



Chairman: Mr. E. Olu SANU (Nigeria).

AGENDA ITEMS 83 AND 26

Publications and documentation of the United Nations (*continued*) (A/8319 and Corr.1, A/8362, A/8437, A/8488, A/8532 and Corr.1 and 2, A/8540, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.37, 38, 39/Rev.1 and 40 to 42);

- (a) Report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/8437);
- (b) Reports of the Joint Inspection Unit (*continued*) (A/8319 and Corr.1, A/8362);
- (c) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (*continued*) (A/8532 and Corr.1 and 2)

Rationalization of the procedures and organization of the General Assembly: report of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly [section IX] (*continued*) (A/8426, A/8488, A/8532 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.37, 38, 39/Rev.1 and 40 to 42)

1. Mr. JEREMIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation supported as a whole the draft resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in annex III of its report (A/8532 and Corr.1 and 2) and strongly opposed the deletion of its operative paragraph 11.

2. Mr. KALITSOUNAKIS (Greece) said that he supported the Advisory Committee's draft resolution but considered that the measures proposed should be applied progressively; for that reason he would vote in favour of the Pakistan amendment (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.41) to the draft.

3. Mr. STEENBERGER (Denmark) said that, like the representative of Brazil (1470th meeting), he considered that operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution under consideration also applied to the Main Committees of the General Assembly. He therefore proposed the addition to that paragraph of the phrase "by its Main Committees" after the words "by its subsidiary organs".

4. He was grateful to the Yugoslav and Ecuadorian representatives for having focused attention on the question of delays in the distribution of documents. The initial text of the Yugoslav proposal (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.39) had not been happy in that its singling out of the Advisory Committee could be read as a criticism of that body and made the approach to the problem less systematic.

5. In the Joint Inspection Unit's report on documentation (see A/8319 and Corr.1), for example, there had been a

multitude of preparatory stages between the resolution whereby the General Assembly had given the inspectors their mandate and that proposed finally for adoption on the question of documentation; as a result, the whole preparatory process resembled the operation of a production line. Rather sophisticated techniques had been developed to deal with production-line problems in industry and he believed that similar methods based on linear programming in connexion with a control system, could, to a very large extent, be applied to the production of United Nations documentation. He did not think that the application of such methods should necessarily be very expensive because, within the Secretariat, there were certainly people who were either masters of the relevant techniques or had the background necessary for acquiring them very quickly, as well as all the necessary statistical material. He proposed that the attention of the Secretariat should be drawn to that possibility by the addition to the text of the Ecuadorian amendment (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.40) to the draft resolution of the words "including the systematic application of modern problem-solving techniques" after the words "such measures".

6. His delegation found the revised version (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.39/Rev.1) of the Yugoslav proposal fully satisfactory and had therefore become a sponsor of it. It nevertheless considered that the problem of delays should be stressed in the draft resolution and in the Fifth Committee's report to the General Assembly.

7. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he would vote in favour of the Brazilian amendment (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.37) to the draft resolution of the Advisory Committee.

8. He would have no difficulty in accepting the United States amendment (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.38) if it could be proven that the proposal in paragraph 3 of the draft did not concern the Economic and Social Council.

9. Nor would his delegation have any difficulty in accepting the revised version (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.39/Rev.1) of the Yugoslav proposal. It could also agree to insert in the draft the paragraph proposed by the Ecuadorian delegation (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.40), even though the rules of procedure of the General Assembly already provided for the observance by the Secretary-General of a given schedule in the submission of documentation.

10. The Danish amendment relating to the application of modern techniques in the solution of problems was perhaps not sufficiently precise and it might be asked how the Secretary-General was to interpret it. Nevertheless, his delegation saw no objection to its adoption.

11. He did not really understand what purpose would be served by the Pakistan amendment (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.41) because paragraph 13 of the draft resolution provided that the Secretary-General should submit a report on the implementation of the resolution to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session.

