



## CONTENTS

## Page

Measures to limit the duration of regular sessions of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/2206, A/C.6/339/Add.1, A/C.6/L.278/Rev.1, A/C.6/L.279, A/C.6/L.281, A/C.6/L.284, A/C.6/L.285) ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	269
---	-----

**Chairman:** Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand).

**Measures to limit the duration of regular sessions of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/2206, A/C.6/339/Add.1, A/C.6/L.278/Rev.1, A/C.6/L.279, A/C.6/L.281, A/C.6/L.284, A/C.6/L.285) (*continued*)**

[Item 50]\*

1. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Norway if he accepted the verbal suggestion made by the representative of El Salvador (350th meeting) that the word "reasonable" should be inserted before the word "limitation" in paragraph 2 of the operative part of the revised Norwegian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.278/Rev.1).

2. Mr. SERRANO GARCIA (El Salvador) said that he would formally move that amendment only if the Syrian amendment (A/C.6/L.280) were accepted.

3. Mr. DONS (Norway) said that although the word "improvement" in his text contained the idea which the El Salvadoran representative wished to express by his suggestion, he would, if necessary, agree to the insertion of the word "reasonable" before the word "limitation" in paragraph 2 of the operative part of his revised draft resolution.

4. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since many speakers had objected to the draft amendments contained in the annex to the revised Norwegian draft resolution, it would be preferable to refer the whole question to the Assembly's eighth session. No satisfactory reasons or adequate basis for the proposed amendments to the rules of procedure were to be found in the Secretariat memorandum (A/2206). If it was decided to set up a special committee, the latter would study the question within the framework of that memorandum, which would not in the meantime have been improved upon. Within that unsatisfactory framework, the special committee would be unable to achieve satisfactory

results. For that reason, he criticized the suggestion to set up a special committee at that stage of the consideration of the problem. If, however, such a step, which was suggested by the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.6/L.284) was supported by the majority of the Committee, the Soviet Union delegation would reconsider its position.

5. The decision to establish such a committee could not, however, be taken simply by replacing the operative part of the revised Norwegian draft resolution by the Uruguayan amendment. If that were done, the resolution creating the committee would consist of a preamble proposed by Norway and an operative part proposed by Uruguay. The two texts, however, were not in harmony. The preamble to the revised Norwegian draft resolution paved the way for the adoption of the amendments contained in the annex. The preamble justified the operative part. Though not exactly approving the Secretariat's suggestions, it "noted" them. That word and the whole of the preamble created the mistaken impression that the Committee supported the Secretariat's suggestions. That was not the case. It was also contrary to the intentions of the Uruguayan amendment, which merely invited the proposed special committee to study the Secretariat memorandum, without prejudging the attitude that committee would take.

6. If the majority supported the Uruguayan amendment, his delegation would vote for it, interpreting that text, however, as referring to the Secretariat, not the Secretary-General. His delegation would vote against all parts of the preamble to the revised Norwegian draft resolution.

7. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom) said that some speakers had misrepresented the motives of one of his statements at the previous meeting. He had merely wished the Committee to express its intentions clearly by a vote. As the French representative had said (352nd meeting), any delegation which wished even one of the five draft amendments to the rules of procedure to be adopted should vote against the Syrian

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

amendment (A/C.6/L.280). The change which the Syrian representative (352nd meeting) had wished to make in his own text would merely have complicated the voting procedure and, besides, had been unnecessary. It was for that reason that Mr. Vallat had doubted whether the change in question was in order. The Committee now had before it the Egyptian amendment (A/C.6/L.286). If the submission of that text was in order, the members of the Committee could express their attitude towards the five draft amendments to the rules of procedure by voting on the Egyptian amendment in parts.

