



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 35th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon)

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

CONTENTS

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

First reading (continued)

- Section 15. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
- Section 16. International Trade Centre
- Section 18. United Nations Environment Programme
- Section 19. United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)

*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 IX 2-750, 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.35
19 November 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 116 AND 117: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/40/3, 6, 7, 38 and Add.1 and 262; A/C.5/40/9 and 12 and Corr.1)

First reading (continued)

Section 15. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew the Committee's attention to paragraphs 15.3 and 15.4 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/40/7). The review referred to in paragraph 15.4 was aimed at streamlining the structure of the UNCTAD secretariat so that it would be better adapted to the implementation of UNCTAD's mandate. The Advisory Committee had been informed that no additional financial resources would be requested as a result of the review. With reference to paragraphs 15.9 and 15.10 of its report, the Advisory Committee believed that the appropriation for consultancy services should be adequate to cover present requirements and any unanticipated demands.
2. Mr. CABRIC (Chairman of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination) said that CPC had devoted great attention to section 15 in view of the important role played by UNCTAD. There was a negative rate of real growth of minus 0.2 per cent, a factor which had caused concern to many delegations, to the extent that the view had been expressed that section 15 should be referred back to UNCTAD. Concern had also been expressed over the placing of programme element 1.6 (Financial flows among developing countries) under section 15.C, programme 1 (Money, finance and development), rather than section 15.C, programme 6 (Economic co-operation among developing countries).
3. CPC had recommended that the designation of highest priority should be given to programme element 2.3 (Implementation and improvement of the generalized system of preferences and of special and differential treatment for developing countries) under section 15.C, programme 3, and had further recommended that UNCTAD should improve its co-ordination with other organizations. CPC had also noted that UNCTAD had a key role to play in economic co-operation between developing countries. Finally, he drew the Committee's attention to the reference in paragraphs 314 and 315 of the CPC report to the reservations expressed by various delegations.
4. Mrs. KNEŽEVIĆ (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the Group was concerned by the negative rate of growth under section 15. A majority of States wished the United Nations to devote greater attention to finance and development, particularly the transfer of resources to developing countries. Section 15 should be given the highest priority, and the budget of UNCTAD should be reviewed following its seventh session, to be held in 1987.
5. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) said that he endorsed the views expressed by the representative of Yugoslavia. His delegation wished to know whether programme element 1.6 had been given the highest priority.

6. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that, in view of the large size of the UNCTAD budget and the fact that UNCTAD was located in Geneva, it was important for the Committee to have adequate time to consider the relevant documentation.

7. His delegation trusted that the review of UNCTAD referred to by the Advisory Committee would, indeed, improve efficiency, and wished to know what impact it had had on the budget proposals. His delegation agreed with ACABQ that the justifications for the use of consultants were often splendidly imprecise. The same lack of clarity was apparent in the funding of outputs under technical assistance programmes. In that connection, his delegation was concerned that UNCTAD's role as a technical co-operation executing agency was making significant demands on the regular programme of work and budget to the extent of 500 work-months for professional staff over the next biennium, which amounted, in effect, to a subsidy for technical co-operation activities. There was a need for a more transparent presentation in that area. For example, it was apparent from paragraph 15.61 of the budget that the normal practice of applying a 13 per cent overhead retention had not been followed in the case of the Global System of Trade Preferences among developing countries (GSTP), a departure which required justification and, indeed, reconsideration. Further, his delegation questioned the propriety of regular budget involvement in GSTP, the benefits of which accrued to the Group of 77 alone. Several delegations had raised the question of universality in that connection. Finally, since UNCTAD's areas of interest overlapped with those of other organizations, efficient co-ordination was vital.

8. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) said that there had been little alteration in the distribution of resources between the various UNCTAD programmes over the past few bienniums, despite changing emphases in mandates. In that connection, Sweden would like to see an increase in the proportion of resources devoted to manufactures and to programmes for the least developed countries. With reference to the review of UNCTAD's programme of work, it would be of interest to know what progress had been made. On the issue of a possible duplication of activities, Sweden would welcome a reassurance that programme element 1.3 of programme 7 would not duplicate the work of ECE.

