



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 25:</i> <i>Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Improvement of the Methods of Work of the General Assembly (concluded)</i>	1

President: Mr. Carlos SOSA RODRIGUEZ
(Venezuela).

AGENDA ITEM 25

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Improvement of the Methods of Work of the General Assembly (concluded)*

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The Members of the Assembly will recall that when we last considered agenda item 25 [1256th meeting], we postponed consideration of the possible installation of a mechanical voting system until the Fifth Committee had submitted its report. The Assembly now has before it, for its information, the report of the Fifth Committee [A/5645]. In addition, a draft resolution has been submitted by sixteen Member States [A/L.444/Rev.1].

2. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark): My statement to introduce the draft resolution [A/L.444/Rev.1] need not be long. Members will by now have received adequate data and will have had sufficient occasions for being apprised of the advantages of the installation in the General Assembly of mechanical devices for the purpose of registering and counting of votes.

3. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Improvement of the Methods of Work of the General Assembly [A/5423] which was unanimously approved by this Assembly on 11 November 1963 [1256th meeting] has furnished to the Assembly, in particular in its annex 8, clear explanations as to the operation of the system which was envisaged by the Committee and the comparative costs of the rental and purchase of the necessary equipment. The data at our disposal show that the mechanical processes would very closely follow the methods of voting at present in effect in the General Assembly, whether by showing of hands or by roll-call. The votes would take place in all desirable clarity, every delegation being able to see how its own votes, as well as those of other delegations, would be recorded. The counting will be mechanically faultless.

4. In its own report to the General Assembly [A/5442], the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions has also clearly brought out the advantages of the system from the point of view of

the saving of precious time and the ensuring of accuracy in the counting of votes. It has also referred in particular to the difficulties encountered in the latter respect by the Secretariat.

5. At our 1256th plenary meeting, several speakers expressed themselves as being in favour of the installation of mechanical equipment and referred to the advantages such an installation would have for the most efficient work of the General Assembly and its Committees. Others expressed certain reservations.

6. Further exchanges of views took place in the Fifth Committee. A proposal that no appropriation for 1964 should be recommended in respect of a mechanical voting installation was rejected in that Committee by a decisive majority, and the Committee has now indicated, in its report to the Assembly, the cost of installation of the equipment on an experimental basis for one year, in the plenary hall or in one committee room, and that of some further work of a preparatory nature which it would be advantageous to undertake in order to permit, if the experiment is considered successful, an eventual expansion without undue expense.

7. The draft resolution [A/L.444/Rev.1] which the delegation of Denmark, together with other delegations, has the honour to propose for the approval of the General Assembly authorizes the Secretary-General to proceed with the installation of the equipment on an experimental basis, while following the framework suggested by the Fifth Committee. Preference is expressed, however, for the immediate installation of the system in the plenary hall rather than in one of the committee rooms. It also provides for the examination by the General Assembly, at the earliest possible time, of the results of the experiment which is so undertaken and which will be conducted in the course of our next session.

8. The only real objection which was made to the proposal that mechanical devices for registering and counting votes should be installed in the General Assembly is an objection relating to the costs of the experiment. It is not contested that the new and more modern system—whether votes are taken by roll-call or by show of hands—would permit the operations to be conducted with complete clarity, precious time being saved and complete accuracy being ensured. Above all, I believe we must remember that authorized representatives of the Secretariat have told the Ad Hoc Committee, the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee that the present practices do not make it possible for them to ensure that the results of votes which they communicate to presiding officers are fully accurate. Such a situation, in view of the importance of decisions which we take in the General Assembly on world issues, is clearly intolerable and inconsistent with the dignity of the Organization. As to the expenses envisaged, my delegation and many others are convinced that they will be compensated by the

*Resumed from the 1256th meeting.

savings in time which will be made. We therefore believe that the experiment is worth undertaking and that it will prove successful, and we invite all delegations to vote in favour of the draft resolution before us.

9. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Although the hall is half-empty and delegations are only sparsely represented for this debate, the impression is being created that this item, which the General Assembly is now considering for the second time in a plenary meeting, is in the same class as some of the extremely important international questions on which the future of our Organization may well depend.