8 Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) was surprised at the criticism which had been levelled at his delegation. Some members would apparently have liked the Chairman to rule the Uruguayan amendment out of order on the grounds that it had been submitted too late and was inadmissible *ratione materiae*. He had stated at the 387th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, at which the problem had been discussed, that the question should be deferred until the eighth session. At one of the earlier (347th) meetings of the Sixth Committee, he had reaffirmed that statement, suggested the appointment of a group to study the question between sessions and reserved the right to move a formal proposal to that end. Many speakers had commented on that suggestion during the discussion. Hence it could hardly be said that the Uruguayan amendment had been submitted at the last minute. Anyone who had so stated should admit his mistake. Furthermore, the rules of procedure contained no provision fixing a time-limit for the submission of proposals. If such a provision did exist, it would be necessary to amend the rules of procedure in order to make them more liberal. Those who wished the Uruguayan amendment to be ruled out of order had assisted the representatives who opposed all the proposed amendments to the rules of procedure, for they had shown the danger of any provision which would permit arbitrary decisions by presiding officers.

9. The USSR representative had said that the preamble to the revised Norwegian draft resolution and the operative part of the Uruguayan text were contradictory. Mr. Rodríguez Fabregat analysed the text of that preamble and stated that it harmonized perfectly with the operative part suggested by his delegation. The underlying idea was more important than the words.

10. The Uruguayan delegation would therefore support any text which was put to the vote before the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.6/L.284) and which suggested either that the proposed amendments to the rules of procedure should be rejected or that the study of the problem should be deferred. Consequently, it would vote for the Syrian amendment (A/C.6/L.280) and for the Egyptian amendment (A/C.6/L.286), if the latter were put to the vote. It would also support the Argentine draft resolution (A/C.6/L.279), although it would be preferable to refer the proposal contained therein to the special committee for study. He also agreed that the draft amendment to rule 38 should be examined separately. He added that his amendment was in fact inspired by an idea for which his country had been fighting for many years: the protection of the sovereign rights of Member States.

11. The CHAIRMAN said that, in dealing with the revised Norwegian draft resolution, he would first put to the vote the Uruguayan amendment, which was a motion for adjournment; then the Syrian amendment suggesting the deletion of the whole of the annex to the revised Norwegian draft resolution; and then the Egyptian amendment suggesting the deletion of only one part of that annex.

12. Mr. EL-TANAMLI (Egypt) noted that the United Kingdom representative had announced his intention of asking that the Egyptian amendment (A/C.6/L.286) to the revised Norwegian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.278/Rev.1) should be voted on in parts. Such a procedure would destroy the very meaning of the amendment, which expressed opposition to the principle underlying the four draft amendments to which it referred. His delegation's amendment would therefore be rendered meaningless if it were put to the vote in parts. To prevent any such manoeuvre, it might be preferable to modify the amendment to read: "In the annex delete all the amended texts of the rules of procedure except that of rule 38".

13. He further explained that his amendment (A/C.6/L.285) to the Argentine draft resolution (A/C.6/L.279) was motivated by the fact that the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/2206) referred not only to Member States right to speak but also to other rights enjoyed by those Member States.

14. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 128 [89], if an objection was made to a request for a vote by division, "the motion for division" was to be put to the vote of the Committee. He also said that the change which the Egyptian representative had suggested in the Egyptian amendment (A/C.6/L.286) to the revised Norwegian draft resolution was in order.

15. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom) said he would not ask that the Egyptian amendment should be voted on in parts. The Committee could resort to other means if it wanted to adopt one or more of the proposed amendments to the rules of procedure.

16. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) said that the General Assembly's interests and the maintenance of mankind's faith in the United Nations were paramount. Restrictive measures were acceptable only if they did not undermine more important interests. The Secretary-General's suggestions would not help to accomplish the desired purpose, for they merely increased the powers of the President or the Chairman. If those powers were increased, as the Polish representative had pointed out (351st meeting), the confidence placed in presiding officers might be shaken. Some procedural measures could produce serious repercussions. They would give rise to many discussions and would be self-defeating.

17. Hence, he could not support the revised Norwegian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.278/Rev.1). He was also reluctant to vote for the Syrian amendment (A/C.6/L.280), since it would make the Secretary-General responsible for continuing the studies in question, and those studies were unlikely to furnish the basis for the Committee's decisions. The Committee could not reach a decision unless proposals were first submitted by government representatives. The Uruguayan amend-

ment (A/C.6/L.284) met the requirements Mr. Abdoh had outlined; it was constructive and particularly appropriate in view of certain feelings which had been expressed in the Committee.

