

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records

**SIXTH COMMITTEE, 1039th  
MEETING**

Tuesday, 15 October 1968,  
at 3.35 p.m.



**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 84: <i>Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its twentieth session (concluded)</i>	1
Agenda item 85: <i>Draft Convention on Special Missions . . . . .</i>	3

*Chairman:* Mr. K. Krishna RAO (India).

AGENDA ITEM 84

Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its twentieth session (*concluded*) (A/7209 and Corr.2; A/C.6/L.647, A/C.6/L.651, A/C.6/L.651/Rev.1)

1. Mr. DADZIE (Ghana) said that, following the morning meeting of the Committee, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.651 had considered all the points raised at that meeting and had drawn up document A/C.6/L.651/Rev.1, which took into account the views of all delegations.

2. The sponsors had accepted the proposal that part of paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.6/L.651 be merged with paragraph 3, the rest of paragraph 8 being omitted, and the result was a new paragraph 3 in document A/C.6/L.651/Rev.1. Paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.6/L.651 had been deleted, because it dealt with a controversial issue which might have given rise to lengthy debate. The only other substantive change was the omission of the word "further" in paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.6/L.651. The sponsors hoped that the new version of the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

2. The sponsors had accepted the proposal that part of paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.6/L.651 be merged with paragraph 3 in document A/C.6/L.651/Rev.1. Paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.6/L.651 had been deleted, because it dealt with a controversial issue which might have given rise to lengthy debate. The only other substantive change was the omission of the word "further" in paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.6/L.651. The sponsors hoped that the new version of the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

3. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.6/L.651/Rev.1.

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

4. Mr. KATENGA (Malawi) said that his delegation had not participated in the vote on the draft resolution because the report of the International Law Commission was still under consideration by his Government.

5. Mr. RUDA (Chairman of the International Law Commission) thanked the Committee for the appreciation of the International Law Commission's work expressed in paragraph 2 of the resolution just adopted.

6. Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote, said that his delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.6/L.651/Rev.1 because the text as a whole reflected the discussion in the Committee and the positions taken by delegations. He wished, however, to state for the record that his delegation had accepted operative paragraph 3 on the understanding that the Committee, in addition to approving the programme and organization of work of the Commission, also approved the general idea of the preparation of a new survey of the whole field of international law, in accordance with article 18 of the Commission's Statute. The approval of the idea of such a survey did not prejudice the questions of how and by whom the survey should be carried out and of what the financial implications would be. Those matters should be decided at an appropriate time in the course of the Commission's work.

7. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution on the understanding that the words "codification and progressive development of the law of succession of States and Governments" in the second preambular paragraph entailed consideration of present trends of international law, the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the fundamental right of self-determination, permanent sovereignty over national resources and the new situation created by the rapid process of decolonization. As his delegation had stated (1034th meeting), in view of the importance of the topic of succession to newly independent States, the International Law Commission in considering that topic should take due account of the experience of new States and should not base itself solely on traditional rules and practice.

8. Mr. SINCLAIR (United Kingdom) said that in supporting operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution his delegation had borne in mind the statement in paragraph 99 of the Commission's report that the Commission had asked the Secretary-General to prepare the proposed survey. It would be for the competent authorities to decide, having due regard to the views expressed in the Sixth Committee, how and by whom the survey should be carried out. It would of necessity be a comprehensive work and might require the services of an outside expert.

9. Mr. JAFRI (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which was testimony to the Sixth Committee's esteem for and confidence in the International Law Commission. He

hoped that the Commission would continue to discharge its responsibilities with the same distinction that had marked its efforts over the past twenty years. In its further work on succession, the Commission should take full account of the recommendations contained in General Assembly resolutions 1765 (XVII) and 1902 (XVIII). His delegation supported the view expressed by the Special Rapporteur on that topic in his first report,<sup>1/</sup> commenting on article 4 of his draft, that the State practice in favour of the continuance in force of boundaries established by treaty appeared to be such as to justify the conclusion that a general rule of international law existed to that effect. Disregard for boundaries established by treaty would be a negation of the principle *pacta sunt servanda*, and the resultant reshaping of national boundaries would create a situation which would threaten world peace and international order. His delegation also supported the Special Rapporteur's view that, by excepting from succession in respect of treaties boundaries established through treaties, article 4 of his draft in no way excluded the independent operation of the principle of self-determination.