10. With a persistence worthy of a better cause, some delegations continue to press for the hasty adoption—and I emphasize the words "hasty adoption"—by the General Assembly of a resolution which, if all its actual financial implications are taken into account, entails a possible total expenditure of the order of \$1 million.

11. I have said that some delegations are now trying hastily, at the last moment, literally in the closing days of the Assembly's current session, to secure at any cost the adoption of a resolution which would approve at least the first steps in that direction.

12. I shall show that, by so doing, these delegations are in reality displaying unjustified, I would even say completely unwarranted haste.

13. Indeed, the question of using so-called "electrical voting equipment" in the United Nations has already been considered by three bodies: the Ad Hoc Committee on the Improvement of the Methods of Work of the General Assembly, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly.

14. What did the debates in all three have in common? That not one of those bodies concluded that there was any need to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt a resolution along the lines of that now proposed to us [A/L.444/Rev.1], and that not one of those subsidiary organs of the General Assembly took a decision on the substance of the matter.

15. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Improvement of the Methods of Work of the General Assembly declined to come to any definite conclusions because of the substantial difference of opinion that arose while this matter was being discussed. The Committee did not recommend that the General Assembly should adopt this resolution, and despite some vagueness in wording, of which the delegations advocating the hasty installation of the system of electrical voting have tried to take advantage, it was clearly shown during the previous debate on this item at the 1256th plenary meeting that the Ad Hoc Committee did not recommend installation of the system and did not take a positive decision on the matter.

16. The same thing happened in the other two organs—in the two financial organs to which I have just referred. Those organs considered only the problematical financial consequences that might ensue if—and I stress the word "if"—the General Assembly decided to install such a system.

17. Thus, none of the discussion in the financial organs—either in the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions or in the Fifth Committee—can be taken as recommending that the

plenary meeting of the General Assembly should adopt this resolution.

18. This confirms the conclusion which I drew at the beginning of my statement, namely, that none of the three organs to which we gave the task of studying this question has made any positive recommendations on it. Can it be a coincidence that not one of the three organs that considered the matter has made positive proposals to us that this system should be installed immediately, that steps should be taken to install equipment in one or more conference rooms with a view to the eventual conversion of other Assembly rooms?

19. This is no coincidence. On the contrary, it reflects the sharp differences of opinion that exist on this question. Finally, at its 1044th meeting, the Fifth Committee adopted, by 36 votes to 8, with 30 abstentions, some problematical and conditional recommendations indicating that if the General Assembly took a decision in the matter the cost would be such and such an amount. Even the Fifth Committee's decision to transmit information on the financial implications of this measure was adopted with thirty-eight delegations in one way or another withholding their support for the submission of the information, which we now have before us, and of this report [A/5645]. Only thirty-six delegations supported the submission of the information, which, as I have already said, does not in itself represent a positive recommendation on the subject.

20. This fact is a formal expression and consequence of the sharp differences of opinion that arose during the discussion of this question in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Improvement of the Methods of Work of the General Assembly. The reason for those differences was that a large number of delegations felt that there was no need at the present time, in view of the present financial plight of the United Nations, to give priority to the consideration of this matter or to take a positive decision on it.

21. That is why the Ad Hoc Committee failed to take a positive decision, even though several delegations and the Legal Counsel strongly urged it to take that decision. The Committee refused to do so.

22. In the subsequent discussion here, in the Fifth Committee and in the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, new facts came to light which showed that the delegations which had objected in the Ad Hoc Committee to the introduction of this system were entirely right.

23. It was shown further—to turn first of all, to the financial aspect of the question—that the difficulties encountered with the usual voting procedures in no way justified all the expenditure that would be required if the draft resolution we are now considering was adopted.

24. In the Fifth Committee, a number of representatives pointed out, for example, that over a period of fifteen years the electrical voting system would save a maximum of \$6,000 per year per conference room, while the cost of installing the system would be approximately \$20,000 per year.