18. Even if the Secretary-General's suggestions were adopted it would be too late for the General Assembly to apply them during the current session. The special committee could submit proposals for the Assembly's consideration early in the eighth session, and those proposals could perhaps be put into effect immediately.

19. He would therefore vote for the Uruguayan amendment and, if that was rejected, for the Syrian amendment.

20. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation favoured the proposed amendment to rule 38. If necessary, it could even vote for the proposed amendments to rules 73 [113] and 75 [115]; it was, however, opposed to the spirit of those amendments. The Secretary-General should not examine the political aspect of questions; only the technical aspect was within his competence. Even technically, however, the Secretary-General's proposals were not very constructive.

21. Finally, the Yugoslav delegation would vote for the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.6/L.284) to the revised Norwegian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.278/Rev.1); that amendment suggested a satisfactory solution to the problem. If it was rejected, the Yugoslav delegation would vote for the Egyptian amendment (A/C.6/L.286), which would delete all of the proposed amendments contained in the annex to the revised Norwegian draft resolution except the amendment to rule 38. The amendment to rule 38 was definitely technical in nature and fully justified.

22. Mr. LACHS (Poland) said that those who supported the proposed amendments must have realized that the item had been badly prepared and that it was therefore very difficult to find a solution. The French representative's conclusions (352nd meeting) contradicted the analysis upon which she had based them. The pressure exerted by certain delegations in order to ensure the adoption of the proposed amendments, and in particular the United Kingdom representative's opposition (352nd meeting) to the change suggested in the Syrian amendment (A/C.6/L.280), had shown that the proposed amendments to the rules of procedure were not so harmless as had been contended.

23. The Polish delegation was not in principle opposed to further study of the question and therefore supported the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.6/L.284), although it agreed with the USSR representative that that amendment should not be attached to the preamble to the revised Norwegian draft resolution.

24. It had been a mistake to try to amend the rules of procedure in order to limit the duration of General Assembly sessions and, as the Egyptian representative had stated (352nd meeting), the proposed amendment to rule 38 had nothing to do with the item before the Committee.

25. He agreed with the USSR representative that the Committee should vote on the proposed amendments to the rules of procedure as a whole, not on each of them separately.

26. Mr. SALAMANCA FIGUEROA (Bolivia) said that his delegation would vote for the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.6/L.284). Should that amendment be rejected, he would support the Egyptian amendment (A/C.6/L.286), in order to avoid any infringement of the rights of delegations. An extension of the powers of the President or the Chairman might in fact lead to abuse. Finally, the Bolivian delegation would vote for the Argentine draft resolution (A/C.6/L.279), with the Belgian amendment (A/C.6/L.281) thereto.

27. Mr. PETRZELKA (Czechoslovakia) recalled that his delegation had already expressed its point of view at the 388th plenary meeting of the General Assembly. Most delegations had emphasized that, in order to limit the duration of Assembly sessions, it was necessary to rely on the co-operation and goodwill of States; hence, the rules of procedure should not be made more stringent and the rights of delegations should not be restricted, for to do so might impair the prestige of the United Nations. The sole purpose of the rules of procedure was to ensure that questions submitted to the General Assembly were wisely and properly discussed, in the interests of international peace and security. The Members of the United Nations—which were sovereign States—should therefore not be subjected to the discretionary power of the President of the Assembly or the Chairmen of Committees. The draft amendments contained in the annex to the revised Norwegian draft resolution would have the effect of strengthening the position of the presiding officers. It was not correct to say that they already had the powers in question by virtue of rule 35 [106]. The proposed amendment to rule 74 [114] was particularly rigid and would in effect tend to deprive representatives of the right to speak. In that connexion, he congratulated the Australian representative for having withdrawn (351st meeting) his amendments (A/C.6/L.282 and Rev.1). The proposed amendment to rule 72 [112], regarding points of order, was quite inadmissible. That rule was extremely important, for it enabled representatives to correct errors.