12. His delegation opposed the deletion of paragraph 11 of the draft resolution, as the Indian representative had proposed (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.42). The figure stated in that paragraph was entirely reasonable because it had been decided upon after a thorough consideration of all relevant factors. It would therefore vote against that proposal.

13. Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Austria) said that he, too, would be unable to support the Indian amendment and also had serious doubts with regard to the amendment by Pakistan. On the other hand, he welcomed the Yugoslav proposal, which took up a proposal introduced by the Brazilian representative in the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly.

14. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that he had requested the deletion of operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution for purely technical reasons. If the volume of documentation was reduced by 15 per cent pursuant to paragraph 2 of the draft, a reduction in expenditure would follow inevitably. The amount of the latter reduction should not be fixed arbitrarily and, in any case, the financial implications of a resolution should not appear in its text.

15. He recalled that his delegation had requested the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to indicate the breakdown by section of the proposed reduction of \$1,250,000. Proper procedure dictated that that be done particularly as the Committee had already completed first reading of the relevant sections. In the absence of a breakdown by section, there seemed no point in having separate readings. He also pointed out that the Secretariat should be asked whether it considered that paragraph 11 of the draft resolution could be implemented.

16. Mr. FAKIH (Kenya) asked whether in future it would be possible to compile in a single document all amendments proposed to a draft resolution: that would lead to a reduction in the volume of documentation.

17. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Brazilian amendment, as well as that of the United States. He had no objection in principle to the Ecuadorian amendment although he would prefer it to be submitted in the form of a paragraph to be included in the Committee's report, as in the case of the Yugoslav proposal. His delegation could not accept the amendment by Pakistan because it believed that the time had come for firm decisions to be taken. Nor could it accept the Indian amendment.

18. Mr. BENDJENNA (Algeria) said that he would vote in favour of the Pakistan amendment. Although his delegation had indicated at the 1471st meeting, during consideration of agenda item 78, that it supported the 15 per cent reduction in documentation, it had added that the reduction should not be to the detriment of the developing countries.

19. It would also vote in favour of the Ecuadorian amendment, with the Danish subamendment to it.

20. Mr. ABARA (Nigeria) supported the amendments to the draft resolution and the proposal A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.37, 38 and 39/Rev.1. He could not support the Indian amendment because the draft resolution would lose its impact if it did not contain a precise figure.

21. The Pakistan amendment would prejudice the decision that the General Assembly was to take at its twenty-eighth session on the Secretary-General's report, as provided in paragraph 13 of the draft resolution; consequently his delegation could not accept that amendment.

22. Mr. BROWN (Australia) supported the amendments to the draft resolution and the proposal in documents A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.37, 38 and 39/Rev.1. He would prefer the amendment by Ecuador not to be adopted, but he suggested that if the Committee decided to accept it, the words "as far as possible" should be deleted. He would vote against the Pakistan proposal, since he, too, believed that the time had come to take a firm decision. He would also vote against the Indian proposal.

23. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) explained the connexion between operative paragraphs 2 and 11 of the draft resolution. In paragraph 2 the Advisory Committee suggested that the Secretary-General should reduce by 15 per cent the documentation originating in the Secretariat, which represented about two thirds of all documentation. That amounted to applying a reduction of 10 per cent to all documentation. In paragraphs 54 to 60 of its report (A/8532 and Corr.1 and 2), the Advisory Committee explained how it had calculated that the reduction of 10 per cent would make possible savings of \$2 million, a figure that had been then reduced to \$1,250,000 to provide for contingencies. That target was completely realistic, and there was no rule prohibiting the Fifth Committee from setting a figure in the text of a resolution: on the contrary, he agreed with the Nigerian representative that it would certainly strengthen the draft resolution.

24. He hoped that the Australian delegation would not insist on deleting the phrase "as far as possible" from the Ecuadorian amendment.