25. Let us take another example. The Secretary-General's report on the subject [A/5423] shows that the estimated cost of the purchase and installation of voting machines in one conference room—and I emphasize that this would be in only one conference

room—would be more than a quarter of a million dollars—\$268,700 to be exact. If the equipment was rented rather than purchased—and, incidentally, the draft resolution says nothing about whether such equipment is to be purchased or rented, even though it makes a great difference in the cost—the yearly expenditure would still amount to a rather large sum, \$78,700. And all this would be done in order to save a few minutes of the time spent in voting.

26. A legitimate question arises—one which, incidentally, also arose during the previous discussion: will this method and this decision really bring about a sharp reduction in the amount of time spent in plenary and committee meetings, or are the enthusiastic supporters of the electrical voting system so carried away by the idea that they have made it an end in itself, forgetting that this system, like any other technical means of servicing the work of the United Nations, is only a means and not an end? One gains the impression that some of the devotees of this system do not see it in relation to our practical work and are trying to have it installed for reasons which have very little to do with any real improvement or better organization of the Assembly's work.

27. As a matter of fact, there was an average of one and one-half votes per plenary meeting at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly. I apologize for the awkwardness of this figure, but that is what the statistics show, and there is no arguing with statistics. I repeat, then, that there was an average of one and one-half votes per plenary meeting—one by show of hands and one-half by roll-call. All of this required a total of about thirteen minutes. Thus, in order to save ten minutes of the time of the plenary meeting, we are to spend more than a quarter of a million dollars or pay an annual rental of \$80,000.

28. Of course, those who do not intend to bear a share of this expenditure or who intend to pay only a token amount—one one-hundredth share, say—may not be properly impressed by these considerations. However, all of us here are members of one organization, and irrespective of whether our share in financing its expenses is large or small, we must be prudent managers. Can you imagine for a moment that the businessmen on the board of directors of a company meeting to approve such an expenditure would, after receiving an estimate of this kind, nevertheless decide to go ahead with it?

29. I do not believe that any sensible person would credit them with much intelligence or agree that they had taken the wisest possible decision under the circumstances. Yet, it is unfortunately true that many plenary meetings of the General Assembly still begin late in spite of what I might call the heroic efforts of our President, who, by comparison with his predecessor, has been exemplary in the way he has organized and conducted our deliberations. As a result of our lack of discipline, meetings have continued to begin late.

30. If we compare the saving of ten minutes with the required initial expenditure of more than a quarter of a million dollars, or an annual rental of \$80,000, I think that everyone who has not received his professional training in a large monopoly but simply knows how to plan his expenses on the basis of his salary will be horrified at such proposals, which suggest that their backers have temporarily lost any sense of relation between the measure they are advo-

cation and the practical results which that measure would bring.

31. If anything can be described as mismanagement, it is this effort to induce us to adopt a certain course of action at the last minute, just as the curtain is about to fall on this session of the General Assembly; without having been able to digest these proposals properly, we shall dutifully vote for them and thus initiate a project that will result in our wasting a million dollars which could be used much more rationally and beneficially to meet the many needs of our Organization.

32. This is quite apart from the fact that this sum of \$1 million would represent a heavy charge on the United Nations budget, which is in any case constantly increasing and most often unjustifiably so.

33. It was for these reasons that we opposed and voted against any such decision when this question was considered in the Ad Hoc Committee, the Fifth Committee and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

34. I should now like to turn to the draft resolution contained in document A/L.444./Rev.1. There is very little for me to add to what I have already said. In my opinion, paragraph 1 of this resolution which reads:

"Authorizes the Secretary-General to arrange for the installation, on an experimental basis for one year, of electrical voting equipment in the General Assembly Hall and to carry out additional work of a preparatory nature, in one or two committee rooms, so as to permit, if the experiment is successful, an eventual expansion of the system without undue expense",

is completely unacceptable because of the considerations of principle which I have just set forth.

