



General Assembly

Sixty-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
31 December 2007

Original: English

Sixth Committee

Summary record of the 28th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 19 November 2007, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Tulbure. (Moldova)

Contents

Agenda item 79: United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law (*continued*)

Agenda item 83: Diplomatic protection (*continued*)

Agenda item 85: Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization (*continued*)

Agenda item 80: Criminal accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission (*continued*)

Agenda item 78: Responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts (*continued*)

Agenda item 82: Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its fifty-ninth session (*continued*)

Agenda item 84: Consideration of prevention of transboundary harm from hazardous activities and allocation of loss in the case of such harm (*continued*)

Agenda item 86: The rule of law at the national and international levels (*continued*)

Agenda item 108: Measures to eliminate international terrorism (*continued*)

Agenda item 81: Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its fortieth session (*continued*)

Agenda item 137: Administration of justice at the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 129: Programme planning

Agenda item 121: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 5: Election of the officers of the Main Committees

Completion of the Committee's work for the main part of the sixty-second session

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.



The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 79: United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law (*continued*) (A/C.6/62/L.12)

1. **The Chairman** recalled that paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.12 had been orally revised by the representative of Ghana at the Committee's twenty-seventh meeting to read: "Approves the guidelines and recommendations contained in section III of the report of the Secretary-General, in particular those designed to achieve the best possible results in the administration of the Programme of Assistance within a policy of maximum financial restraint".

2. *Draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.12, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Agenda item 83: Diplomatic protection (*continued*) (A/C.6/62/L.13)

3. *Draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.13 was adopted.*

Agenda item 85: Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization (*continued*) (A/C.6/62/L.11)

4. **Ms. Arsanjani** (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.11, said that, under the terms of paragraph 2, the Special Committee would hold its next session from 27 February to 5 March and on 7 March 2008. It would hold a total of 14 meetings with simultaneous interpretation in all six languages. Twenty-five pages of pre-session, 55 pages of in-session and 55 pages of post-session documentation would be required, to be issued in all six languages. Since the session had already been programmed in the calendar of conferences and meetings for 2008, no additional resources would be required.

5. As for the cost of distributing the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice as official documents of the United Nations, in accordance with paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, it was understood that the advisory opinions would be processed as and when capacity became available. Accordingly, paragraph 7 would not entail any additional financial implications.

6. *Draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.11 was adopted.*

Agenda item 80: Criminal accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission (*continued*) (A/C.6/62/L.10)

7. **Ms. Arsanjani** (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.10, said that, under the terms of paragraph 7, the Ad Hoc Committee on criminal accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission would hold its next session from 7 to 9 April and on 11 April 2008. It would hold a total of eight meetings with simultaneous interpretation in all six languages. Forty-five pages of pre-session, 25 pages of in-session and 20 pages of post-session documentation would be required, to be issued in all six languages. Since the session had already been programmed in the calendar of conferences and meetings for 2008, no additional resources would be required.

8. *Draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.10 was adopted.*

9. **Mr. Adsett** (Canada), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of the CANZ group (Australia, Canada and New Zealand), expressed satisfaction with the progress achieved on agenda item 80. The draft resolution contained a clear message that Member States should take all necessary action to ensure that any crimes committed by United Nations officials and experts on mission would not go unpunished. He welcomed the spirit of consensus that had prevailed and looked forward to continuing the discussion on the subject in April 2008.

Agenda item 78: Responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts (*continued*) (A/C.6/62/L.20)

10. *Draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.20 was adopted.*

Agenda item 82: Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its fifty-ninth session (*continued*) (A/C.6/62/L.18)

11. **Mr. Medrek** (Morocco), speaking on behalf of the Bureau, introduced draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.18 concerning the report of the International Law Commission on the work of its fifty-ninth session and said that it was an update of the corresponding draft resolution adopted the previous year. It took into account suggestions and comments made by

delegations, as well as developments in the Commission's work since its previous session, reflected in a number of new preambular and operative paragraphs, to which he drew attention.

