

# **United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties**

Vienna, Austria  
First session  
26 March – 24 May 1968

Document:-  
**A/CONF.39/SR.1**

## **First plenary meeting**

Extract from the *Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, First Session (Summary records of the plenary meetings and of the meetings of the Committee of the Whole)*

# SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE PLENARY MEETINGS

---

## FIRST PLENARY MEETING

*Tuesday, 26 March 1968, at 3 p.m.*

*Acting President:* Mr. STAVROPOULOS  
(Legal Counsel of the United Nations, representing the  
Secretary-General)

*President:* Mr. AGO (Italy)

### Opening of the Conference

[Item 1 of the provisional agenda]

1. The ACTING PRESIDENT said it was his privilege and honour to welcome the Federal President of the Republic of Austria. The United Nations was grateful for the facilities and assistance provided by the Austrian Government, which had made a notable contribution to the success of the 1961 and 1963 Conferences on Diplomatic and Consular relations.

2. On behalf of the Secretary-General, he declared the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties open and invited the Conference to observe a minute's silence for prayer or meditation.

*The Conference observed a minute's silence.*

3. The ACTING PRESIDENT said that his next duty was to welcome participants on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who had asked him to express his regret at his inability to be present and to convey to the Conference his best wishes for its success.

4. The present Conference was the sixth in a series of conferences called by the General Assembly for the purpose, laid down in the Charter, of "encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification". It was the most important, and might also prove to be the most difficult, of those conferences. Since the Second World War, there had been a steady increase in the number of treaties concluded each year, and international relations were now carried out more within the framework of treaties than within that of customary international law. Moreover, international relations themselves were taking on an increasing importance with the growing recognition that the pressing problems of humanity could best be dealt with by co-operation at the international level. The rules of law governing such matters as the conclusion, interpretation, validity and termination of treaties were therefore of fundamental importance and the clarification of those rules and their embodiment in a multilateral convention would have an immense significance for the whole future of international law.

5. The draft placed before the Conference was the result of long years of work by the International Law Commission. The Conference was fortunate in having as its expert consultant Sir Humphrey Waldock who, as that Commission's Special Rapporteur, had helped to bring that work to fruition.

6. Following their adoption by the Commission, the draft articles on the law of treaties had been submitted in 1966 to the General Assembly, which had requested further comments from Governments, and had discussed the draft articles at its twenty-first and twenty-second sessions in 1966 and 1967. The present Conference was thus the climax of long years of work by the Commission, by Governments and by the Assembly. The plans for the Conference which had been adopted by the General Assembly called for the examination at the present session of the entire draft at the committee stage. The Conference would meet again in 1969 for a second session, at which the results of the committee stage would be examined in plenary meeting and finally adopted in the form of a convention.

### Address by the Federal President of the Republic of Austria

7. H. E. Dr. Franz JONAS (Federal President of the Republic of Austria) said that in December 1966 the General Assembly of the United Nations had decided that an international conference should be convened to prepare a convention on the law of treaties. The antecedents of that decision of the General Assembly could be traced back as far as 1949. In that year the International Law Commission of the United Nations had placed the problem of the law of treaties on its agenda as a topic suitable for codification, and the Commission had been dealing with the problem ever since 1950. At its eighteenth session the Commission had adopted draft articles on the law of treaties, had submitted them to the General Assembly and had recommended the holding of an international conference of plenipotentiaries to study the draft articles with a view to the conclusion of an international convention on the law of treaties.

8. With the opening of the Conference that day the discussions concerning a convention on the law of treaties entered a decisive phase. Delegates to the Conference had an important and responsible task before them. The United Nations was the competent international body for the consolidation and further development of international law as one of the most important means of maintaining peace and progress.

9. It was no accident that the International Law Commission had taken up the codification of the law of treaties as one of its first tasks. International law without treaties was unthinkable. The principles of the international legal order were based on treaties. Treaties should replace armed force and be recognized as a moral force, the expression of democracy and of peace in international life. Treaties should lay down generally applicable rules for the co-existence of peoples, and endow material ties with moral strength. In cases of doubt, naturally, the authority of a court of arbitration was needed, but the stability and effectiveness of treaties were based on mutual trust between the contracting parties. For the same

reasons the United Nations adhered to the principles of respect for treaties and of the peaceful settlement of disputes, renunciation of the use of force in international relations, and the self-determination of peoples.