35. The qualifying phrase "without undue expense", which appears as a kind of curtsy at the end of this paragraph, does not change the essence of the matter, because it is perfectly obvious from all the documentation at our disposal that the total cost of this measure would be approximately \$1 million, and if those who support this resolution do not regard that as an undue expense, then it is a question of taste. We are in the habit of keeping careful accounts; we are responsible to our people and Government for every penny that is spent under the United Nations budget, and we state here that we shall vote against this paragraph. If the paragraph is retained in spite of the very reasonable arguments which have just been advanced against this completely unjustified squandering of our Organization's resources, we reserve the right to draw the necessary conclusions concerning possible ways of putting an end to such unwarranted wastefulness.

36. We reserve the right to study this question and to take such steps as we may consider necessary in order to avoid participating in measures involving the expenditure of money for purposes which do not improve our work in any way or generally speaking, in measures which, in the last analysis have no essential connexion whatever with the organization of our work and the activities of the United Nations.

37. If paragraph 1 is deleted from the draft resolution, we are prepared to raise no objection to paragraph 2 or to the preamble; the draft resolution would then simply request the Secretary-General to include

in the provisional agenda of the nineteenth session an item entitled "Installation of mechanical means of voting".

38. In our view, there is no reason to resume discussion of this question in the next few years—in any event, not until there has been a substantial change in the financial position of our Organization. However, inasmuch as a number of delegations have shown a certain interest in the matter, we would consider it possible, by way of a reasonable compromise, to agree to take it up again, not in a hasty manner in the closing days of the session, but in such a way that we can carefully examine all the calculations and factors involved in this proposal. It might then be possible to consider this question again in our subsidiary bodies, so that the General Assembly would not be compelled, as is now the case, to take a decision without any recommendation from those bodies, which have studied the matter and, as I have already said, have not submitted a positive recommendation in regard to it.

39. In short, we are opposed to adopt a decision of this kind in the atmosphere of haste and artificial excitement which has been created in an effort to impose at any cost at this session, over the active or passive opposition of dozens of delegations, a decision involving such heavy expenses.

40. If paragraph 1 is retained in the draft resolution before us, we shall vote against the resolution for the reasons which I have just mentioned. We urge all delegations which passively opposed this decision in the Ad Hoc Committee and in the Fifth Committee—i.e., the thirty delegations which did not support the draft resolution—to support our reasonable compromise proposal, which calls for deleting operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution and retaining the remainder of the resolution. That would enable us to discuss the substance of this question again calmly, properly, in a business-like way and without haste—with the participation of all our colleagues, many of whom have left New York and are now flying or sailing across the Atlantic.

41. Mr. S. K. SINGH (India): We have listened with due respect to the statement made by the representative of Denmark, who presented and introduced the draft resolution [A/L.444/Rev.1] and also to the representative of the Soviet Union. I would very briefly attempt to mention the stages through which this document has come before the General Assembly and through which it has been possible for it to have this extremely widely based co-sponsorship which, I hope, is indicative of the Assembly's interest in this matter, as well as its sympathy towards the measures which this draft resolution proposes to introduce.

42. We feel that it is a kind of admission by all of us that certain changes in the methods of work have gradually, although perhaps imperceptibly, taken place in the work of the Organization over the last seventeen years; and as the membership of the Organization continues to increase, and may perhaps reach 120 or 125 very shortly, it would perhaps be necessary to apply ourselves to thinking how to simplify our methods of work and how to save time.

43. I would be very chary of commenting on any proposal which opposes this draft resolution. As regards the criticism by the Soviet representative, I would merely draw the attention of the Assembly to docu-

ment A/5423 in which, in paragraph 5, his own name appears as one of the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Improvement of the Methods of Work of the General Assembly. In the same document we find the following statement: "The present report was adopted unanimously on 27 May 1963."

44. After the report of the Ad Hoc Committee had been made, in paragraphs 57 and 58 of which this proposal was first mooted, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions reported on it [A/5442]. These two documents thereafter became the basis of the report of the Secretary-General of 25 October 1963 [A/C.5/991]. This was further considered by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and reported on in paragraph 12 of its report of 12 November 1963 [A/5604].

45. The entire matter came for discussion—and I repeat "discussion", not decision—before the Fifth Committee on 19 November 1963 [1044th meeting].