25. Mr. TURNER (Controller) said that the Secretariat, which for many years had proposed such measures, was pleased to see that the Fifth Committee found it necessary to take steps that, even though somewhat arbitrary, provided the opportunity of making at least some improvement in a difficult situation.

26. However even if the Secretariat succeeded in reducing its documentation by 15 per cent—which would correspond to a reduction of 10 per cent in all documentation—that did not mean that budgetary savings of the same order would be realized *ipso facto*. The Advisory Committee had said, in paragraph 59 of its report, that the main savings resulting from a reduction of 10 per cent in documentation would be under temporary assistance, overtime, contractual translations, and reproduction supplies. For 1970 those costs amounted to \$4 million, and thus savings of 10 per cent

would amount to \$400,000. By going even further, and making savings of 100 per cent on contractual translations, a further \$200,000 could be saved which, together with an estimated saving of \$100,000 for printing costs, as indicated in paragraph 60 of the Advisory Committee's report, would bring the total savings to \$700,000. He did not see how it was possible to effect the additional savings of \$500,000 that would be necessary to bring the figure up to that fixed by the Advisory Committee. It would be difficult to reduce the staff of the Office of Conference Services, for which no additional posts had been requested for 1972, even though the volume of work had increased; such a proposal would be unreasonable. Consequently, in order to attain the figure of \$1,250,000, the level of documentation must be reduced by much more than 15 per cent. The volume of documentation had grown to the point where it hampered the very functioning of the General Assembly and its organs. Thus the main aim should be to reduce the volume of documentation, the budgetary reductions being, in that case, the consequence and not the cause. Once again, the Secretariat would do its best to achieve the objective set by the Advisory Committee, but he could not, in all good conscience, guarantee complete success.

27. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that the Controller's statement clearly showed that the figure of \$1,250,000 in operative paragraph 11 of the draft resolution had been fixed arbitrarily. His delegation was just as anxious as others to see documentation reduced, but did not see why it was necessary to fix a specific figure. However, in view of the opposition shown in the Committee, he withdrew his amendment (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.42).

28. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) supported the United States amendment to the draft resolution of the Advisory Committee and the revised version of the Yugoslav proposal, which he found quite satisfactory. He also supported the Ecuadorian amendment.

29. As to the oral amendment by the Danish representative to the amendment by Ecuador, he said that it was not clear how the Secretariat would apply that provision, and he hoped the Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services would give some clarification on that point.

30. His delegation supported the Pakistan amendment and the amendment made orally by the Danish representative to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

31. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that the Controller's statement clearly showed that the level of the percentage reduction in documentation and the resulting budgetary savings should not be linked together. Furthermore, the reductions were proposed in relation to the volume of documentation for 1970, although the number of Member States in the United Nations had increased since then, which made the situation even more difficult. Consequently, his delegation would like it made clear in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution that the reduction in documentation should be on an experimental basis.

32. As to the other amendments to the draft resolution, his delegation supported those submitted by the United States and Ecuador, as well as the Yugoslav proposal.

33. Mr. DRUMMOND (South Africa) said that he would vote against the Pakistan amendment for the same reasons as those given by the representatives of Australia and Nigeria. He supported all the other amendments, including those submitted orally by the Danish representative.

34. Mr. FAUSTINO (Philippines) said that, as a representative of a developing country, he understood the misgivings expressed by the Algerian representative, but he was convinced that the Secretariat would ensure that the reductions were applied only to superfluous documentation.

35. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed surprise at the statement by the Controller. At the time when the Committee was about to vote, the Controller was in effect trying to influence representatives to take a position contrary to the conclusions set forth in the reports of the Advisory Committee (A/8532 and Corr.1 and 2) and the Joint Inspection Unit (see A/8319 and Corr.1). In fact, the reductions recommended by the latter were much higher—\$4.5 million—than those proposed by the Advisory Committee. It was therefore surprising that the Controller should, firstly, have expressed doubts that the Secretariat could achieve the much smaller reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee, and secondly, have failed to express those doubts at the Advisory Committee's meetings on the subject at which the Controller had been present. If the General Assembly adopted the draft resolution, the Secretariat must comply with it.

36. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that apparently the Controller had arrived at figures that differed from those of the Advisory Committee because he had not applied the reductions to all documentation. As indicated in paragraph 60 of its report, the Advisory Committee had based its calculations on an expenditure of \$29 million on the production of documents, and on that basis had arrived at a reduction of \$1,250,000.

37. Mr. TURNER (Controller) said that the Secretariat accepted the proposals of the Advisory Committee and any amendments the Fifth Committee felt should be made to them. He had merely expressed some reservations as to the possibility of applying them fully, particularly because of the increase in the workload with which the Office of Conference Services would have to deal.

38. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the various amendments to the draft resolution of the Advisory Committee (A/8532 and Corr.1 and 2, annex III) and the proposal before the Committee.

*The Brazilian amendment (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.37) was adopted without objection.*

*The United States amendment (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.38) was adopted without objection.*

*The Yugoslav proposal (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.39/Rev.1) was adopted without objection.*

39. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the Ecuadorian amendment added

nothing to the Yugoslav proposal which the Committee had just adopted and did not therefore see any point in including it in the draft resolution.

40. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) recalled that the representative of Denmark had orally proposed a change in the Ecuadorian amendment and that the representative of Ecuador had not said whether he accepted the subamendment in question. In addition, the Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services had not yet explained how that provision could be applied.

41. Mr. NOSEK (Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services) said that there were various stages in the process of producing documentation: drafting, editing, translation-revision, typing, reproduction and distribution. The proposal made by the representative of Denmark would make it necessary for the Secretariat to give careful thought to the measures which could be taken to improve the process as a whole and to determine at what stage such measures should be introduced. Attempts at using machines had already been made, in particular in translation-revision and typing, but the results had so far not been very satisfactory. Efforts were also being made in reproduction; however, some urgent documents, such as those of the Security Council, were reproduced more quickly by manual methods. Progress had been made at the distribution stage and the Secretariat intended to pursue that course. The Secretariat would try to look for new methods with a view to improving the process of producing documentation, but he was not able at that stage to give more details in that regard.

42. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) thought, in view of the explanations which had been given, that the question had many complex aspects of which the Committee had only a general notion. He felt therefore that it would be premature to formulate an opinion and requested the representative of Denmark not to press his proposal.

43. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) did not think that the Ecuadorian amendment duplicated the Yugoslav proposal, which consisted in including a paragraph in the Committee's report and related to the documentation of the Fifth Committee and the Advisory Committee, while the Ecuadorian amendment modified the draft resolution and concerned all the documentation prepared for the General Assembly.

44. Mr. STEENBERGER (Denmark) was aware of the difficulties his amendment caused. However, in a desire that modern problem-solving techniques should be mentioned in the draft resolution, he proposed that the wording of his amendment should be changed by the addition of the words "including the possible application of modern management techniques" after the words "such measures as he deems appropriate".

45. Mr. IZURIETA (Ecuador) preferred that the Committee should take a separate decision on the Danish oral subamendment to his own amendment.

46. The CHAIRMAN put the Danish and Ecuadorian amendments to the vote.

*The Danish oral subamendment to the Ecuadorian amendment was adopted by 37 votes to 3, with 32 abstentions.*

*The Ecuadorian amendment (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.40), as subamended, was adopted without objection.*

47. The CHAIRMAN put the Pakistan amendment to the vote.

*The Pakistan amendment (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.41) was rejected by 29 votes to 22, with 16 abstentions.*

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Danish oral amendment whereby the words "and by its Main Committees" would be added after "its subsidiary organs" in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

*The Danish oral amendment to the draft resolution was adopted without objection.*

49. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole (A/8532 and Corr.1 and 2, annex III), as amended.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 73 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

50. Mr. GUPTA (India), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his country was perhaps more than any other in favour of reducing documentation. However, for the reasons he had previously explained and also because he had not received satisfactory answers to the questions he had asked, he had had to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

51. Mr. FAKIH (Kenya) pointed out that there had also been no answer to the question he had asked at the beginning of the meeting.