9. Mr. ORTEGA (Mexico) said that his delegation endorsed the remarks made by the representative of Yugoslavia. With reference to paragraph 15.1 of the budget, his delegation wondered whether resource limitations might have hampered the establishment of priorities by the Trade and Development Board. Paragraph 15.2 stated that financial flows, debt problems and monetary issues would be further developed under UNCTAD's programme of work, in view of which his delegation could not understand the reduction of 0.8 per cent in resources for that area referred to in table 15.3. Further, it was not clear what the minor adjustments referred to in paragraph 15.4 might be. In that connection, Mexico felt that the budget should be tailored to activities and not vice versa. It seemed from paragraph 15.4 of the Advisory Committee's report that the outcome of the review might have been prejudged in the sense that adjustments would affect programme delivery. His delegation could see no reason why the review should not lead to the conclusion that more resources were necessary.

10. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that his delegation was concerned by the lack of clarity in section 15. For example, the Advisory Committee had noted that the reasons given for the use of consultants were often less than precise, and it seemed to his delegation that permanent staff could be used instead. Italy would vote in favour of section 15, on the understanding that UNCTAD resources would be used more efficiently.
11. Mr. MONIRUZZAMAN (Bangladesh) said that his delegation endorsed the remarks made by the representative of Yugoslavia, and shared the concerns expressed by the representative of Sweden. His delegation would welcome additional information concerning the reference in paragraph 15.76 of the budget to the effect of decisions taken by the Intergovernmental Group on the Least Developed Countries.
12. Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil) said that his delegation agreed that the level of resources available to UNCTAD was unsatisfactory. If UNCTAD, at its seventh session, expressed a need for additional resources, Brazil expected the Secretary-General to request them.
13. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation was also concerned by the reduction in resources. He wished to know whether account had been taken of the Common Fund for Commodities and of the fact that UNCTAD was due to hold its seventh session during the next biennium.
14. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel) said that Israel attached great importance to the work of UNCTAD, particularly economic co-operation among developing countries. Such co-operation should, however, be open to all countries on a basis of self-selection and sovereign equality. Since those principles had not been observed under programme element 1.1 (Global System of Trade Preferences among developing countries) of programme 6, his delegation had serious reservations. Israel also objected to section 15.B, programme element 1.3, Special Economic Unit (Palestinian people). The Unit had taken part in a vicious anti-Israeli campaign throughout the United Nations system, in view of which his delegation would like a separate vote on that programme element, which, he had been informed by the Secretariat, had an appropriation of \$412,500. Israel would vote against that appropriation, and the appropriations for section 15 as a whole.
15. Mr. SCHLAFF (Office for Programme Planning and Co-ordination), responding to questions, said that no consensus had emerged in CPC on granting the highest priority to programme 1, programme element 1.6. However, the programme element should have been given high priority, and programme managers would be instructed accordingly. With regard to the possible duplication of activities, the Committee could rest assured that there was close co-ordination between UNCTAD and ECE. Finally, the appropriations under section 15 had taken account of the seventh session of UNCTAD, but not of financing for the Common Fund for Commodities.
16. Mr. FORAN (Controller), referring to paragraph 15.4 of the Advisory Committee's report, said that the review of the UNCTAD secretariat was part of an overall assessment of the programme of activities and modus operandi of UNCTAD undertaken in the first half of 1985 with a view to providing a number of options

(Mr. Foran)

for streamlining its structure. The review had, in fact, been completed and a report had been submitted for follow-up action when a new Secretary-General was appointed. It was his understanding that the findings of the review did not have financial implications.

17. Mrs. DEREGIBUS (Argentina) said that her delegation endorsed the views expressed by the representative of Yugoslavia, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77. The budgetary allocation under section 15 was too small to allow UNCTAD to discharge its mandate to the fullest extent.

18. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision first on the recommendations of CPC relating to section 15.

19. At the request of the United States representative, a recorded vote was taken on the recommendation of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination contained in paragraph 665 of its report.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

20. The recommendation of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination contained in paragraph 665 of its report (A/40/38) was adopted by 100 votes to 2.

21. Mr. ORTEGA (Mexico) wished the record to show that his delegation supported the recommendation.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination contained in paragraphs 656 to 664 of its report.

23. It was so decided.

24. At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on the appropriation for programme element 1.3 in section 15B.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Swaziland, 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, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

25. An appropriation of \$412,500 for programme element 1.3, section 15B, for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 86 votes to 2, with 15 abstentions.

26. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote since it had reservations about the output of the Special Economic Unit (Palestinian people) and believed that UNCTAD should have a wider mandate to carry out its activities within the general structure of the organization.