10. There was another reason why the codification of the law of treaties was growing more and more urgent and important. The development of trade, of the world economy, of science, of technology and now of space research continually created new legal problems which required to be solved by treaties. In short, international legal relations were growing steadily more concentrated. The development of the family of nations, particularly during the present stormy phase of transition, could not be left to chance. In the interests of the human community, a serious effort must be made, through wise treaties, to make the community of peoples a community of law and justice, of freedom and democracy.

11. Recognizing the great significance of the Conference and appreciating the lofty tasks before it, Austria had decided to invite the United Nations to hold it at Vienna, and to Austria's great pleasure, the Secretary-General of the United Nations had informed the Austrian Government that the invitation was accepted. That he regarded as an acknowledgement of the efforts of neutral Austria for the furtherance of international co-operation and understanding among peoples.

12. The distinguished representatives of the participating States could rest assured that Austria would do its utmost to make the Conference a success. All Austrian citizens would be proud if the codification of the law of treaties, which would be an important event in the life of the international legal community, were to be associated with the name of the Federal capital. After the successful United Nations Conferences at Vienna in 1961 and 1963, when diplomatic and consular law had been codified, the position of Vienna as the traditional home of diplomacy and international law would be affirmed anew.

13. On behalf of Austria, he welcomed that great United Nations Conference and prayed that the moral force of law might come into its own, and the spirit of understanding and international co-operation prevail. He wished the Conference every success.

14. The ACTING PRESIDENT thanked the Federal President of the Republic of Austria for honouring the Conference by addressing its opening meeting.

*The Federal President of the Republic of Austria withdrew.*

#### Question of participation in the Conference

15. Mr. KHLESTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation felt obliged to make a categorical protest against the discrimination that was being practised in the organization of the Conference. It was well known that all States, as equal members of the international community, had the same right to participate in the settlement of problems of common interest. That followed from the principles of the sovereignty and equal rights of States, enshrined in the United Nations Charter, and from generally accepted principles of international law: no State or group of States was entitled to exclude others from participation in the

settlement of problems that were of common interest to all States. Accordingly, all countries without exception should have been allowed to participate in the present Conference. The violation of that principle was a blatant injustice and a gross affront to international law.

16. But owing to the biased attitude of certain States Members of the United Nations, a number of international conferences of common interest had been marred by the imposition of an artificial and discriminatory formula providing that only States Members of the United Nations, members of the specialized agencies and parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice could participate, regardless of whether or not the Conference in question affected the interests of all the countries of the world. Under the cover of that formula, certain States, particularly the United States and the United Kingdom, were trying to further their narrow political interests and to infringe the rights of a number of sovereign States, especially of socialist countries. Such an attempt was being made at the present Conference, although the purpose of the Conference was to prepare a general multilateral convention, designed to regulate treaty relations between all the countries of the world. The Conference was obviously of interest to certain States which were not Members of the United Nations, but which concluded international agreements, including agreements with States Members of the United Nations. Since the convention to be prepared at the Conference was universal in its purposes, its functions and its subject-matter, any State, irrespective of its political and social structure, should have the right to be a party to it. Obviously, therefore, it was both desirable and necessary that the Conference should be genuinely representative in character and that all those States which expressed the desire to participate in it should be allowed to do so.

17. The United States, the United Kingdom and the other countries which had imposed the decision to prevent certain States from participating in the Conference had acted in violation of the United Nations Charter and had thus prejudiced the achievement of the main purpose of the Conference, which was the codification and progressive development of international law. It was perfectly obvious that the value of the convention to be prepared by the Conference would be vitiated by the exclusion of the People's Republic of China, which accounted for one-fifth of the population of the whole world. On the one hand, that was a gross violation of the rights of that State and of the great Chinese people, and on the other it reduced the significance of the new convention, which would be drawn up without the participation of the People's Republic of China. The same applied to such socialist States as the German Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The German Democratic Republic had diplomatic and consular relations with many countries and participated in a wide variety of international conferences and organizations. It was especially important to note that the German Democratic Republic was in the vanguard of the States which resolutely fought for peace and friendship among nations. It had concluded hundreds of international agreements with Members and non-Members of the United Nations alike. It had also participated

in such general multilateral agreements as the 1963 Moscow Treaty banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water and the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, and many other general multilateral agreements. The convention that was to be prepared was undoubtedly of interest to the German Democratic Republic, and its participation in the Conference would have helped to improve the drafting of the convention, as had been demonstrated by the interesting and significant comments on the draft articles which had been submitted by the German Democratic Republic and which would certainly be found very useful when the articles were being considered.