28. He agreed with the USSR representative (347th and 349th meetings) that the amendment to rule 38 was not connected with the item before the Committee. In proposing that amendment, the Secretary-General and the Norwegian representative had made the very error which was condemned in paragraph 25 of the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/2206). He would therefore vote against all parts of the revised Norwegian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.278/Rev.1). He would vote in favour of the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.6/L.284), but a satisfactory preamble to it should be found. If that amendment was rejected, he would vote for the Syrian amendment (A/C.6/L.280).

29. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom) protested against the Polish representative remarks and said that he had never exerted pressure on any delegation to secure the adoption of the proposed amendments to the rules of procedure. All he had wished to do was to emphasize the difference between the proposed amendment to rule 38 and the other amendments.

30. Mr. LACHS (Poland) explained that what he had said was that the United Kingdom representative

had tried to prevent the Syrian representative from altering his amendment.

31. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom) said that he had already apologized in that respect. He had raised an objection because he had understood that the change had been submitted after the voting had begun.

32. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Secretary of the Committee) said that, because of the many criticisms of the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/2206), he wished to recall that, at the sixth session, the Fifth Committee had decided to recommend in its report<sup>1</sup> that the item now before the Sixth Committee should be included in the provisional agenda of the seventh session and that the Secretary-General should be asked to prepare a working paper on the subject. After consulting the permanent delegations, the Secretary-General had revised his memorandum. Far from wishing to impose his proposals upon delegations, he wanted to hear their views.

33. Mr. SUAREZ (Chile) asked how the revised Norwegian draft resolution would be voted upon in the event that the Syrian amendment was rejected. His delegation wished to vote in favour of some of the proposed amendments to the rules of procedure, and he hoped the Norwegian representative would revise his text in order to facilitate voting upon it.

34. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the 352nd meeting he had announced his intention of putting the annex to the revised Norwegian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.278/Rev.1) to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

35. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a vote on his motion regarding the Committee's competence to amend rule 38 of the rules of procedure. He had already (347th and 349th meetings) stated his opinion that the matter was not within the Committee's competence.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 120 [80] of the rules of procedure, the USSR motion was in order and that he would put it to the vote immediately before the revised Norwegian draft resolution.

37. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that the preamble to the revised Norwegian draft resolution should be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph, before the vote on the Uruguayan amendment.

38. The CHAIRMAN agreed to follow that procedure.

39. He put to the vote the first paragraph of the preamble to the revised Norwegian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.278/Rev.1).

*The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 35 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.*

40. Mr. ROBERTS (Union of South Africa) asked whether it was understood that the Committee would be given the opportunity to vote on the second paragraph of the preamble to the Argentine draft resolution (A/C.6/L.279). He preferred that text to the corresponding paragraph of the revised Norwegian draft resolution.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 41, document A/2022/Add.1.

41. The CHAIRMAN said the Committee would be given that opportunity.

42. He put to the vote the second paragraph of the preamble to the revised Norwegian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.278/Rev.1).

*The second paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 32 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.*

43. Mr. ABDON (Iran) proposed that the word "Noting" should be replaced by the words "Having considered" in the third paragraph of the preamble to the revised Norwegian draft resolution. That would make it easier for certain delegations to vote for the paragraph.

44. Mr. DONS (Norway) accepted that amendment.

45. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) observed that, according to the letter (A/C.6/339/Add.1) dated 31 October 1952, from the President of the General Assembly to the Chairman of the Sixth Committee, the Committee had not been asked to discuss the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/2206).

46. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that, under the rules of procedure, amendments could not be introduced during the voting. His delegation would vote against the third paragraph of the preamble to the revised Norwegian draft resolution, no matter how it was worded.

47. The CHAIRMAN ruled that in the circumstances the Iranian verbal amendment was out of order.

48. He put to the vote the third paragraph of the preamble to the revised Norwegian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.278/Rev.1).