52. Mr. KALINOWSKI (Poland) had voted against the Pakistan amendment, which he had not considered judicious as he was convinced that, if the Secretariat effectively applied the draft resolution adopted, it would be possible to make yet more substantial reductions than those which were foreseen. On the other hand, his delegation had had no difficulty in approving the Brazilian, United States and Ecuadorian amendments, which it felt to be very constructive and consistent with the objectives of the draft resolution. He was convinced that the effective application of the draft resolution which had just been adopted would make it possible to produce documentation in a more efficient manner and would contribute to the more efficient and economical functioning of the Organization.

53. Mr. NOSEK (Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services) explained, in reply to a question which had been asked at the previous meeting, that the problem of distributing documents in all the languages simultaneously was extremely complex. It had already been discussed in 1966 and 1967; in paragraph 4 of resolution 2292 (XXII), the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General "to take all measures to ensure a more effective presentation and communication of the documents in due time and simultaneously in the working languages". That request had also been made in resolution 2247 (XXI) and the Secretariat had since spared no effort in acting upon it.

54. Nevertheless, a translation could obviously not be issued as quickly as an original; the fact was that in New

York the great majority of the documents were prepared in English. Thus, in 1970, 13,000 pages of texts prepared in English had been submitted for translation into French, 27,000 for translation into Spanish, 24,000 for translation into Russian and 4,500 for translation into Chinese, while only 4,500 pages of texts prepared in French had been submitted for translation into English. In Geneva, the situation was slightly different and there was a better balance.

55. Some progress had been achieved with regard to sessional documents, such as resolutions and reports, and to a lesser degree with regard to other documents. There was still a time-lag, however, in distribution: the Secretariat could not, for lack of storage space and because of fire hazards, hold back the distribution of a document in the original language until the translations had been issued. He assured members of the Committee, however, that the Secretariat would continue, as in the past, to do its very utmost to distribute documents as quickly as possible in all the working languages.

56. Mr. GOUAMBA (Congo) said that the reply of the Under-Secretary-General was not entirely satisfactory. A document would sometimes be prepared in a language other than English, but that did not mean that it was distributed more quickly in the original language simply because it was often translated or recast into English for purposes of publication, and then retranslated into the other languages. Such a case had occurred in 1970 in connexion with the Security Council Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea, after which, although nearly all interviews had taken place in French, the French-speaking delegations had had to wait nearly a week before receiving the documents. Furthermore, when a French-speaking staff member was recruited into the Secretariat, he was asked whether he knew English, whereas an English-speaking candidate was not asked whether he knew French.

57. Mr. HOFFMAN (Secretary of the Committee), replying to a question raised by the representative of Kenya at the beginning of the meeting, said that it would usually be quite difficult to compile in a single document the various amendments submitted at a meeting, firstly because time would be lost waiting until all amendments had been submitted before they could be translated, and secondly, because that might make it difficult to apply rule 132 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly regarding the order in which amendments should be put to the vote. But he assured the representative of Kenya that his suggestion would be borne in mind whenever possible.

*Question raised regarding document A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.16, concerning the format of the reports of the Fifth Committee\**

58. Mr. GUPTA (India) pointed out that the Committee had before it a proposal by Hungary and India (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.16) that had not yet been considered.

59. The CHAIRMAN replied that, in his opinion, operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution adopted, as amended, took account of the proposal by Hungary and

India. However, if the representative of India insisted, that proposal would be put to the vote.