12. *Draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.18 was adopted.*

Agenda item 84: Consideration of prevention of transboundary harm from hazardous activities and allocation of loss in the case of such harm (*continued*) (A/C.6/62/L.19)

13. **Mr. Sheeran** (New Zealand), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.19 on behalf of the Bureau and the co-coordinator **Mr. Alday González** (Mexico), said that the draft resolution would help the international community to meet the challenges of transboundary harm and would also contribute to the development of international environmental law. The text, which was the product of consensus after two weeks' consultations, drew on General Assembly resolutions 61/36 and 56/82 and reflected the Committee members' views on the way forward with respect to the topic in question.

14. Consultations had focused chiefly on paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6. Paragraphs 3 and 4 commended to the attention of Governments the articles on the prevention of transboundary harm from hazardous activities and the principles on the allocation of loss in the case of transboundary harm without prejudice to any future action recommended by the International Law Commission. Paragraph 5 invited Governments to submit comments on any future action and paragraph 6 contained a decision to include the topic in the provisional agenda of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly. The text of the articles on prevention of transboundary harm from hazardous activities were annexed to the draft resolution, which therefore provided a sound basis for taking the topic forward and for encouraging the use of the articles and principles by States, international tribunals and courts and other relevant organizations. For that reason, he hoped that it would be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

15. *Draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.19 was adopted.*

Agenda item 86: The rule of law at the national and international levels (*continued*) (A/C.6/62/L.9)

16. **Mr. Barriga** (Liechtenstein), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.9 on behalf of the Bureau, said

that the preamble of the current text was essentially the same as that of General Assembly resolution 61/39. It contained considerations of a general nature relating to the rule of law and expressed the General Assembly's commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. In addition it reaffirmed the need for universal adherence to, and implementation of, the rule of law at the national and international levels and the General Assembly's solemn commitment to an international order based on the rule of law and international law.

17. In the sixth preambular the words, "in accordance with Chapter VI of" had been inserted before "the Charter". The first three operative paragraphs called for various kinds of action to strengthen the rule of law. Paragraph 4 was not intended to prejudice future programme budget implications which would be considered by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee. Paragraph 5 had been amended so that it ended after the phrase "The rule of law at the national and international levels". The remainder of the paragraph had been deleted as, regrettably, it had proved impossible to reach agreement on the topics, or sub-topics, which were to have formed the focus of the Sixth Committee's debate under that item at the General Assembly's sixty-third session. Naturally an effort should be made to decide on such a topic, or sub-topic, at future sessions. He recommended that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote.

18. *Draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.9, as orally amended, was adopted.*

19. **Mr. Fitschen** (Germany), explaining his delegation's position, said that in General Assembly resolution 61/39 the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on matters pertaining to the issues addressed in that resolution and to submit a report thereon at its sixty-second session. A number of delegations, including his own, had replied and those comments had been forwarded to the General Assembly in the report of the Secretary-General entitled "The rule of law at the national and international levels: comments and information received from Governments" (A/62/121 and Add.1). That report had not, however, been mentioned anywhere in the resolution which had just been adopted. It was his delegation's understanding that that report could still be discussed during future deliberations and that neither delegations, nor the

Secretary-General, would be precluded from referring to it.

Agenda item 108: Measures to eliminate international terrorism (*continued*) (A/C.6/62/L.14)

20. **Mr. Adsett** (Canada), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.14 on behalf of the Bureau, said that the new text contained very few changes from General Assembly resolution 61/40. In paragraph 14, it had been updated to welcome the entry into force of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism and in paragraph 19 it welcomed the efforts of the Secretariat to prepare the third edition of the publication *International Instruments related to the Prevention and Suppression of International Terrorism* in all official languages. In paragraph 23 it set the dates for the forthcoming meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee established by General Assembly resolution 51/210. The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee, which was to be found in paragraph 22, was the same as that which it had received the previous year. During consultations on the draft resolution, a number of helpful suggestions had emerged which might make it possible to focus and streamline the text still further the following year. That would be an effort worth pursuing, since the positive atmosphere which had surrounded discussions during the current session augured well for future work on the agenda item. Although the text was undoubtedly amenable to improvement, it provided a solid basis for deliberations in the coming year. He therefore recommended that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote.