10. Mr. DE BRANCHE (France) said that his delegation had been able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.6/L.651/Rev.1, because the present wording had removed the misgivings his delegation had had with regard to draft resolution A/C.6/L.651.

11. Mr. WARNER (United States of America) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution (A/C.6/L.651/Rev.1) on the understanding that the manner in which the survey mentioned in operative paragraph 3 was to be carried out was a question for the competent authorities to decide. His delegation assumed that the financial implications of the draft resolution were as had been stated by the Legal Counsel at the 1037th meeting of the Committee.

12. The CHAIRMAN said that, since paragraph 99 of the Commission's report—referred to in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.6/L.651/Rev.1—stated that the Commission had decided to ask the Secretary-General to undertake preparatory work on the survey, he assumed that the draft resolution adopted by the Committee would not interfere with the work which the Commission had asked the Secretariat to do before the next session of the Commission.

13. Mr. SECARIN (Romania), Rapporteur, referred to paragraph (f) of the annex to General Assembly resolution 2292 (XXII) and asked for the Committee's views on the type of report he should submit on its behalf to the General Assembly on the present item. He recalled that in the past the reports of the Sixth Committee on items relating to the work of the International Law Commission contained summaries of the views expressed during the debate. He had been informed by the Secretariat that, in the present instance, the cost of typing, translating and reproducing a summary of the representative trends of opinion which had emerged during the discussion of the report of the International Law Commission would amount to approximately \$3,000. In his opinion, an analytical summary of the opinions expressed in the Committee's discussion would undoubtedly be useful to the Inter-

national Law Commission in its further work on the items considered at the present session and would not duplicate the chronological account given in the summary records.

14. However, he did not consider that a summary of the main trends of opinion emerging in the Committee's discussion on agenda item 85 entitled "Draft Convention on Special Missions" should be included in the report on that item, because the Commission's work of codification on that topic had been concluded. He proposed that the Sixth Committee's report on that item should be drawn up on the model of the draft report of the Committee of the Whole of the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties,<sup>2/</sup> which contained no summary of the debate.

15. He would be guided by the instructions of members, who should bear in mind that the report should constitute a useful instrument in the work on the codification of international law, while not incurring undue expenditure.

16. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should accept in principle the proposal that its report should contain a statement of the representative trends of opinion and not of the individual views of all delegations.

*It was so decided.*

17. Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objection to such a procedure, provided that its views were duly recorded in the summary records. For example, every delegation had a right to have its views on the interpretation of the text just adopted by the Committee duly recorded, although no one delegation could claim to have its interpretation regarded as final and definitive. His delegation understood paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.6/L.651/Rev.1 as meaning that the question of the publication of the survey was not an urgent one, that the project was part of the duties of the International Law Commission, and that practical action would be taken on the matter only after that draft resolution had been considered by the Commission and after the Commission had taken an appropriate decision in the light of that draft resolution.

18. Mr. ALCIVAR (Ecuador) noted that the draft resolution included no reference to the proposal in paragraph 98 (a) of the Commission's report to extend the term of office of members of the Commission. Differing views had been expressed on that question in the Committee's debate and the majority of members had not yet received instructions from their Governments on the matter and required more time to consider it. He therefore proposed that the question should be considered at the next session of the General Assembly and that the Rapporteur should include a statement to that effect in the report.

19. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) agreed with the USSR representative that a single delegation's interpretation of a draft resolution could not be regarded as definitive. The Soviet delegation's views on the text should certainly be reflected in the

<sup>1/</sup> A/CN.4/202.

<sup>2/</sup> A/CONF.39/C.1/L.370 and Add.1-7.

summary record; he had no doubt that that would be done, and also that the Committee's discussions on the matter would be accurately reflected both in the summary records and in the report.

20. Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he merely wished his comments to be reflected in the summary record of the meeting.

21. Mr. SONAVANE (India) supported the Ecuadorian representative's suggestion. As his delegation had said earlier (1035th meeting), the extension of the term of office of its members would enable the International Law Commission to plan and execute its work better. Nevertheless, given the divergence of views on the question, it would be more profitable if discussion of the matter were deferred until the following year.

22. Mr. SAHOVIC (Yugoslavia), referring to the Rapporteur's statement, said that the report submitted by the Committee the previous year had provided delegations and the Commission with a clear picture of opinions expressed in the Sixth Committee on the Commission's report. A similar type of report should be submitted on the Committee's current session.

23. As the Ecuadorian representative had suggested, mention should also be made in the report of the fact that a number of delegations had requested that discussion of the question of the extension of the term of office of members of the Commission should be deferred until the following year.

24. The report should also refer to the omission of paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.6/L.651 from the text finally adopted by the Committee (A/C.6/L.651/Rev.1). The issue referred to in that paragraph was wider than might have been gathered from certain statements made during the debate on the matter.

25. Mr. MOLINA LANDAETA (Venezuela) supported the suggestion that the report should mention that, in the opinion of certain delegations, discussion of the question of the extension of the term of office of the members of the Commission should be deferred until the following year. His delegation had received no instructions from his Government on that subject.

26. Mr. PRANDLER (Hungary) said that his delegation had co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.6/L.651/Rev.1 on the understanding that under the terms of article 18 of its Statute the International Law Commission was competent to prepare the survey referred to in paragraph 3. The Commission must decide the procedure to be followed in making survey. The Secretary-General should comply with the request made in paragraph 99 of the Commission's report. As the Committee had been informed at the previous meeting, preparation of the background material for the survey would not necessarily entail additional expenditure.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its discussion of the report of the International Law Commission on the work of its twentieth session.

*The meeting was suspended at 4.35 p.m. and resumed at 5 p.m.*

## AGENDA ITEM 85

Draft Convention on Special Missions (A/6709/Rev.1 and Corr.1,<sup>3/</sup> A/7156 and Add.1 and 2; A/C.6/389; A/C.6/L.646)

28. The CHAIRMAN, tracing the history of the item, said that at its tenth session the International Law Commission had decided that the question of special missions should be discussed in order to determine the rules of law governing such missions. On the basis of the report of the late Mr. A. E. F. Sandström, who had been appointed Special Rapporteur, the Commission had drawn up recommendations for rules concerning special missions. The Commission's draft was based on the idea that the rules it had prepared on diplomatic intercourse and immunities in general should on the whole be applied to special missions. The draft had been referred by the General Assembly to the United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities, convened at Vienna early in 1961, for consideration with the Commission's draft articles on the subject of that Conference. A special Sub-Committee appointed by the Conference had expressed the view, however, that the draft articles were unsuitable for inclusion in the final convention without a long and detailed study, which could take place only after a set of rules on permanent missions had been concluded. The Sub-Committee had recommended, therefore, that the Conference should refer the question back to the General Assembly so that the Assembly could recommend the International Law Commission to make a further study of the topic. Those recommendations had been adopted by the Vienna Conference and the matter was again submitted to the General Assembly, which in resolution 1687 (XVI) had requested the Commission to study the subject further.

29. Later, the Commission had appointed Mr. Bartoš as Special Rapporteur and, after considering four of his reports, written comments from Governments and the views expressed in the Sixth Committee, had adopted, at its nineteenth session in 1967, the final text of fifty draft articles on special missions. The Commission had at the same time adopted a draft preamble for a convention on special missions. The draft articles had been submitted in 1967 to the General Assembly,<sup>4/</sup> which, by resolution 2273 (XXII), had decided to include an item entitled "Draft Convention on Special Missions" in the provisional agenda of its twenty-third session. The Assembly had also invited Member States to submit, not later than 1 July 1968, their written comments and observations on the draft articles.