46. Based on these discussions, we have before us the report of the Fifth Committee of 9 December 1963 [A/5645] which mentions the earlier discussion in plenary of the Ad Hoc Committee's report, a result of which was the adoption of resolution 1898 (XVIII), which indicated the amount of sympathy that there was for the proposal, as well as the Assembly's desire for due norms and forms to be followed so as to ensure for itself, that there would be no expenses unnecessarily and unduly incurred.

47. When the matter came before the Fifth Committee, the main question which was discussed had two aspects. The first was that of the timing. If the Ad Hoc Committee recommended that a new mechanical voting system might perhaps be required at some future date, some experimental measures to ensure that it would be necessary and it would be possible to put it in had to be taken.

48. As far as the timing is concerned, the main consideration that guided our discussion was that the major maintenance and capital improvement at United Nations Headquarters is at present scheduled for 1964 and, therefore, any experiments of this type could very easily be started at this time, when the carpets, the seats, the electrical installations, wiring, etc. will all be in the process of being dismantled and refitted. So much for the timing.

49. The other consideration before the Fifth Committee was that of whether the experiment should take place in the Assembly hall or whether it should be made in one of the Committee rooms. It is quite obvious that the Assembly hall is the largest of our halls and the voting here is of the greatest import. After due discussion and at the instance, I recall, of the representative of New Zealand, the Chef de Cabinet, Mr. Narasimhan, appeared before the Fifth Committee and gave his opinion. It was on that opinion, it was on the Secretary-General's recommendation, it was on the Advisory Committee's recommendation, it was on the Ad Hoc Committee's initiative and insistence that the Fifth Committee decided to make the recommendation which it has made.

50. The Fifth Committee was not oblivious to the financial implications; and the financial implications, as the record of the 1044th meeting of the Fifth Committee would indicate, took into account all the necessity or otherwise for this expenditure.

51. The expenditure on this experiment has to be viewed in two lights. In the first place, if we do not incur this expenditure now, we might perhaps be faced after three or four years, if the need becomes more pressing then, with incurring at least three or four times the expenditures which we are incurring now or are liable to incur now.

52. The other consideration was whether or not the \$38,000 on the rental was a good sum to be spent. But, as the term "experimental measure" suggests, the Organization could not be advised to purchase the mechanical voting apparatus at this stage of the experiment. The result is before the Assembly in the form of the report of the Fifth Committee on this point [A/5645] in which nothing has been hidden and nothing has been slurred over.

53. We felt that the wording of the recommendation of the Fifth Committee was a little vague. There appeared during the course of the discussion in the Fifth Committee a general consensus that most of us felt that the needs of the Assembly hall were greater and more urgent, and therefore the co-sponsors attempted to indicate in the draft resolution that we consider the Assembly hall as the first priority.

54. With respect to the experimental work to be done in one or two committee rooms, we have allowed a certain amount of flexibility in the hands of the Chief Executive Officer of this Organization.

55. We are in favour of this draft resolution, not because we want the money of this Organization to be spent unnecessarily or unduly, but because, by incurring this expenditure now, perhaps we would be saving more money later. This is not such a remote possibility in the light of the views of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Improvement of the Methods of Work of the General Assembly. In presenting this draft resolution we are perhaps thinking in terms of long-range economies and not of short-range expenses.

56. A point was made by the representative of the Soviet Union regarding a lack of businesslike management which became apparent to him in this draft resolution. I would merely submit that the same point was made in the Fifth Committee with regard to the International School. I would submit that there are certain fields of activity in our national and international lives of which we do not think in terms of business and businesslike balance sheets. Schools, national parliaments and perhaps this most sacred of all international parliaments, I hope are included in that category.

57. May I sum up by impressing upon this Assembly that it should not be considered too much if, out of a gross budget of \$105 million or \$106 million per annum, the Assembly were to agree, after due consideration, for the improvement of our working methods, for the modernization of the procedures of our work and for the saving of time, to incur an extra expenditure of \$12,000 per annum. Now this was a figure given by the representative of Hungary, who spoke at great length in the Fifth Committee on this point, and tried to show that in the long run perhaps we might be incurring an extra expenditure, after due deductions, of roughly \$12,000 per annum—and it is not a figure necessarily accepted by us, the co-sponsors. But even if, for facilitating the argument, this fixture were to be accepted, is it not fair to view the figure in the context of the improvements and

saving of time for an organization with a budget of \$105 million or \$106 million?

