



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and
Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSFELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEMS 116 AND 117: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 AND
PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

First reading (continued)

Section 12. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

Section 13. Economic Commission for Africa

Section 14. Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DK 2 240, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL,
A/C.5/40/SR.34
18 November 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 116 AND 117: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/40/3, 6, 7 and Add.1, 38 and Add.1, and 262; A/C.5/40/2 and Corr.1; A/C.5/40/CRP.1)

First reading (continued)

Section 12. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary-General had submitted an estimate of \$49,006,300, which had been reduced by the Advisory Committee to \$48,993,800.
2. Miss DURRANT (Jamaica) said that her delegation endorsed the statement made by the representative of Yugoslavia at an earlier meeting concerning the regional economic commissions. With reference to section 12.C.6, subprogramme 5 (Economic integration and co-operation among Caribbean countries), since the substantive activities of the Port of Spain office were under one programme, Caribbean countries did not benefit from other ECLAC programmes, such as that relating to energy issues. There were, in particular, links between programmes 12.C.5 and 12.C.6 and other areas of concern to the Commission. Further, her delegation trusted that ECLAC posts relating to the Caribbean would be staffed by individuals who were familiar with Caribbean problems, and that the same considerations would apply to consultants employed. With reference to the proposed establishment of a P-3 post to co-ordinate the integration of women into development, the post should be funded from the regular budget. It was not possible to divert resources earmarked for the P-5 post referred to in paragraph 12.39. Consideration should, however, be given to upgrading the P-3 post. Her delegation supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations relating to ECLAC.
3. Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation agreed with the representative of Jamaica. Trinidad and Tobago was concerned to ensure that resources were employed efficiently. The Caribbean Development and Co-operation Committee was in the process of reviewing its work, and his delegation expected to see its recommendations reflected in the next programme budget. There was no doubt that the resources available to the Port of Spain office were inadequate.
4. Mr. PIERRE (Guyana) said that the geographical position of the Caribbean meant that it was relegated to obscurity, particularly at the United Nations. It was essential to take account of ECLAC's programme of work in determining the resources to be made available to it. His delegation supported the appropriation for ECLAC, particularly those elements relating to the Caribbean.
5. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to endorse the recommendations of CPC contained in paragraphs 646 to 648 of its report.
6. It was so decided.

7. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$48,993,800 under section 12 for the biennium 1986-1987.

8. Mrs. SHEAROUSE (United States of America) said that, in keeping with its policy of opposition to the establishment of new posts, her delegation would vote against the recommended appropriation.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

9. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$48,993,800 under section 12 for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 82 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

10. Mr. PANESSO (Colombia) said that, had it been present, his delegation would have voted in favour of the appropriation.

Section 13. Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)

11. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary-General had submitted an estimate of \$51,829,400, which had been endorsed by the Advisory Committee.

12. Mr. MOHI EL DIN (Sudan) said that the real rate of growth of 1.6 per cent under section 13 did not reflect adequately conditions in Africa. It was regrettable that the critical situation of the continent and the need to pursue its social and economic development had not been taken into account, and that the livelihood of African peoples had been subordinated to a particular rate of growth.

13. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia) agreed that the appropriation did not reflect conditions in Africa, which was the least developed of all regions. ECA had a heavy responsibility, which it would be unable to discharge if the international community did not make the necessary resources available. The Committee should recognize the seriousness of the position and approve by consensus the appropriation, together with any supplementary appropriations which might emerge.
14. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that, at the second regular session of the Economic and Social Council, held at Geneva in July 1985, a representative of the Secretary-General had stated that the economic situation of Africa was one of the criteria governing the preparation of the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987. Yet it was not clear to his delegation how that had been reflected in the appropriation for ECA. In particular, he wished to know whether the decisions adopted by the Council relating to the situation in Africa had been taken into account. With a rate of growth of only 1.6 per cent, it was not certain that ECA would be able to play the critical role incumbent upon it. Further, other regional commissions, for example ECE, had been provided with more financial support than ECA, and his delegation wished to know why.
15. Mr. NTAKIBIRORA (Burundi) said that his delegation also felt that the rate of growth for ECA did not adequately reflect the critical situation in Africa. Paragraph 13.156 referred to an appropriation for the use of free-lance interpreters and translators to service meetings away from Addis Ababa. Given that a training programme for translators had been in existence at ECA for some time, his delegation wished to know why the staff trained under the programme would not be used instead of free-lance staff. Did the requested appropriation imply that the training programme had been a failure? In that connection, it was his understanding that some translators trained in 1982 had still not been recruited.
16. Mr. NTSAMA (Cameroon) said that he trusted that the solidarity displayed by the international community in helping Africa to cope with natural disasters would inspire the Fifth Committee to approve the recommended appropriation. Africa's development needs were vast and needed support, while the appropriations recommended for ECA were little more than a maintenance budget. His delegation strongly felt that there should be no zero growth for Africa.
17. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that, had it been present, his delegation would have voted in favour of the appropriation under section 12. Kenya trusted that the appropriation under section 13 would be approved by consensus.
18. Mr. FALL (Senegal) said that his delegation would like to see the Secretariat devote more attention to programmes for Africa by formulating more appropriate budgetary appropriations. Senegal hoped that it would be possible to approve the appropriation for ECA without a vote.
19. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said that it did not seem that the Secretariat had taken account of the economic problems facing African countries in formulating the appropriation.

20. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) noted that there were a number of instances in section 13, as in other sections, of requirements for staff travel to collect information for reports. He hoped that such travel could be kept to a minimum and that it could be combined, whenever possible, with travel on substantive missions. With regard to paragraph 13.84 of the budget document, he would be grateful for background information on the inclusion of the outputs described in subprogramme 3.1 (vi) and subprogramme 4.1 (i), and asked for clarification as to whether those activities were consistent with normal procedures.
21. Mr. MONIRUZZAMAN (Bangladesh) said that the priority attention devoted to the economic problems of Africa at various international forums had not been adequately reflected in the budget proposals. The meagre 1.6 per cent rate of real growth for ECA suggested that the wind of reform in the Organization was blowing too heavily on the African countries. It was to be hoped that the appropriation under section 13 could be agreed upon by consensus as a token, at least, of the Committee's awareness of the critical situation in Africa.
22. Mr. SCHLAFF (Office for Programme Planning and Co-ordination), replying to the questions raised by the representative of Algeria, said that prior to the preparation of the 1986-1987 budget estimates, the Secretary-General had established general priorities, the first being in favour of the developing countries. In that context, the African region had been given special priority, as shown by the high rate of real growth for ECA.
23. The decisions taken by the Economic and Social Council during its summer session held at Geneva were not reflected in the budget proposals, which had already been in preparation in late 1984 and early 1985 with a view to their timely submission to the Advisory Committee and CPC. However, those decisions were now coming before the Main Committees and their administrative, financial and programme budget implications would be considered in due course.
24. With regard to the translator training programme at Addis Ababa, he could assure the representative of Burundi that the Department of Conference Services was well satisfied with results achieved thus far. Five graduates of that programme were now employed as full-time translators at Addis Ababa and one had been assigned to Headquarters. Three more trainees had completed the programme but had not yet been employed because of post difficulties. However, it was expected that they would be on the manning table by February 1986. As to the question of temporary assistance for translation work outside Addis Ababa, it was cheaper to recruit free-lance translators for peak periods rather than to maintain a large permanent capacity throughout the year.
25. Concerning the outputs referred to by the representative of the United Kingdom in section 13.7, the preparation of draft memoranda described in subprogramme 4.1 (i) was in conformity with normal procedure for cases in which it appeared that the interconnecting interests of the United Nations and related agencies or institutions could effectively be served using regular budget resources. He could not give a definitive response with regard to the substantive servicing of the Group of 77 meeting preparatory to the seventh session of UNCTAD, listed under subprogramme 3.1 (vi), and would seek additional information to answer that question at a later stage.

26. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that the question raised by the representative of Algeria concerning the different budgetary resource levels for the various regional commissions had to a large extent been answered in his statement at the 33rd meeting. Given the limitation of resources, account had to be taken of the varying needs of the commissions, including local costs and infrastructure requirements. Some historical factors also affected the situation. Caution had to be exercised to avoid basing decisions on the bare statistics, and it should be pointed out that budgetary growth at ECE, for example, had remained static notwithstanding the large but not immediately apparent infrastructure costs at Geneva, over which the Secretariat had little control. For purposes of comparison, it would be more appropriate to consider staff as the major resource. The figures for post requirements in 1986-1987 showed that ECE had 234 established posts financed out of the regular budget, ESCAP had 560, ECLAC was allocated 591 and ESCWA 314. The 626 posts for ECA represented the highest total.

27. With regard to the economic situation in Africa, it should be remembered that the Secretary-General had approved the establishment of an Office for Emergency Operations in Africa and the strengthening of a number of existing units. The special measures pursued by the Secretary-General included programmes and corresponding budgetary allocations distinct from those of ECA, as well as activities financed from extrabudgetary resources. Those measures and their costs were not reflected in section 13 of the proposed programme budget.

28. Turning to the United Kingdom representative's question about the travel requirement for staff to collect information for reports, ECA had advised the Secretariat that, under present circumstances, it was difficult to obtain vital information from Governments and regional institutions for studies without which consultants could not be used effectively. It was customary to send staff for such purposes together with consultants engaged on substantive missions wherever possible, but the Secretariat took the point that greater efforts could be made in that area.

29. Mr. MOHI EL DIN (Sudan) said that he did not share Mr. Schlaff's view that real growth at ECA could be described as high. During the general debate on agenda items 116 and 117, his delegation had called for a review of the methodology used to estimate resource requirements. The estimates for section 13, which failed to reflect real priorities, were the best proof of the need for such a review.

30. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) agreed with the representative of Sudan. He understood that not all expenditures related to the situation in Africa were reflected in section 13, but a 1.6 per cent rate of real growth was insufficient to enable ECA to cope even with its own increasing work-load. Moreover, section 13 dealt not only with an administrative entity but also with a set of programmes. As far as comparing resource allocations for the various organizational units was concerned, he could not agree with Mr. Annan that historical precedents necessarily had to be taken into account. It was essential to develop a methodology for estimating requirements that was adaptable to changing needs and critical situations.

31. Mr. BESTMAN (Liberia) said that his delegation supported the policy of maximum budgetary restraint, provided that it was applied across the board. However, the budget proposals gave only lip-service to the needs of Africa on the level of resource commitment. Low growth in funding made the operation of ECA almost an exercise in futility. The Commission needed firm financial support, and he called upon the Secretariat to give second thought to its estimates of expenditure.
32. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision first on the recommendations of CPC relating to section 13.
33. The recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination contained in paragraphs 649 and 650 of its report (A/40/38) were approved.
34. Mrs. SHEAROUSE (United States of America) said that her delegation was opposed to the establishment of a number of new posts under section 13 and therefore requested a recorded vote on the section as a whole.
35. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote. The gravity of the situation in Africa justified giving the highest priority to ECA. His delegation could have supported the estimates under section 13 had most of the proposed growth been absorbed by programmes of activity. As it was, executive direction and management accounted for nearly 70 per cent of total growth.
36. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the estimates on the understanding that the Secretariat sought to introduce the necessary adjustments to reflect the high priority that should be given to the problems of Africa.
37. At the request of the United States representative, a recorded vote was taken on the appropriation under section 13.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

38. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$51,829,400 under section 13 for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 98 votes to 1, with 12 abstentions.