27. At the request of the United States representative, a recorded vote was taken on the appropriation for section 15 as a whole.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau,

Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

28. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$51,945,900 under section 15 for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 99 votes to 2.

29. Mr. ORTEGA (Mexico) and Mr. MALAGA (Peru), said that, if their delegations had been present during the vote, they would have supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

30. Mr. MILLER (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation appreciated the degree of budgetary restraint shown in the estimate for section 15, but had serious objections to several aspects of the UNCTAD work programme, including the output of the Special Economic Unit, the funding of travel for representatives of the national liberation movements and the lack of universality of some programme activities.

Section 16. International Trade Centre

31. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee recommended a reduction of \$59,400 under section 16. The reduction for contractual services and external printing and binding was explained in paragraph 16.18 of its report. Paragraph 16.7 gave information about the increase of \$432,000 under "transfer from surplus account", which had arisen from corrective action taken to reimburse the regular budget in respect of excess charges against that budget in 1982-1983. The proposed programme budget for 1988-1989 would not be offset to the extent as in the current submission. Bearing that in mind, as well as the actual rate of real growth for the International Trade Centre in 1986-1987, the Advisory Committee recommended that every effort be made to achieve economies and minimize expenditures.

32. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) said that his delegation fully supported the work programme of the Centre. Despite a modest resource allocation, it had great potential to carry out activities for the benefit of the developing countries.

33. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination relating to section 16, as contained in paragraph 666 of its report (A/40/38).

34. It was so decided.

35. At the request of the United States representative, a recorded vote was taken on the appropriation under section 16.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

36. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$8,041,300 under section 16 for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 93 votes to 4.

37. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy), Mr. ORTEGA (Mexico) and Mr. MALAGA (Peru) wished the record to show that their delegations supported the appropriation.

38. Mr. MILLER (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had opposed the appropriation because of the excessive rate of real growth for the Centre.

39. Mr. PARSHIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted against the appropriation because it could not support the creation of new posts and the unjustified post reclassifications proposed under section 16.

Section 18. United Nations Environment Programme

40. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee's recommendations led to a reduction of \$473,700 under section 18. As indicated in paragraph 18.2 of its report, the expenses of the United Nations Environment Programme were met from the regular budget of the United Nations and from the Fund of UNEP. In paragraph 18.4, on the basis of information provided on the current vacancy rate at UNEP, it was recommended that the turnover deduction be retained at 8 per cent rather than the standard 5 per cent for established posts in the Professional category and above.

41. In paragraphs 18.7 and 18.8 of its report, the Committee indicated that it could not agree with the reclassification of the post of Chief, New York Liaison Office, from D-1 to D-2. In paragraphs 18.9 to 18.13, the Committee gave detailed background information relating to the proposed transfer of a P-5 post in the Desertification Branch to the regular budget, which it had also been unable to support.

42. In paragraphs 18.16 to 18.23, the Committee discussed the requirements relating to sessions of the Governing Council, temporary assistance for meetings, overtime, conference costs, travel and hospitality. On the basis of the conclusions described in those paragraphs, ACABQ recommended a reduction of \$102,100. Lastly, external printing and the administration and common services programme were also examined and minor reductions were recommended, as indicated in paragraphs 18.26 to 18.29.

43. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) drew attention to table 18.12 which showed 7 posts financed under the regular budget and 51 financed from extrabudgetary resources. Some careful explanations were needed for it would appear that administrative expenses were disproportionately large in relation to programme activities. His delegation had got the impression that the activities described in paragraphs 18.32 and 18.33 were liaison functions similar to those which in other sections came under the heading support services - in other words, they were not programmes as such.

44. The distinction was not purely theoretical. The fact that UNEP was able to finance those posts had enabled it to grant the representatives to the regional commissions a D-2 post. That growth had been facilitated by the fact that posts funded from extrabudgetary resources were not scrutinized as carefully as those funded from the regular budget.

45. It was claimed that the reclassification was necessary in order to put the post in the New York Office on the same level as those in the regional offices; however, the Advisory Committee had found insufficient grounds to support the request. Perhaps instead of reclassifying the New York post it would be better to downgrade the regional offices.

46. He asked what had been the growth over the years in the staff of the liaison offices financed from extrabudgetary resources. The size of the UNEP secretariat seemed to have grown far beyond what had been envisaged in 1972. His criticisms were prompted by a desire to see the bulk of the funds go to substantive programmes that would help countries develop an environmental policy.