21. **Ms. Arsanjani** (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the programme budget implications of the draft resolution, said that, under the terms of paragraphs 22 and 23, the Ad Committee established by General Assembly resolution 51/210 would, on an expedited basis, continue to elaborate the draft comprehensive convention on international terrorism and would continue to discuss the convening of a high-level conference under the auspices of the United Nations. To that end, in 2008 it would hold a total of six meetings with simultaneous interpretation in all six languages. Document requirements amounted to 25 pages before the session, 60 pages during the session and 40 pages after the session, all of which were to be issued in all six languages. Since the 2008 session of the Ad Hoc Committee had already been included in the biennial calendar of conferences and

meetings for 2008-2009 (A/62/32, annex I, sect. B, item 2), no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

22. **Ms. Negm** (Egypt), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, recalled her delegation's position when the resolution on the same subject had been adopted the previous year and said that the regional and subregional organizations mentioned in the twenty-first preambular paragraph should meet certain criteria. Although her delegation would join the consensus on the resolution, it expressed a reservation concerning the reference to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which was a military alliance and therefore different from the other organizations mentioned in that context.

23. **Mr. Lamine** (Algeria) said that, despite the indubitably sincere efforts of the coordinator to present a more concise and better balanced text responding to a number of concerns, for a variety of reasons — some of them clear, such as time pressure, and others which were less clear — the draft text was regrettably merely a “technical” update of the resolution adopted the previous year, although the subject was anything but technical. He reiterated the stance taken by his delegation at the previous session with regard to the twenty-first preambular paragraph, and emphasized that the words “taking note” did not signify endorsement of the approach to, or notion of, terrorism of all the organizations listed in that paragraph, notwithstanding all the respect due to any efforts to eradicate the scourge of terrorism.

24. **Mr. Bahaei Hamaneh** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, although his delegation would join the consensus on the draft resolution, it wished to express a reservation with regard to the reference to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the twenty-first preambular paragraph, because, unlike the other organizations listed in that paragraph, it was a military organization.

25. **Mr. Muhumuza** (Uganda) said that his delegation would join the consensus. The East African Community should, however, be added to the list of organizations listed in the twenty-first preambular paragraph, as it had done good work and made big strides in combating terrorism.

26. *Draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.14 was adopted.*

27. **Mr. Gómez González** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), explaining his delegation's position, said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution with a view to arriving at worldwide agreement on concerted practical action to combat terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. Despite the fact that the text was essentially the same as that adopted the previous year, it unfortunately failed to send out the political signals required in order to achieve unity on the subject among the international community through an inclusive, participatory and transparent approach that would make it possible to hold a frank public debate on an issue which affected the whole of humanity. In future, every effort should be made to avoid negotiations leading to reservations and in which only a few delegations had participated, since the outcome was a completely unbalanced document. It was necessary to revisit the text adopted the previous year and to reject any attempt to be exclusive. One aspect which had not been discussed had been the content of the twenty-first preambular paragraph. The mention of a military organization such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization did not mean that his Government accepted that organization, nor should it set a precedent.

28. **Mr. Ben Lagha** (Tunisia), explaining his delegation's position, said that there had been merit in the coordinator's approach during consultations on the draft resolution. If more flexibility had been shown during those consultations a tangible result might have been achieved. That approach should be revisited at the next session as part of a transparent, inclusive exercise. With regard to the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph, he drew attention to his Government's proposal that a code of conduct for the battle against terrorism should be drawn up under the auspices of the United Nations. States could abide freely and voluntarily by such a code as a way of demonstrating their political and moral support for a number of internationally recognized rules and principles. That initiative had the backing of the African Union, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Non-Aligned Movement. His Government reserved the right to refer to that initiative in due course.

29. **Mr. Abdelsalam** (Sudan), explaining his delegation's position, said that his Government endorsed the reservations expressed by previous speakers to the reference to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the twenty-first preambular paragraph.