18. A number of countries represented at the Conference had entered into various treaty relations with the socialist States he had mentioned, and if the latter were debarred from participating in the preparation of a convention on the law of treaties, it was hard to see what instrument would govern those treaty relations. Clearly, the United States and the United Kingdom and their supporters were prejudicing the interests of the entire international community by their discriminatory action. The Soviet Union, which had always supported the principle of universality and of the development of friendly relations among all States, categorically condemned that action and insisted that all States had equal rights to participate in international conferences on questions of common interest.

19. Mr. KRISHNA RAO (India) said that the work of the Conference was of the greatest importance to the newly independent countries. The codification of the law of treaties would serve to express in writing the contemporary rules of law on the subject and thus release those countries from the need to refer to customary rules of international law; the search for those lawyer-based rules often gave only a picture of what international law had been rather than of what it actually was.

20. Against that background, his delegation reaffirmed its steadfast adherence to the principle of non-discrimination between States. Since the international community was a community of States, no distinction should be made between States, whether based on population, size, importance or power. It was significant that the right of all States to participate without discrimination in multilateral conventions adopted under United Nations auspices had been accepted in the vitally important matters of disarmament and outer space.

21. The present Conference, however, had been convened by the United Nations, and General Assembly resolution 2166 (XXI) set out the basis on which that had been done. Under operative paragraph 4 of that resolution, those invited to participate in the Conference were "States Members of the United Nations, States members of the specialized agencies, States Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice and States that the General Assembly decides specially to invite." The Conference could not go beyond the terms of reference laid down for it in that paragraph.

22. Consequently, although his delegation supported the idea put forward by the USSR representative, it must insist, with regret, that the Conference was not legally competent to extend participation in the Conference in

the manner suggested. The proper time to raise that question had been during the discussion in the General Assembly leading to the adoption of resolution 2166 (XXI). But whatever convention was eventually adopted by the present Conference should be open to accession by all States. At the appropriate time, his delegation would take a firm stand on that issue.

23. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation had consistently expressed its support of the principle of universality of participation in conferences preparing general multilateral conventions of concern to all members of the international community. In 1966, during the General Assembly debate on the convening of the Conference, the United Arab Republic had supported the proposal that operative paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 2166 (XXI) should be so drafted as to ensure that invitations were issued to all the countries of the world. In doing so, it had been guided by the fact that participation in the formulation of general norms of international law was an inherent right of the independent statehood of sovereign members of the community of nations. That was a fundamental rule which no group of States had the right to infringe or curtail. It was most regrettable that that formula had not been adopted and that certain important States had not been invited to participate in the Conference.

24. Sir Francis VALLAT (United Kingdom) said that the problem raised by the USSR representative was fundamentally political and could not properly be debated at a conference of jurists engaged in preparing a convention on the law of treaties. The Conference had been convened under the auspices of the United Nations, and the General Assembly had unequivocally decided what States should be allowed to participate, since Assembly resolution 2166 (XXI) had been adopted by over 100 votes. It could not be maintained, therefore, that the decision had rested with one or two Governments.

25. The Conference was embarking on a task the importance of which to the future of international law could not be overestimated. Controversy would undoubtedly arise on many points, for international law was not an exact science. He would appeal to participants to confine their remarks to issues which concerned them as international lawyers, and not to add to the burdens of the Conference by attempting to interfere with a decision already taken by the General Assembly.