47. In response to a question from Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) Mr. MSELLE (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, in the case of those sections where the Committee had taken a decision on the figures in the first reading, if no changes were proposed during the second reading and if there were no other decisions from any other Committee or revised estimates from the Secretary-General with respect to those sections, the figures would stand. At the same time, there were a number of sections where the decision taken by the Committee in first reading would call for a second look being taken. For example, the decision to restore the P-5 temporary post referred to in paragraph 2A.24 under section 1 would require the Advisory Committee to submit information regarding the financial implications of that decision.

48. The best procedure would be for the Committee to decide what to do with respect to the proposals to reclassify the post of Chief, New York Liaison Office, from D-1 to D-2 and to transfer one P-5 post from the Environment Fund to the regular budget. On the basis of those decisions the financial implications would be worked out.

49. Mr. SCHMIDT (Assistant Executive Director, UNEP), noting that the representative of Belgium had referred specifically to the extrabudgetary expenditure for the regional and liaison offices, said that the UNEP regional offices had substantive duties. The regional offices engaged in information activities which UNEP considered substantive operations since a major part of UNEP's mandate was to raise the awareness of Governments, people, industry and non-governmental organizations regarding environmental concerns and to propose actions which they could carry out on their own. In the developing regions, the regional offices worked with Governments in the area of institution-building, preparing environmental legislation, responding to requests for consultants and helping to work out regional programmes of common interest.

50. Concerning the reclassification, he said that the New York Liaison Office was also a regional office for North America. The Director had a substantial work-load which involved working with groups, non-governmental organizations and universities to explain, through speeches and common activities what UNEP's objectives were and what objectives the world community had decided should be of major concern.

51. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) suggested that the Committee should ask the Advisory Committee to determine whether it would be timely to finance certain expenses from voluntary contributions. Perhaps the Joint Inspection Unit could undertake a study on the general functioning of UNEP and the role of the various offices. He was making those suggestions because of his delegation's great interest in UNEP and its wish - which was shared by many others - to see the bulk of the funds going to operational activities.

52. Mr. DITZ (Austria), referring to the proposed reclassification, said he had been under the impression that there was a master standard in the Secretariat which was supposedly an objective system for measuring the functions of a post. Was that master standard not applied any more?

53. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) confirmed that the master standard for reclassification was generally applied within the Secretariat. In the case under consideration the reclassification had not been undertaken along the lines described by the representative of Austria.
54. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) proposed that the Committee should defer its decision on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee for that section until its next meeting.
55. It was so decided.

Section 19. United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)

56. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had recommended a reduction of \$518,400 for that section. On the basis of its examination, it believed that a 10 per cent vacancy factor should be applied to that section; that would result in a reduction of \$267,200 in the estimates. A further reduction related to the joint meetings of the bureaux of the Commission on Human Settlements and of the Governing Council of UNEP which the Governing Council had decided to terminate. If the General Assembly concurred with that decision, the amount included in the budget for those meetings would no longer be required.

57. For the reasons set forth in paragraph 19.18 of its report (A/40/7), the Advisory Committee did not support the request for an additional post under that section. Further reductions in respect of ad hoc expert groups, external printing and communications had been recommended in paragraphs 19.19, 19.20 and 19.22.

58. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination contained in paragraphs 669 and 670 of its report (A/40/38 and Add.1).

59. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination contained in paragraph 669 and 670 of its report.

60. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) requested a recorded vote on paragraph 670.

61. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the recommendation of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination contained in paragraph 670 of its report.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, 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, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,

Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

62. The recommendation of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination contained in paragraph 670 of its report was adopted by 104 votes to 1.

63. The recommendation of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination contained in paragraph 669 of its report was adopted.

64. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) requested a recorded vote on section 19 as a whole.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

65. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$9,622,800 under section 19 for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 96 votes to 1 with 8 abstentions.

66. Mr. MALAGA (Peru) said that, had he been present at the time of the voting, he would have voted in favour of the recommendation.

67. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the recommendation because of the excessive rate of real growth in the section and because it provided funding for the travel of representatives of national liberation movements.

68. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the recommendation even though it was not entirely happy with it. The rate of real growth for the section was not excessive but the minimum acceptable given the tasks which had to be undertaken.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.