30. **Ms. Pino Rivero** (Cuba), explaining her delegation's position, said that it had joined the consensus on the draft resolution as a token of its determination to prevent and combat all acts of terrorism. Nevertheless it maintained the view it had expressed the previous year with respect to the twenty-first preambular paragraph, namely that the latter should not include a reference to a military organization such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Agenda item 81: Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its fortieth session (*continued*) (A/C.6/62/L.16 and A/C.6/62/L.17)

31. **Mr. Bühler** (Austria), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.16 on behalf of the Bureau, announced that Belize and Burkina Faso had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution was the annual omnibus resolution on the topic and it was therefore very similar to General Assembly resolution 61/32. As always, the preamble stressed the importance of international trade law and recalled the mandate, work and coordinating role of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL). Paragraphs 1 to 3 referred to the progress achieved by the Commission in preparing a legislative guide on secured transactions which it expected to complete in December 2007, in revising its Model Law on Procurement of Goods, Construction and Services and the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules, in preparing a draft instrument on transport law and in its work on future developments in insolvency law. Paragraph 4 endorsed the Commission's efforts to increase the coordination of and cooperation on legal activities of international and regional organizations active in the field of international trade law and to promote the rule of law at the national and international levels in that field. Paragraph 5 reaffirmed the importance for developing countries of the Commission's technical assistance and cooperation. Paragraphs 6 and 7 dealt with the trust fund established to provide travel assistance to developing countries that were members of the Commission. Paragraph 8 welcomed the Commission's decision to hold a comprehensive review of its working methods. Paragraph 9 referred to the Commission's activities to engage non-State actors from the private sector in its work. Paragraphs 10 and 11 addressed the issue of documentation and summary records. Paragraph 13 urged Members to consider becoming

parties to the UNCITRAL conventions. Paragraph 15 noted with satisfaction that the Congress “Modern Law for Global Commerce” had been held in Vienna in July 2007 and requested the Secretary-General to ensure the publication of the proceedings of the Congress to the extent permitted by available resources. The last paragraph commended the Commission’s restructured website. He was confident that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

32. *Draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.16 was adopted.*

33. **Mr. Donovan** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, noted that UNCITRAL decisions had historically been made by consensus. By seeking to find solutions that were acceptable to all countries, UNCITRAL had established itself as an effective standard-setting organization. Its method of work had benefited countries at all stages of economic development, and his delegation would not support any effort to change it. The current draft resolution should have explicitly reaffirmed the value of the Commission’s method of decision-making. It was with that understanding that the United States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

34. **Ms. Millington** (Canada), speaking in explanation of position, said that while the planned comprehensive review of the Commission’s working methods might lead to some improvements, her delegation considered that most of its current methods were successful, particularly the practice of decision-making by consensus, which had been effective in ensuring the high quality of the Commission’s work. A complete revamp of its methods was unnecessary and would not be productive. It was with that understanding that Canada had joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

35. **Mr. Belliard** (France), speaking in explanation of position, said that the draft resolution just adopted by the Sixth Committee did not in any way predetermine the substance or the outcome of the review of the Commission’s working methods, which would take place in December 2007. That was clear from paragraph 8 of the resolution, which expressed solid support for the review. His delegation hoped that the review would be undertaken in a constructive spirit with a view to enhancing the quality of the Commission’s work.

36. **Mr. Bühler** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the Bureau, introduced draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.17 and outlined its content, noting that it highlighted the fiftieth anniversary of one of the most successful treaties in the area of commercial law: the Convention on Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards.

37. Draft resolution A/C.6/62/L.17 was adopted.

Agenda item 137: Administration of justice at the United Nations (*continued*) (A/C.6/62/L.22)

38. **Mr. Sivagurunathan** (Malaysia), introducing draft decision A/C.6/62/L.22 on behalf of the Bureau, noted that the administration of justice at the United Nations was a complex topic which Member States were examining in its totality for the first time. The administration of justice affected the lives and careers of staff and the overall management of the Organization, and was not a matter that could be dealt with piecemeal or on an experimental basis. Moreover, it was a topic that had to be addressed by both the Fifth and the Sixth Committees before the new system was put in place by January 2009, in accordance with the timeline set by the General Assembly.

39. Having considered the item against that background, the delegations taking part in the informal consultations on the topic had agreed to follow the same procedure as in 2006 — i.e., to transmit the conclusions of the Sixth Committee’s deliberations thus far, through a letter from its Chairman through the President of the General Assembly, to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee. In addition, it had been agreed that an Ad Hoc Committee on the Administration of Justice at the United Nations should be established in order to continue the next stage of the work on the topic. Again following the practice of the previous year, the Sixth Committee would be recommending that the General Assembly adopt a decision to that effect (A/C.6/62/L.22).