26. Mr. PELE (Romania) said his delegation regretted that all the States of the world had not been invited to participate in such an important conference. It was becoming obvious that the development of international law required the active co-operation of all countries. Codification could not be confined to systematization of existing legal norms, for the progressive development of international law must also be borne in mind. That was why the Romanian delegation considered that the participation of the People's Republic of China, the German Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would greatly help the Conference to bring its work to a successful conclusion and to promote peaceful co-existence and friendly co-operation among nations.

27. Sir Lalita RAJAPAKSE (Ceylon) said that the formulation of general multilateral treaties was so universal a task that it should not be carried out by a group of States, however large, but that all States, regardless of their ideology or commitments, should be allowed to participate. The absence of the People's Republic of China, a world power of the first magnitude, and of other States, could only have an adverse effect on the Conference's deliberations and on the value of the ultimate product.

28. Mr. USTOR (Hungary) said that his delegation shared the misgivings expressed by earlier speakers concerning the wording of operative paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 2166 (XXI), because it was essential to invite all States to participate in conferences of universal interest. The codification of the law of treaties was of concern to all States, since the convention would govern all subjects of international law, and it was an elementary requirement of democracy that no subject of law should be excluded from its making. That principle had been sacrificed to obvious political aims, and the discrimination practised against the People's Republic of China, the German Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea constituted a violation of the vital principle of the equal sovereignty of States. During the relevant debate in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly, Hungary had protested that discrimination against those countries was not only illegal, but unjust, inequitable and unfair. His delegation wished again to record its protest against that practice.

29. Mr. KORCHAK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that contemporary international life showed a general trend towards the co-operation of all States in matters of general interest. That trend was leading to increased observance of the principle of the universality of multilateral treaties, a principle reflected in such important instruments of international law as the 1963 Moscow Treaty banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water and the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies. In addition, a number of General Assembly resolutions on questions of general interest contained a formula for the participation of all States without exception. The development of international co-operation predicated the participation of all States in universal conventions, as a basic principle of international law.

30. The wording of operative paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 2166 (XXI) was therefore highly regrettable, since it excluded a group of peace-loving States from participation. It had been said that a conference of jurists could not deal with political matters, but it seemed anomalous, in preparing an instrument on the law of treaties, to allow even a shadow of discrimination and a departure from the principle of universality. To take only one example, the German Democratic Republic, which was one of the outstanding industrial countries of the world, which abided entirely by the principles of the United Nations Charter in its foreign policy, and which had concluded a number of interna-

tional agreements as a sovereign State, should not be excluded from participation. The same applied to the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China. His delegation therefore strongly urged the observance of the principle of universality in the work of the Conference.

31. Mr. JAMSRAN (Mongolia) said that since the codification and progressive development of rules of international law were of interest to all States, all of them should participate in the process. Moreover, that was required by the principle of sovereign equality on which the Charter was founded. The discrimination applied against some States under General Assembly resolution 2166 (XXI), operative paragraph 4, conflicted with the right of all States to conclude treaties. Universal participation in the present Conference, whatever the political and social system of any State would ensure its success.

32. Mr. SEATON (United Republic of Tanzania) said he deplored the exclusion of certain States; progress and international security depended on the rule of law which all States must take a hand in formulating. Every State had an inherent right to participate in the Conference and the law of treaties could not be codified by a restricted group which then imposed rules on others which had not taken part. Though the Conference was not competent to revoke a General Assembly decision, he hoped that the discussion would ensure that in future all States contributed to the creation of legal rules.

33. Mr. OSIECKI (Poland) said that during the discussion in the General Assembly of operative paragraph 4 of resolution 2166 (XXI), his delegation had advocated universal participation in the Conference on the ground that depriving certain States of the right to attend was contrary to the principle of equality of States. The outcome of the Conference was of vital importance because the rules adopted would regulate relations between all States. The States excluded supported the aims of the United Nations, took part in some of the work of specialized agencies and were parties to bilateral and general multilateral treaties.

34. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said he endorsed what had been said about the importance of all States taking part in elaborating a convention on the law of treaties which would help to promote peaceful relations and economic and social progress. Any attempt at codification could only be fully successful if each State made its contribution.