30. The Committee was dealing with a complex topic. As Mr. Bartoš had observed, the question was one on which no clearly defined solutions had crystallized either in the literature or in the precedents. There were no world-wide established precedents on a number of problems covered by the subject, and practice varied from one country to another; it was

<sup>3/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 9.

<sup>4/</sup> Ibid., chapter II, section D.

therefore difficult to refer authoritatively to existing solutions.<sup>5/</sup>

31. Ad hoc diplomacy was, however, not new, the use of special missions having been, in fact, the earliest form of diplomacy. State practice on the subject went back to the very beginning of formal relations between nations. The historical works on India established that constant contacts and relations were maintained between some of the States of ancient India and certain Asian, European and African States through special missions. Similarly, the Greek city states and Rome had developed in ancient times an elaborate system of ad hoc diplomacy.

32. International intercourse being comparatively limited in extent in ancient times, it was not surprising that diplomatic missions were always temporary. But with its growth, the practice of sending permanent diplomatic missions had been introduced and firmly established. However, as Mr. Bartoš had said, the ever-growing influence of political control, the democratization of State political systems in general, the increasingly active participation of politicians, and particularly of Heads of Government and Ministers for Foreign Affairs in international relations, and the closer and more direct "summit" and "high-level" contacts had resulted in the transfer of a large volume of affairs from resident to ad hoc diplomacy.<sup>6/</sup> The use of special missions was becoming increasingly important in all fields and at all levels of intercourse between States. It was most important, therefore, that a solid foundation for a positive system of law in that field be laid and the rules of such a system formulated in detail. Codification of law relating to special missions would undoubtedly contribute to the promotion of friendly relations between States.

33. The Committee, therefore, and eventually the General Assembly meeting as a conference would consider and establish the law relating to an important aspect of contemporary international relations. In fact the draft articles on special missions belonged to the family of the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations. As the International Law Commission had observed in a resolution adopted at its 940th meeting, the draft completed "the work on codification already carried out in connexion with diplomatic and consular relations".<sup>7/</sup>

34. There was obviously a similarity between a special mission's activities and aims and those of a permanent mission. Hence the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations would form an important part of the basis of the work on special missions. However, as the International Law Commission had pointed out, special missions were, both by virtue of their functions and by their nature, an institution distinct from permanent missions.<sup>8/</sup> That raised the question whether, and to what extent, the rules concerning diplomatic intercourse and immunities ought to apply to special missions. The contents of the 1963

Vienna Convention on Consular Relations should also be borne in mind.

35. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) requested that the Chairman's statement be reported very fully in the summary record of the meeting.

36. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document A/C.6/389, containing a communication from Switzerland requesting that it be permitted to participate, without the right to vote, in the work of the Sixth Committee on the draft Convention on Special Missions. The communication drew attention to the fact that the work of the United Nations on the codification of public international law had so far been carried out at international conferences open not only to States Members of the United Nations but also to States which were members of the specialized agencies or parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and to States specially invited. Presumably, had the General Assembly decided to convene a plenipotentiary conference on special missions it would have invited Switzerland under the usual formula.

37. For the first time, however, the General Assembly had decided that the Sixth Committee, rather than a plenipotentiary conference, should complete a major codification project. That precluded the usual invitation to non-Member States which were members of the specialized agencies or the International Court of Justice to participate with full rights in the consideration of the draft Convention. It did not, however, preclude an invitation to such non-Member States to participate, without the right to vote, in the Sixth Committee's deliberations on special missions, if the Committee considered that sufficient justification for extending an invitation existed. In the past, non-Member States, and even organizations, had been invited to participate in the consideration by committees of items in which such States had a special and particular interest. So far as could be ascertained, however, there had been no instance in the past of a non-Member State requesting or having been invited to participate in the drafting of a convention by a Main Committee of the Assembly.