39. Mr. PANESSO (Colombia) wished the record to show that his delegation supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

40. Mr. ORSATELLI (France), explaining his vote, said that the position of his delegation was similar to that taken by Belgium. Additional appropriations for ECA would be acceptable, provided that greater emphasis was placed on programmes of activity.

41. Mr. MOHI EL DIN said that his delegation's vote in favour of the appropriation should not be taken to mean that the estimates of expenditure, in its view, reflected real needs.

42. Mr. BESTMAN (Liberia) said that the result of the vote just taken should alert the Secretariat to the need to revise its estimates under section 13 so as to give the critical situation in Africa the priority it deserved.

43. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that his delegation had voted in favour even though it considered the appropriation inadequate. In view of the constructive comments made by the representatives of Belgium and France, he hoped that before the budget was finally adopted, the Secretariat, in consultation with those concerned, could see whether the appropriations under that section could be increased.

44. Mr. CHIBANDA (Zambia) associated himself with those comments.

Section 14. Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA)

45. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee was recommending a reduction of \$1,566,600 in the estimates for that section. Much of the reduction related to the Committee's recommendations (A/40/7, paras. 30 to 33) with regard to an evaluation report on the computer needs of the regional economic commissions, which it had requested, should be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-first session.

46. Another major reason for the recommended reduction was the vacancy situation. In paragraph 14.5 of its report the Committee had recommended that the turnover deduction should be raised from 5 to 9 per cent. In paragraph 14.6, it had recommended a slight reduction in respect of travel and, in paragraph 14.14, it had recommended a reduction of \$157,200 in respect of the estimate for improvement of premises.

47. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (A/40/38, paras. 651 to 655) and to the financial implications of those recommendations (A/40/38/Add.1, paras. 17 and 18).
48. Mr. YONIS (Iraq) requested an explanation for the continuing high vacancy rate in the Commission. The subject had been discussed the previous year and assurances had been given that the situation would be remedied. Referring to Annex IX of the proposed programme budget he requested an interpretation of rule 105.2 (b) of the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, under which programme elements could be terminated. His delegation interpreted that rule as meaning that before a programme element was terminated efforts should be made to change the programme element. If, after being changed, the programme still did not produce results, then implementation of the programme should be suspended. Only after those two steps had been taken could a programme element be terminated. Thirdly, he asked what means were made available for implementing the programmes and who was responsible for their implementation once the programme budget was adopted. Finally, noting that the Secretary of the Commission was only a P-5 post he asked whether the Secretaries of the regional commissions all had the same functions.
49. Mr. LOZA (Egypt) associated himself with the questions put by the representative of Iraq. His delegation attached great importance to ESCWA and welcomed the efforts to remedy the high vacancy rate. The Commission should be strengthened and imaginative new programmes should be devised.
50. He took note of the explanation provided in paragraph 287 of the CPC report regarding the termination of programme elements. Programme elements could be terminated provided that such changes were in accordance with the objectives of the subprogramme as set out in the Medium-Term Plan and provided that the head of department or office concerned obtained the prior approval of the competent intergovernmental body. Finally, his delegation supported the recommendations of CPC and hoped that the JIU study on the regional commissions would help to point out more clearly the problems affecting ESCWA.
51. Mr. MONAYAIR (Kuwait) associated himself with the questions put by the representative of Iraq. His delegation attached great importance to the activities of ESCWA and was concerned at the high vacancy rate in the Commission and at the elimination of 15 programme elements.
52. Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan) said that ESCWA was much younger than the other regional commissions and, for a number of reasons, had experienced considerable difficulties in its early days. Those factors should be taken into consideration. The proposed real growth rate of 1 per cent was much lower than that proposed for the other regional commissions aside from the Economic Commission for Europe.
53. His delegation fully agreed with the Advisory Committee regarding the need to establish a new P-4 post and to reclassify one P-3 post to the P-4 level. At the same time, it continued to be concerned at the high vacancy rate. While continuing to try to attract staff from States that were under-represented, the administration should take ad hoc measures to recruit staff from other countries in the region or even from outside the region, at least on a temporary basis.