*The third paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 29 votes to 11, with 8 abstentions.*

49. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that the Uruguayan amendment should be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 1 of the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.6/L.284) to the revised Norwegian draft resolution.

*Paragraph 1 of the amendment was adopted by 23 votes to 20, with 2 abstentions.*

51. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 of the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.6/L.284) to the revised Norwegian draft resolution.

*Paragraph 2 of the amendment was adopted by 26 votes to 20, with 2 abstentions.*

52. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 3 of the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.6/L.284) to the revised Norwegian draft resolution.

*Paragraph 3 of the amendment was adopted by 27 votes to 20, with 1 abstention.*

53. The CHAIRMAN then called for a vote on the revised Norwegian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.278/Rev.1), as a whole, as amended.

*The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 27 votes to 20, with 1 abstention.*

54. The CHAIRMAN said the Committee would vote next on the Argentine draft resolution (A/C.6/

L.279). There were two amendments to that draft resolution, one (A/C.6/L.281) submitted by Belgium, and the other (A/C.6/L.285) by Egypt.

55. Mr. LAUREL (Argentina) stated that his delegation accepted the Belgian amendment.

56. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wondered whether it was wise to vote on the Argentine draft resolution after the Committee had decided to set up a special committee to consider the problem as a whole. Should the Argentine delegation insist on a vote on its draft resolution, he would move, under rule 130 [91] of the rules of procedure, that that text should not be put to the vote.

57. Mr. LAUREL (Argentina) maintained his delegation's draft resolution. It would not in any way affect the special committee's consideration of further measures to limit the duration of the Assembly's sessions.

58. The adoption of his draft resolution would constitute an important step forward because it would enable the Assembly to fix a definite closing date for the eighth session, without awaiting the results of the special committee's studies.

59. Mr. VALLAT (United Kingdom) agreed with the USSR representative. His delegation had voted against the establishment of the special committee. Since that committee had been set up, however, it should study all the proposals to limit the duration of the Assembly's sessions.

60. Mr. BANERJEE (India) associated himself with the remarks made by the USSR and United Kingdom representatives and urged the Argentine delegation, without formally withdrawing its draft resolution, not to insist upon a vote on it.

61. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said he would also prefer that the Argentine draft resolution should be referred to the special committee. If, however, the Argentine delegation insisted upon a vote, he would support the draft resolution, because he was convinced that the special committee would in any case, within its general terms of reference, consider whether the Assembly should, at the beginning of each session, fix a closing date for that session.

62. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) said that he would vote against the USSR motion for the following reasons. First, the question whether the Assembly should fix a closing date at the beginning of each session should not be referred to the eighth session for consideration together with the special committee's recommendations. Secondly, the Committee should adopt at least one concrete and positive proposal and thus avoid the criticism—which might otherwise quite justly be made—that it resorted too often to the establishment of sub-committees to deal with items referred to it by the General Assembly.

63. If the USSR motion was rejected, his delegation would vote in favour of the Argentine draft resolution (A/C.6/L.279).

64. Mr. HERRERA BAEZ (Dominican Republic) endorsed the Australian representative's remarks and

said that he would vote in the same way as that representative.

65. Mr. SHCHERBATYUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation would support the USSR motion, which it regarded as very wise.

66. The Committee would be doubly inconsistent if it adopted the Argentine draft resolution; first, because it would be adopting a decision contrary to the one it had just taken in establishing a special committee, and, secondly, because it would be inviting the Assembly to apply a rule which related to a point it had asked the special committee to study.

67. Mrs. BASTID (France) recalled that, in spite of the diversity of views which had been expressed in the Committee, all delegations had agreed during the general debate that a genuine effort should be made to limit the duration of Assembly sessions. The Argentine draft resolution would in fact help to achieve that purpose, while leaving sufficient latitude in the organization of the Assembly's work.

68. Her delegation saw no reason why the Committee should not take a decision on that very modest proposal, which did not in any way affect the freedom of speech of Member States. Indeed it was the Committee's duty to accept its responsibilities and to vote upon the Argentine draft resolution. The delegations which claimed the right of freedom of expression should also allow Member States the right to take a decision by a vote on the proposals submitted to them. Her delegation, for its part, insisted that the Argentine draft resolution should be put to the vote.

69. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was surprised that one of the delegations in favour of the immediate adoption of amendments to the rules of procedure, which would have had the effect of limiting the right to speak, should now defend the right to vote.

70. In submitting its motion, which was based entirely on common sense and a respect for earlier decisions, his delegation had in no way intended to prevent the Argentine delegation from submitting its draft resolution or the Committee from voting on it. It had simply wished to impress on the Committee that it should not take a decision which ran counter to the views of the majority. The majority, considering that the amendments to the rules of procedure should not be discussed at the current session, had just voted for the establishment of a special committee. The opinion of the majority should be respected and the Committee should refrain from voting on a text which could more usefully be submitted to the special committee.

71. The original Argentine draft resolution (A/C.6/L.279) had been completely unacceptable. Even with the Belgian amendment (A/C.6/L.281), it was open to serious criticism. If the closing date fixed at the beginning of each session was final and had to be observed at all costs, Members' right of free expression would obviously be impaired. If that date was not final, the Argentine draft resolution would add nothing to the present rule 2 of the rules of procedure, which provided that the Assembly should, at the beginning of each session, fix a target date for the closing of the session.



72. Some delegations which had been prepared to accept certain of the amendments in the annex to the revised Norwegian draft resolution had nevertheless agreed, in a spirit of compromise, that those amendments should not be adopted, but that the matter should be referred to a special committee. Accordingly, he appealed to the representatives who had voted for the establishment of the special committee to oppose the taking of a vote on the Argentine draft resolution.

73. Mr. TZOUNIS (Greece) said that his delegation was always glad to see the USSR—a country in which the majority was sometimes larger than the actual number of voters—rising to champion the rights of the majority. His delegation agreed with the French representative. It was convinced that each member of the Committee not only should proclaim his rights but also should have the courage to assume his responsibilities. He would vote against the USSR motion, in order to have an opportunity to vote on the Argentine draft resolution.

74. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said it was unfortunate that the Chairman had not called the Greek representative to order for his slanderous statement about the Soviet Union. That statement had absolutely no connexion with the question under discussion.

75. Mr. SALAMANCA FIGUEROA (Bolivia) thought that the Argentine draft resolution should be referred to the special committee which had just been established, and he would therefore be unable to support that draft resolution.

76. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR motion to the effect that the Argentine draft resolution A/C.6/L.279 should not be put to the vote.

*The motion was rejected by 21 votes to 20, with 5 abstentions.*

77. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the Egyptian amendment (A/C.6/L.285) to the second paragraph of the preamble to the Argentine draft resolution.

*The amendment was adopted by 42 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

78. The CHAIRMAN said that, at the request of Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the Argentine draft resolution (A/C.6/L.279) would be voted on in parts. He recalled that that draft resolution had been altered by the adoption of the Egyptian amendment (A/C.6/L.285) and the sponsor's acceptance of the Belgian amendment (A/C.6/L.281).

79. He put to the vote the first paragraph of the preamble to the Argentine draft resolution (A/C.6/L.279).

*The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 27 votes to 11, with 7 abstentions.*

80. The CHAIRMAN said it would not be necessary to put to the vote the second paragraph of the preamble to the Argentine draft resolution, since the Egyptian amendment to that paragraph had been adopted and the Committee would have an opportunity to vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

81. He put to the vote the operative part, as amended, of the Argentine draft resolution (A/C.6/L.279).

*The operative part, as amended, was adopted by 25 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions.*

82. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Argentine draft resolution (A/C.6/L.279), as a whole, as amended.

*The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 26 votes to 15, with 6 abstentions.*

83. Mr. ABDON (Iran) explained that common sense had guided him in voting against the Argentine draft resolution. The Argentine representative had explained that the closing date which would be fixed under his draft resolution would not be final and could be changed, if necessary. That meant that the date was simply a target date; consequently, the Argentine draft resolution did not in any way alter the existing provisions of rule 2 of the rules of procedure.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.