38. The members of the Sixth Committee would surely agree that Switzerland could be considered as having a special and particular interest in the subject of special missions. Not only were the United Nations Office at Geneva and the headquarters of many international organizations located in its territory, but also it was perhaps the State most visited by special missions for the discussion of questions of great international significance. Switzerland, therefore, had good cause to wish to participate in preparing a convention which might eventually affect it more frequently and more continuously than any other State.

39. He suggested that, on the firm understanding that it was not creating a precedent, the Committee should invite Switzerland to participate, without vote, in its deliberations on the subject of special missions.

40. Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had always favoured the principle that all countries wishing to do so should be permitted to participate in the preparation of international conventions. Any non-observance of that principle was attributable to the obstructionist atti-

<sup>5/</sup> See Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1964, vol. II, p. 69, para. 1.

<sup>6/</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 70, para. 12.

<sup>7/</sup> See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 9, para. 35.

<sup>8/</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 16.

tudes of certain countries. In the case in question, however, the Committee should be guided by legal rather than political considerations. According to rule 29 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, only Members should participate in the work of the United Nations. Indeed, there had been no case in the United Nations of a non-member State participating in the preparation of a convention. To authorize such a State to do so would be tantamount to conferring the privileges of membership on a State which had not assumed its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

41. From a strictly legal point of view, therefore, Switzerland was not entitled to participate in the work of the Committee. But since Switzerland, which certainly had a special interest in the subject, had not requested the right to vote on the question, it might be possible to allow it to participate in the Committee's work on special missions on the understanding that the case was a special and exceptional one, as had been pointed out by the Chairman, and what should be considered as a general consensus did not create a precedent. His delegation reserved the right to reconsider its position in subsequent cases in the light of the principles to which he had referred.

42. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the understanding that no precedent was being created, Switzerland should be invited to participate, without the right to vote, in the Committee's deliberations on the subject of special missions.

*It was so decided.*

*At the Chairman's invitation, Mr. Turrettini, Observer for Switzerland, took a place at the Committee table.*

43. Mr. TURRETTINI (Observer for Switzerland) thanked the Sixth Committee for allowing his delegation to participate, without vote, in its work on special missions. Switzerland had always played an active part in the development of international law, and had participated in all recent inter-State conferences dealing with the codification of that law. It was in a position, therefore, to make a useful contribution to the formation of the law relating to special missions.

44. Switzerland's international relations were based on the principle of universality and, being the host of many international organizations, it received many special missions. In addition, special missions of third countries frequently met on its territory. In 1959, for example, Greek and Turkish delegations had met at Zürich to discuss the status of the island of Cyprus. Indeed, one of the articles of the draft Convention provided for such meetings on the territory of a third State. For those reasons, Switzerland attached special importance to the draft prepared by the International Law Commission.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that the note by the Secretariat (A/C.6/L.646) raised a number of questions concerning the methods of work and procedures to be adopted in preparing the draft Convention on Special Missions. In accordance with paragraph 2 of that note, he suggested that the Committee should

decide to dispense with a general debate on the draft articles.

46. Mr. SINCLAIR (United Kingdom) and Mr. ROBERTSON (Canada) agreed with the Chairman's suggestion, on the understanding that particular articles might give rise to more extensive debate than others, and that broader issues might be brought forward at the appropriate time.

*The Chairman's suggestion was adopted.*

47. The CHAIRMAN suggested that discussion of article 1, on the use of terms, should be deferred until after consideration of the substantive draft articles.

48. Mr. SINCLAIR (United Kingdom), Mr. DELEAU (France), Mr. OGUNDERE (Nigeria) and Sir Kenneth BAILEY (Australia) thought that, while decisions on article 1 should be reserved for the concluding stages of the work, sponsors of amendments to article 1 should be permitted to introduce their amendments before the Committee took up article 2, particularly as the term "special mission" was defined in article 1 and an understanding of the meaning of that term was essential in the consideration of the other articles.

49. Mr. OSTROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that amendments to an article should be introduced immediately before the discussion of the article.

50. Mr. YASSEEN (Iraq) and Mr. DADZIE (Ghana) thought that the best course would be for the Committee to start with the discussion of the substantive articles. Members could express their opinions on the use of terms in the course of the discussion on the substantive articles.