58. Mr. MATHEW (United Kingdom): Before voting on the draft resolution [A/L.444/Rev.1] which was moved so well and so eloquently by the representative of Denmark, I would like, in explanation of my delegation's vote—and it is the intention of the United Kingdom delegation to support this draft resolution—to refer to one or two points.

59. In doing so, we note first of all two points about the estimates of cost. First, the estimates of cost are based on the study of one particular electronic system. Now those of us with parliamentary knowledge and experience know of, and have probably had experience with, a number of different electronic and other systems. I know that the representative of Denmark himself has had experience with some of these systems. In other countries there are not only different types of electrical equipment, but there are also non-electronic systems which seem to me to contain largely the advantages of the electronic system, which are first of all speed in taking the vote, and secondly absolute accuracy.

60. If I may, I should like to refer quite briefly to one system which I have seen in operation in the Diet in Japan—I have no doubt that the representative of Japan would be able to give members further information on this—which is not electronic. It is a system of tokens of different colours which are held by the members in the Diet who are going to vote and which are gathered by messengers and taken up to the podium, where they are put against scales in wooden boxes, so that very quickly the vote, with the number in favour, against and abstaining, can be read off by the clerk. This is a simple system requiring very little maintenance; it is entirely physical, without any electronic or electric power or anything else required, and it has the virtue not only of simplicity but of speed in counting the vote.

61. I would add here that as a parliamentarian, I think that we should bear in mind that voting is symbolic as much as anything else. We must not think of it rigidly and only as a matter of recording the stand taken by an individual member, or, in this Assembly, by a delegation. We, in the House of Commons, for instance, have always stuck to the physical action of the member of Parliament actually having to be in the "yes" or "no" lobby and to pass through the voting clerks. We feel that there is some value, some virtue, some magic if you like, in the symbolic physical action where a member records his vote by actually doing so. I think we ought perhaps to bear in mind when this experiment comes about that there is some value in that aspect of voting, that there should be some small ritual in what after all is the culminating point of a debate when the decision is taken.

62. Our second point in considering the estimates of costs which are before us was that they are based actually on the cost of installation in the committee rooms, and not in this General Assembly hall. We in the United Kingdom delegation assume, of course, that tenders will be put out to additional firms both in the United States of America and in other countries. We welcome that, and the close scrutiny which, of course, will follow as a matter of course, with the result that the system chosen will be the most effective and the most suitable and at the most reasonable price for this chamber in which we now are.

63. I would like to add here that we hope that, in considering the systems which will be put forward by the various firms, one consideration, other than those of purely technical efficiency and of finance, will be taken into account and that is the aesthetic aspect. I think that there are probably some of us in this Assembly who have seen electronic systems with the recording boards placed above the podium or on the walls of a chamber which have been very ugly and out of keeping with the decor of that particular chamber. I hope that the aesthetic considerations will not be lost sight of, in spite of the more technical views of those who have to install the equipment, and I hope that the equipment will harmonize with our chamber.

64. I would add that the difficulties which the Secretariat have had in counting votes and in obtaining a quick and accurate record in plenary meetings of the General Assembly have also arisen in the Committee rooms, and perhaps almost as often as in plenary. I hope, therefore, that this will be borne in mind and that there will be preparatory work carried out in the other two rooms.

65. With these comments, my delegation is prepared to support the proposal which was so ably proposed by the representative of Denmark and which has been put forward by India and the other co-sponsors. This proposal is that electrical voting equipment should be installed in the General Assembly hall and that the preparatory work should be carried out in one or two Committee rooms, as the case may be, so as to permit, should the experiment be successful, an eventual expansion of the system without undue expense. In these circumstances, my delegation is prepared to support this draft resolution.

66. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary): In the course of the debate on this item in the Fifth Committee, the Hungarian delegation was opposed to the installation of a mechanical voting system. We produced a series of convincing facts and figures in support of our stand, and there is no need to repeat them now because the report of the Fifth Committee contains these remarks. The conclusion of our arguments was that the installation of a mechanical voting system would mean at least a yearly loss of \$12,000 per room compared with the cost of the measures suggested by my delegation to save more time and obtain more accuracy in the counting of votes. In its present financial situation, the Organization cannot afford this luxury. Therefore, in the Fifth Committee the discussion concerned not only the timing and the place of the experiment, as the representative of India said, but also the advisability of the experiment itself. Because the sponsors of the draft resolution [A/L.444/Rev.1] disregarded the views of my delegation and the doubts concerning the usefulness of the introduction of the system which were expressed in the Committee from many quarters, my delegation will be compelled to vote against the draft resolution as it is now submitted.

67. Mr. YOST (United States of America): I do not want to confuse this issue any further, but there is one point which we feel we should make. This question of electrical voting was very thoroughly considered in the Ad Hoc Committee over a period of weeks, and the advantages and disadvantages were presented in detail. Frankly, we did not firmly make up our minds as to whether the disadvantages or the advantages were the most compelling, but we felt that on

the whole the advantages were sufficiently great to make it worth while to make the experiment. Therefore, we have consistently supported the proposal, which was first put forward by the Ad Hoc Committee, that this system be tried out experimentally in one of the Committee rooms and that advantage should be taken of the opportunity provided by the reconstruction which will be taking place next year to make certain preparations in other rooms so that if the experiment is successful such expansion would be considerably less expensive.

68. As I say, we have always envisaged that this experiment would be made in one of the Committee rooms. We were therefore troubled at the final revision of the draft resolution which has just been circulated and which recommends that the experiment be made in the General Assembly hall itself. It was our feeling that this would probably be somewhat more expensive, but, more important, we also felt that if the equipment were installed in this hall it would have less of an experimental flavour and would, we feared, tend to prejudice more definitely the final decision which the Assembly may wish to take after a year's experiment. Therefore, we would have much preferred the language of the draft resolution as originally introduced, which would have authorized the Secretary-General to make the experiment either in the General Assembly hall or in a Committee room. We certainly would have advised that the experiment be made in a Committee room. We would very much hope, therefore, that the sponsors of the draft resolution might find it possible to go back to their earlier language, which gave the two alternatives.

69. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): My list of speakers is now exhausted, and we shall proceed to a vote on the sixteen-Power draft resolution [A/L.444/Rev.1].

70. The representative of the Soviet Union has the floor on a point of order.

71. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Since we are going to begin voting, I should like to request a separate vote on operative paragraph 1. That is my first motion.

72. Secondly, I should like to request a roll-call vote on operative paragraph 1 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

73. I should also like to request a roll-vote on the second draft resolution, which relates to the financial implications.

74. Although there is probably no need for me to do so, I should like to point out that, in accordance with the Charter and the rules of procedure, a two-thirds majority is required for the adoption of these decisions.

75. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): As the members of the Assembly have heard, the representative of the Soviet Union has requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. He has also requested a roll-call vote on this paragraph and on the draft resolution as a whole.

76. I should like to draw the Soviet representative's attention to the fact that the Assembly has before it only one draft resolution; there is no draft resolution on the financial implications of the text it is now considering, but only a report of the Fifth Committee [A/5645]. Thus there is only one draft resolution before the Assembly.

77. In accordance with rule 91 of the rules of procedure and in view of the request made by the representative of the Soviet Union, if there is no objection, I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Central African Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Finland, France, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada.

Against: Congo (Leopoldville), Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Abstaining: Ceylon, Ethiopia, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United States of America, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 50 votes to 10, with 22 abstentions.

78. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We shall now vote on the draft resolution as a whole, including operative paragraph 1.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Bulgaria, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Finland, France, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Republic, Congo (Leopoldville), Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, United States of America, Algeria, Australia, Austria.

The draft resolution was adopted by 51 votes to 10, with 23 abstentions.

79. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We have now concluded our consideration of agenda item 25.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.