 8 and 9 should not be separated by another item, felt that item 4 should be taken before them to ensure that there would be ample time to discuss it.

17. The CHAIRMAN explained that he had suggested that item 2 should be taken first because all delegations were prepared to discuss it. Item 5 had been given next place as it was non-controversial and would require little time. Item 3 had been put in the third place, instead of the second, as the Israel representative had suggested, because representatives who were particularly interested in that item had asked for it not to be taken earlier. There was no real objection to giving item 6 the next place, since its relation to item 5 was a purely formal one; moreover, separation of those two items would have the advantage of making it easier for delegations to consider each of them on its merits. Item 1, which followed on his list, had been moved down because representatives needed time to study the documents.

18. He had allowed item 7 to be separated from items 8 and 9 by item 4, because in submitting item 7 to the General Assembly the Argentine delegation had explained that it related only to the publication of documents. It was a purely technical item which would not be affected by action taken on the controversial items 8 and 9. Item 4 had been placed after item 7 because if it were considered last there might not be sufficient time to give it all the attention it deserved.

19. Mr. ROBINSON (Israel) was still convinced that the report of the International Law Commission should be placed last on the agenda. Since, however, the Committee seemed unable to come to an immediate decision, he suggested that the order of items 4, 7, 8 and 9 should be settled later.

20. Mr. CAREY (United States of America) felt that an immediate decision on the subject would enable the Committee to plan its work more rationally. He accordingly proposed that item 4 should be placed last on the Committee's agenda.

21. After some discussion, Mr. SPIROPOULOS (Greece) observed that, in view of the division of opinion in the Committee on the order of the last four items, it would be advisable not to take a decision on the subject at that early stage.

22. Mr. CAREY (United States of America) withdrew his proposal.

23. The CHAIRMAN proposed that items 2, 5, 3, 6 and 1 should be taken in that order, leaving the order of discussion of items 4, 7, 8 and 9 to be determined later.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.