51. The CHAIRMAN suggested, as a compromise, that the Committee should start with the discussion of article 2, that delegations should submit their amendments to article 1 by the end of the current week, and that a convenient time should be found for delegations to introduce those amendments.

52. Mr. MYSLIL (Czechoslovakia) supported the Chairman's suggestion. The only term in article 1 that called for extensive comment was "special mission", since all the others had been taken from the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, and delegations could state their views on the meaning of the term during the discussion of article 2.

53. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Legal Counsel) agreed that the members could make known their philosophies concerning the nature of a special mission during the discussion of article 2. If the Committee started with a discussion of article 1, its work would be seriously impeded.

54. Sir Kenneth BAILEY (Australia) accepted the Chairman's compromise suggestion.

55. The CHAIRMAN noted that the members of the Committee were in general agreement on his compromise suggestion. He suggested further that the Committee should take decisions on the draft articles by simple majority in accordance with the rules of procedure, but should recommend that the General Assembly take its decisions on the draft articles by

a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting.

*The Chairman's suggestions were adopted.*

56. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the drafting committee, if one was established, to prepare for submission to it a draft preamble, taking into consideration the one prepared by the Commission, and a set of final clauses for the future Convention.

*It was so decided.*

57. Mr. DADZIE (Ghana) proposed that the Chairman should be requested, after consultation with the various regional groups, to appoint a drafting committee composed of fifteen members on the basis of equitable geographical representation. The experience of earlier codification conferences confirmed the desirability of a small drafting committee. A membership of fifteen would provide an efficient committee and at the same time would allow representation of the principal geographical regions and the principal legal systems of the world.

58. Mr. PRANDLER (Hungary) supported the Ghanaian proposal.

59. Mr. MOLINA LANDAETA (Venezuela), recalling that the Drafting Committee set up by the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States had been concerned with much more than matters of style, wished to know precisely what the drafting committee's terms of reference would be.

60. The CHAIRMAN replied that the drafting committee's main functions would probably be those stated in paragraph 7 of the Secretariat's note (A/C.6/L.646), namely, to prepare drafts and give advice on drafting as requested, and to co-ordinate and review the drafting of all texts adopted; but the Committee would retain the power to determine the functions of the drafting committee.

61. Mr. DADZIE (Ghana), replying to a question put by Mr. HASAN (Pakistan), said that his delegation did not support the suggestion in paragraph 7 of the Secretariat note that geographical representation in the drafting committee should be based on the

composition of the Security Council. Under his proposal, the membership of the drafting committee would be selected on the basis of equitable geographical distribution.

62. Mr. HASAN (Pakistan) said that his delegation was confident that the Chairman would exercise his discretion wisely.

63. Mr. BAMELA ENGO (Cameroon) supported the Ghanaian proposal. His delegation's view concerning the participation of the Third World in conferences was well known. He could not support the suggestion that the membership of the drafting committee should be based on the composition of the Security Council, since the composition of the Council did not reflect the existing world situation. Equitable geographic distribution should be the only consideration.

64. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) pointed out that the membership of the Security Council had only recently been increased to fifteen. His delegation was confident that the Chairman would appoint an effective drafting committee.

65. Mr. BAMELA ENGO (Cameroon) pointed out that the additional members elected to the Security Council were not permanent members.

66. Mr. ALCIVAR (Ecuador) said that the composition of the Security Council did not reflect the world political situation and, in particular, did not give adequate representation to the Latin American countries. While that composition might be appropriate for the Security Council, which had a special function, it was not appropriate for legal bodies, which should be established on the basis of equitable geographical representation. He therefore supported the Ghanaian proposal.

67. Mr. RATTANSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that it would be inappropriate for a body of lawyers, which was seeking to establish uniformity in a branch of the law, to appoint its drafting committee on the basis of the composition of the Security Council. He supported the Ghanaian proposal.

*The Ghanaian proposal regarding the appointment of a drafting committee was adopted.*

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*