40. A document containing conclusions reached by the Sixth Committee would be annexed to the letter to be transmitted to the Fifth Committee. It described the results of the Committee’s consideration of the legal aspects of the item, including points of agreement, issues requiring further consideration and requests for further information. The paper was divided into three parts. The first part referred to some general issues arising from the implementation of the new system of

administration of justice, including the proposed scope of the system and the question of legal assistance for staff. The second part dealt with the informal system of justice and included sections on the qualifications, selection and terms of reference of the United Nations Ombudsman and the role of mediation. The third part concerned the formal system of justice, particularly questions relating to judges (their qualifications, process of election or appointment, terms of office, removal, etc.), the jurisdiction and powers of the United Nations Dispute Tribunal and the United Nations Appeals Tribunal, the registries of those Tribunals and the adoption of the rules of procedure.

41. The letter of transmittal would inform the President of the General Assembly about the Committee's work and point out that the absence of comments in the conclusions on any particular legal issue should not be interpreted as meaning that the Sixth Committee had necessarily reached agreement on the issue. It would also explain that the Sixth Committee had decided that it should continue to discuss the item in the light of further information to be provided to it, as well as any further decisions that the General Assembly might take on the item at the current session. It would also request that the letter, together with its annexes, be brought to the attention of the Chairman of the Fifth Committee and the Secretary-General, and that it be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, which, pursuant to the draft decision, would include the item in the provisional agenda of its sixty-third session.

42. **Ms. Arsanjani** (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the financial implications of draft decision, A/C.6/62/L.12, said it was envisaged that the Ad Hoc Committee would hold its session, comprising 18 meetings, in April 2008, with simultaneous interpretation in all six languages. Twenty-five pages of pre-session, 55 pages of in-session and 55 pages of post-session documentation would be required, to be issued in all six languages. However, as the conference services needed for the Ad Hoc Committee would be allocated from within resources already reserved for meetings related to agenda items under consideration by the Sixth Committee at the current session, no additional conference resources would be required to service the Ad Hoc Committee in 2008. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft decision A/C.6/62/L.22, no additional requirements would arise

under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

43. *Draft decision A/C.6/62/L.22 was adopted.*

44. **The Chairman** said it was understood that, in order to expedite the work on the topic, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee would inform the Chairman of the Fifth Committee of the results of the former's work.

Agenda item 129: Programme planning

45. **The Chairman** said that the Committee on Programme and Coordination had already approved the section "Legal Affairs" of the biennium programme plan for the period 2008-2009. The Sixth Committee did not, therefore, need to take any action on the item at the current stage. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee had concluded its consideration of the item.

46. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 121: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.6/62/L.21)

47. **The Chairman** said that the Bureau of the Sixth Committee had prepared a provisional programme of work for the sixty-third session, which was contained in draft decision A/C.6/62/L.21. The programme was provisional in nature and was intended to help delegations and the secretariat to plan, prepare and organize the Committee's work in the next session.

48. *Draft decision A/C.6/62/L.22 was adopted.*

49. **Mr. Beras Hernández** (Dominican Republic), speaking on behalf of the Rio Group, said that steps should be taken at future sessions to avoid the simultaneous scheduling of Sixth Committee meetings and informal consultations on the law of the sea and sustainable fisheries. Progress had been made in that regard the previous year, but at the current session the problem had recurred; it affected mainly delegations from developing countries, since many developed countries sent specialized officials to New York for the discussions on the law of the sea. The Committee's work and the consultations took place within a period of two months. It should be possible to plan the schedules with sufficient flexibility to rule out the possibility of overlap. The Group therefore urged the secretariat, in consultation with the Bureau, to take all the necessary steps to prevent a recurrence of the

situation, in line with paragraph 133 of General Assembly resolution 61/222.

50. The Group supported the way the Committee's work had been organized at the current session, with plenary meetings in the mornings and working-group meetings in the afternoons. However, the system of sending working texts by e-mail could lead to a lack of transparency or could place delegations on an unequal footing if they did not receive the e-mails in question. Electronic circulation should not replace the official circulation of hard copies in the meeting room. However, the former could complement the latter, and the e-mail addresses of all the permanent missions in New York should be collected to that end.