35. The delegations at the General Assembly responsible for excluding certain States had acted in defiance of Charter principles and their action would diminish the prestige of the Conference. For example, the German Democratic Republic was a full subject of international law and maintained diplomatic, consular and economic relations with countries the population of which represented two-thirds of the population of the world. It had concluded numerous treaties and participated in many international bodies. It had trade relations with over one hundred countries, including some in western Europe. Historic events were irreversible and it was no use blinking facts or ignoring the existence of that State.

36. A policy of discrimination was also pursued by western countries with regard to other socialist countries, namely the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the People's Republic of China.

37. Members of the United Nations must put an end to discrimination and support the principle of universality.

38. Mr. KOUTIKOV (Bulgaria) said he objected to discrimination against certain States, which was a violation of contemporary international law and totally anomalous.

39. Mr. ALVAREZ TABIO (Cuba) said that all States had an inalienable right to participate in a conference that would formulate universally applicable rules. If States were to assume legal obligations, they must take part in defining them.

40. Mr. KEITA (Guinea) said he deplored the absence of some States whose lawyers and experts could have contributed so much in devising generally valid rules for regulating relations between States.

41. Mr. HU (China) said that under General Assembly resolution 2166 (XXI), the Conference had one task only, that of preparing a draft convention on the law of treaties, and it should not discuss extraneous matters. The Republic of China was fully represented, and according to the Charter a State could only possess one vote.

42. Mr. JELIC (Yugoslavia) said he regretted that the principle of universality had been flouted and a number of interested States prevented from attending the conference.

43. Mr. NACHABE (Syria) said that his delegation had consistently upheld the right of all States to attend international conferences and to become parties to general multilateral treaties, and on various occasions it had co-sponsored General Assembly resolutions on the subject, particularly those concerned with the codification and progressive development of international law. The exclusion from the conference of some members of the international community was contrary to the letter and spirit of the Charter and illegal.

44. Mr. MOUDILENO (Congo, Brazzaville) said it was quite wrong to exclude from the conference certain international entities which possessed all the attributes of sovereign States and had treaty-making power.

45. Mr. SMEJKAL (Czechoslovakia) said that the work of the Conference would suffer from the absence of a group of States which could contribute to the development of international law. That situation was incompatible with the very foundation of international law, which was universality and justice. One group of States was excluding another group from codifying general international law because of their economic and social structure. That was nothing less than discrimination, which was flagrantly at variance with international law.

46. For instance, the German Democratic Republic was a party to general multilateral treaties such as the Moscow Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, while other treaties to which it was a party were registered with the United Nations Secretariat.

47. It was equally absurd that the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam could not be represented at the Conference.

48. His delegation deeply regretted that the effects of the cold war had also made their appearance at the Conference, which could justifiably be regarded as one of the most important in the history of the United Nations.

49. The ACTING PRESIDENT said that the foregoing statements would appear in the summary record.

### Election of the President

[Item 2 of the provisional agenda]

50. The ACTING PRESIDENT said the next item on the agenda was the election of the President of the Conference.

51. Mr. VEROSTA (Austria) proposed Mr. Roberto Ago, an outstanding lawyer with wide experience of work in international organizations which would specially qualify him for the task.

52. Mr. RUEGGER (Switzerland) seconded the proposal.

53. Mr. KRISHNA RAO (India), Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic) Mr. SMEJKAL (Czechoslovakia), Mr. RUDA (Argentina), Sir Francis VALLAT (United Kingdom), Mr. YASSEEN (Iraq), Mr. REGALA (Philippines), Mr. KELLOU (Algeria), Mr. MATINE-DAFTARY (Iran), Mr. KHLESTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. de BRESSON (France) all supported the proposal.

*Mr. Roberto Ago (Italy) was elected President by acclamation and took the Chair.*

54. The PRESIDENT said he was deeply appreciative of the honour done to his country and to himself by his election and sincerely grateful for the kind words of the representatives who had just spoken. He wished first to pay a tribute to the contribution made by Austria to the success of the 1961 and 1963 Conferences and to the outstanding leadership of those Conferences by Professor Verdross in 1961 and Professor Verosta in 1963.

55. The international community had grown in a remarkable manner during the past two decades and an active role was now being played by new members of that community whose diverse philosophical, religious, legal, social and economic conceptions were often markedly different from those which had formerly prevailed in the world. Those developments made it imperative to adapt international law to the new dimensions and the new requirements of the society of States.