60. Mr. GUPTA (India) considered that the proposal by Hungary and India was much more explicit than paragraph 3 of the draft. He assumed that the Committee would want to start applying the draft resolution regarding the reduction of documentation, which it had just adopted so overwhelmingly. He particularly had in mind the arrangement of the report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly on the budget estimates, which was a voluminous—and in part useless—document. If paragraph 3 implied that its provisions would be implemented with effect from the current session, he was prepared to withdraw his proposal; otherwise, he would be obliged to press for a vote on it.

61. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) considered, unlike the representative of India, that there was no difference between paragraph 3 of the draft resolution adopted by the Committee and the proposal contained in document A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.16. Furthermore, the Committee had already taken a decision on the draft; if the Indian delegation insisted, he felt that it would be necessary to apply rule 132 of the rules of procedure.

62. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he did not think a reply had been given to the representative of India, who had asked whether the report of the Fifth Committee at its current session would be prepared in accordance with the provisions of the draft resolution just adopted. If so, he would not insist on a vote; otherwise, he would support the Indian representative's request.

63. Mr. GUPTA (India) thanked the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania and explained that he hoped the draft resolution adopted would be implemented immediately and not with effect from the twenty-seventh session.

64. Mr. BROWN (Australia) said that he was confident that the Rapporteur, in preparing the report of the current session, would bear in mind the decision just taken by the Committee.

65. The CHAIRMAN acknowledged that there was a slight difference between document A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.16 and paragraph 3 of the draft resolution just adopted, but added that the provisions of the resolution would be implemented with effect from the current session. He therefore hoped that the Indian delegation would not press its proposal.

66. Mr. RAMBISOON (Trinidad and Tobago), Rapporteur, said that he would be guided by the Committee to ensure that his work fully conformed to its wishes. Consequently, if it was the Committee's wish that the draft resolution should be applied to its report with effect from the current session, he would try to comply with that wish.

67. Mr. TURNER (Controller) said that, in the matter of procedure, the Fifth Committee should conduct itself in accordance with the decisions that it took; there was no need for the Committee, in implementing its decisions, to wait until the General Assembly had adopted the draft resolution in question.

\* See 1454th and 1455th meetings.

68. Mr. GUPTA (India) shared the Controller's opinion and considered that rule 132 of the rules of procedure did not apply in that particular case.

69. Mr. PICK (Canada) said that, if the proposal contained in document A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.16 was put to the vote, his delegation would find difficulty in supporting it. Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution adopted was quite clear regarding the time for the implementation of its provisions, whereas in the document in question the expression used—"in future"—was much less clear.

70. Mr. SELMECI (Hungary) pointed out that the proposal contained in document A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.16 had been submitted during the general discussion on agenda item 76 and that it applied only to documents of the Fifth Committee, whereas the draft resolution adopted applied to all documents prepared for the General Assembly. The delegations of India and Hungary sought a reduction in the length of the report of the Fifth Committee to the Assembly at its twenty-sixth session, and he felt that it would be very helpful for the Rapporteur if a decision was taken immediately.

71. Mr. MOLTOTAL (Ethiopia) said that he did not understand why the question was being raised again. The Committee had before it a proposal by the Brazilian

delegation to the effect that a vote be taken on whether the Committee should vote on the proposal submitted by Hungary and India. He supported the Brazilian proposal.

72. Mr. BARTUŠEK (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that most representatives did not have document A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.16; hence they found it difficult to take a decision at the current meeting. He therefore suggested that the question be deferred until the next meeting.

73. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that he had no objection to deleting the words "in future" from his proposal. For his delegation, as for that of Hungary, the important point was the immediate application of the draft resolution adopted.

74. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on whether it would vote on the proposal of Hungary and India (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.16).

*There were 14 votes in favour and none against, with 25 abstentions.*

75. The CHAIRMAN said that in the absence of a quorum, a decision could not be taken on the proposal by Hungary and India.

*The meeting rose at 11 p.m.*