51. Informal consultations and informal "informals" should be open to all Member States and should take place inside the United Nations building, with sufficient notice and, where possible, with an announcement in the *Journal*. The most recent case of lack of transparency in that regard had been the negotiation of the draft resolution on terrorism, which had not been conducted in the proper manner. The vast majority of delegations had been absent from the consultations, which had taken place outside the building, almost in secret. Even worse, it had been almost impossible for delegations to state their positions in the plenary, and a solution had been forced with no attempt at negotiation or convergence of positions among members. In addition, the negotiations concerning the draft resolution on the Special Committee on the Charter had been adversely affected by ambiguous or unclear procedures.

52. The Group hoped that such problems could be avoided in the future, since they created an atmosphere of unease and confusion. The Chairman and the coordinators of draft resolutions should listen attentively and with respect, understanding and impartiality to the opinions of all delegations. The Group would cooperate with a view to efficient and legitimate decision-making, in accordance with the procedural rules of the United Nations.

53. **Mr. Muhumuza** (Uganda) said that his delegation, too, was concerned about the overlap in the schedules of the Committee's meetings and the consultations on the law of the sea. Small delegations in particular found it difficult to give adequate attention to both forums if they were scheduled at the same time. Far from being a minor inconvenience, the

problem was a significant one that had persisted for too long. Serious efforts should be made to ensure that the situation did not recur at future sessions, rather than adopting a "business as usual" approach.

54. **Ms. Negm** (Egypt), **Mr. Sheeran** (New Zealand), **Mr. Madureira** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union, and **Mr. Medrek** (Morocco) endorsed the comments made by the representative of the Dominican Republic on behalf of the Rio Group with regard to the need to avoid overlaps in the schedules of the Committee's meetings and the consultations on the law of the sea and fisheries.

55. **Mr. Charles** (Trinidad and Tobago), speaking on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), expressed disappointment that, despite the Secretariat's efforts at the current session, it had proved impossible to avoid overlap in the schedules of the Committee's meetings and the consultations on the law of the sea, which had caused difficulties for the delegations of CARICOM countries and other small delegations. The issues of the law of the sea and fisheries were important to CARICOM countries not only because they were small island developing States but also because of their obligations under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It was to be hoped that, at the sixty-third session, the same spirit of compromise as at the sixty-first session would prevail, so that overlapping schedules could be avoided and all delegations could attend both sets of meetings without prejudice to their legal obligations.

56. **Mr. Kanu** (Sierra Leone), endorsing the comments made by previous speakers, said that his country was a party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and, as such, had obligations and rights under that Convention. Moreover, its economy was, to a large extent, dependent on fishery resources. The negotiations on the draft resolutions on the law of the sea and fisheries were therefore extremely important to his delegation; regrettably, it had not been able to participate in them at all at the current session. Since the overlap in the schedules of the Committee's meetings and the consultations on the law of the sea had persisted for a long time, he appealed for renewed efforts to resolve the problem. In that regard, he proposed that the negotiations on the draft resolutions should be held immediately after the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention each year, so that interested delegations could participate effectively.

57. **Ms. Valenzuela Díaz** (El Salvador) endorsed the request made by other delegations that action should be taken to resolve the problem of overlapping schedules. Decisions taken in multilateral forums lacked legitimacy if insufficient delegations were present.

58. **Mr. Mukongo Ngay** (Democratic Republic of the Congo), speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that the issue of overlapping schedules was particularly important to African countries because most of them had small delegations. The Committee's meetings and the consultations on the law of the sea and fisheries should be held at separate times so that all States parties to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea were able to participate in the negotiations on the relevant draft resolutions.

59. **The Chairman** said that delegations' comments had been duly noted and that every effort would be made to avoid overlap in the schedules of the Committee's meetings and the consultations on the law of the sea at future sessions.

60. *Draft decision A/C.6/62/L.21 was adopted.*

Agenda item 5: Election of the officers of the Main Committees

61. **The Chairman** recalled that, in accordance with rule 99 (a) of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and rule 103, as amended by General Assembly resolution 58/126, the Main Committees should elect a Chairman and a full Bureau three months before the opening of the next session. He therefore suggested that the regional groups should hold consultations at least three months before the opening of the sixty-third session of the General Assembly so as to enable the Committee to elect its officers at the appropriate time.

Completion of the Committee's work for the main part of the sixty-second session

62. **The Chairman** declared that the Committee had completed its work for the main part of the sixty-second session.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.