Following the Sixth Legal committee's progressive and successful opening session, the delegation jumped in right back into debate. To open the session, the committee addressed the topic of Strengthening the Biological Weapons Convention. The delegation seemed every bit as determined as they were the following night. Eager to begin working on this topic, the committee moved into consideration of resolution R-1/13.

Pro and con speakers lists were formed as the delegation further examined the resolution at hand. The resolution was praised for its strong foundation. However, many delegates felt that the operative clauses were fundamentally weak. There were "holes" in the main ideas of the resolution that needed to be amended. An unmoderated caucus was then called in order for delegates to begin drafting possible amendments to address the flaws of the resolution.

Following the unmoderated caucus, seven friendly amendments were brought to the attention of the delegation. The cooperative efforts of the entire delegation had yielded a string of amendments to be created, all of which were approved by the original author of the resolution, the delegate from Rwanda. The unity of this committee seemed to be resulting in the satisfaction of the delegation as a whole. However, not all of the delegates present seemed to share the ideas of the rest of the committee.

An unfriendly amendment was brought to the attention of the delegation. The amendment added a clause that dealt with the punishment and consequences of violators of the laws brought about by the resolution. A brief speakers list was created to voice the opinions of both adversaries and supporters of the amendment. Though many delegates supported the amendment, the majority of delegates said they felt the amendment was out of the Sixth Legal committee's jurisdiction and therefore dilatory. The delegation moved into voting procedures over the amendment. With the majority of the committee against the amendment, it failed to pass. With much time and energy having been put into this resolution, the delegation was looking to put some finishing touches on the resolution before moving into closure of debate.

An unmoderated caucus was called to discuss possible additional amendments to be added to the resolution. Following the unmoderated caucus, two additional amendments were brought to the attention of the delegation. With the inclusion of these two amendments, the resolution at hand now contained a total of nine amendments revising various sections of its operative clauses. Many delegates voiced their belief that the resolution was now passable. However, some delegates seemed to be thinking very differently.

The delegate from UAE called for tabling of the resolution. A whisper of disbelief fell over the committee. The delegate from UAE said she felt that this resolution was taking "too much of the delegation's time." The delegate further explained that this resolution required "too many amendments" and it was "not fundamentally sound." Following the speech from the delegate from UAE, the delegate from Kuwait voiced her concerns over the tabling of this resolution. The delegate said she felt that "too much time" had been invested in the resolution for it not to pass. The

delegate expressed her belief that the resolution was a "culmination" of the committee's time and effort. The delegation seemed to agree. The committee was brought into voting procedures over the tabling resolution R-1/13. With an overwhelming majority against tabling the resolution, the movement failed.

Following the failure of the movement to table resolution R-1/13, the delegation moved into closure of debate. The committee became silent as the Chair called for all delegates in favor of the resolution to raise their placards. Almost every delegate in the room raised their placards high into the air. With a vote of forty-nine to five, the resolution passed. The delegation broke into applause. However, the celebration didn't last long as the determined committee dove into their next topic, immigration law.