(Mr. Othman, Jordan)

54. His delegation attached great importance to the programmes, particularly to the food security measures and evaluation of rural development projects. High priority should be given to the question of water resources. Finally, his delegation agreed with the comments made by the representative of Iraq concerning the elimination of programme elements.

55. Mr. MASSOUD (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation attached great importance to the Commission and was concerned at the deletion of the 15 programme elements from the proposed programme budget. Greater importance should be given to the question of desertification.

56. Mr. SCHLAFF (Office for Programme Planning and Co-ordination) said that the Commission's programme had increased considerably during the 1970s but that the level of programme implementation had remained somewhat low owing to a number of difficulties in recruiting qualified personnel, the difficult conditions in Lebanon and the problems encountered during the transfer of the Commission to Baghdad. Concerned at that low rate, the Commission had requested the Secretariat to direct available resources to implementing the highest priority activity and those which best met the requirements of Member States of the region. Termination of the 15 programme elements was part of a policy of concentration at the programme element level. The Secretariat had been asked to pursue that policy by a Standing Committee set up to review the whole work programme of the Commission and to establish priorities. Moreover, the proposed termination had been endorsed by Member States of the Commission and they had reviewed the programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985 and 1986-1987. The procedure followed had not been under rule 105.2 (b) but under regulation 4.6 of the programme budgeting regulations.

57. Referring to the recruitment difficulties, he said that the United Nations was dispatching recruiting missions to countries in the region that were underrepresented. It was also trying to recruit staff from many other countries. The vacancy rate had declined somewhat and was continuing to do so.

58. The Executive-Secretary of ESCWA was the person responsible for implementing programmes once they had been approved, within the powers delegated to him by the Secretary-General and subject to the immediate guidance of the Commission. Ultimately, of course, it was the Secretary-General who had full responsibility for such an implementation.

59. Finally, there was a relationship between the vacancy rate and the growth rate. When a department had a high vacancy rate and had difficulty in filling existing posts, the Secretariat believed it was a sham to propose a large increase in that department's resources, particularly its staff resources, the feeling being that the existing vacancies should be filled as much as possible before plans were made for any expansion.

60. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division), answering the question put by the representative of Iraq, said that the Secretary of ECA was a P-4 post, those of ECLAC and ESCWA were P-5 posts and those of ESCAP and ECE were D-1 posts. The different levels reflected the different functions assigned to the position. The Secretaries of ESCAP and ECE were also special assistants to their respective Executive Secretaries.
61. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and reminded it that a recorded vote had been requested on paragraph 655.
62. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel) said that his delegation objected to the proposed budget appropriation since ESCWA was in flagrant violation of the principles relating to the sovereign equality of all States and universality set forth in the Charter. Israel, a Member State located within the geographical region of the Commission, had been barred while the PLO - which was not a State - had been admitted. Accordingly, his delegation would vote against the recommendation in paragraph 655 and it would request a separate vote on other relevant paragraphs.
63. At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on the recommendation contained in paragraph 655 of the CPC report.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Tozo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Germany, Federal Republic of.

64. The recommendation contained in paragraph 655 of the CPC report was adopted by 101 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.
65. The recommendations contained in paragraphs 651 to 654 of the CPC report were adopted without a vote.

66. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, based on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Committee should adopt, in first reading, an appropriation of \$33,483,100 under section 14 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987.

67. A recorded vote was requested.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Tojo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

68. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$33,483,100 under section 14 for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 93 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

69. Mr. HOLBORN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his Government was committed to increasing economic development as demonstrated by its extrabudgetary contributions to the United Nations and its bilateral aid programmes. However, because of its position regarding budgetary restraint, it had difficulty in accepting the rate of growth provided for in sections 11, 12, 13 and 14 and had therefore abstained in the votes on those sections.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.