56. The codification of international law in pursuance of Article 13 (1) of the Charter was therefore both urgent and essential. The task before the Conference, however, was the most ambitious ever undertaken within that framework because of the vital importance to international relations of the rules governing the law of treaties.

57. In the preparation of that task in the United Nations over a period of eighteen years, a leading role had been played by the International Law Commission's Special Rapporteurs on the law of treaties; the Secretariat, in

turn, had contributed valuable documentation. The Commission had prepared a draft which provided the Conference with a most suitable basis for its work.

58. The task of the Conference would be a difficult one. Success would be achieved only at the price of mutual concessions and reciprocal sacrifices; opposing but equally legitimate views would have to be reconciled in order to reach general agreement on the rules which would govern the conduct of States in their mutual relations. It was essential that the Conference should succeed and thereby introduce an element of security into a key sector of international law. If the Conference were to fail, a dangerous uncertainty would be created in a field that was vital to the satisfactory conduct of international affairs and indeed to the very existence of an orderly international society.

59. He relied on the co-operation of all participants in the performance of the Conference's constructive task and could assure them that, in the discharge of his duties, he would endeavour to assist the Conference to the best of his ability.

#### Adoption of the rules of procedure

[Item 4 of the provisional agenda]

60. The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to adopt its provisional rules of procedure.

*The provisional rules of procedure (A/CONF.39/2) were adopted.*

#### Adoption of the agenda

[Item 3 of the provisional agenda]

61. The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to adopt its provisional agenda.

*The provisional agenda (A/CONF.39/1) was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

## SECOND PLENARY MEETING

*Wednesday, 27 March 1968, at 12 noon*

*President: Mr. AGO (Italy)*

### Question of the representation of South Africa

1. Mr. SEATON (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on a point of order on behalf of the African States, said that those States did not recognize the representatives sent by the South African régime. In the first place, that régime was not representative of the population of South Africa as a whole and, in the second place, the policy of discrimination it was pursuing with regard to Africans flagrantly violated the provisions of the United Nations Charter. The principle of universality on which the United Nations system was based applied only to the true representatives of those nations. The Africans of South Africa were not represented at the Conference. The African States asked the Conference to take note of that fact. When those nine million Africans had obtained their independence and freedom,

they would be entitled to consider that they were not bound by the Conference's decisions, since their representatives had not been invited to it and had not participated in it.

2. The PRESIDENT said that that statement would be reproduced in the record of the meeting.

### Election of Vice-Presidents

[Agenda item 5]

3. The PRESIDENT reminded the Conference that under rule 6 of the rules of procedure (A/CONF.39/2) the Conference had to elect twenty-three Vice-Presidents. The delegations had discussed the election and had reached general agreement on nominations.

4. The rules of procedure of the United Nations General Assembly provided that one of the posts of Vice-President should go alternately for one year to a Latin American State and to a Western European or other State. He suggested that that post should go to Spain in 1968 and to Guatemala in 1969.

*It was so decided.*

5. The PRESIDENT read out the list of nominations upon which agreement had been reached: Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Chile, China, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guinea, Hungary, India, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain (for 1968), Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. He proposed that the Conference should elect as Vice-Presidents the representatives of those twenty-three countries.

*That proposal was adopted.*

### Election of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole

[Agenda item 6]

6. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic) nominated Mr. Elias (Nigeria) for the office of Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

7. Sir Francis VALLAT (United Kingdom), Mr. USTOR (Hungary), Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) and Mrs. ARBOLLEDA de URIBE (Colombia) supported that nomination.

*Mr. Elias (Nigeria) was elected Chairman of the Committee of the Whole by acclamation.*

### Election of the Chairman of the Drafting Committee

[Agenda item 7]

8. Mr. KRISHNA RAO (India) nominated Mr. Yasseen (Iraq) for the office of Chairman of the Drafting Committee.

9. Mr. ALVARADO (Peru), Mr. PELE (Romania), Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan), Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) and Mr. OSIECKI (Poland) supported that nomination.

*Mr. Yasseen (Iraq) was elected Chairman of the Drafting Committee by acclamation.*