



General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/40/1032
12 December 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fortieth session
Agenda items 33 and 116

QUESTION OF PALESTINE

PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions
A/40/L.23, A/40/L.24 and A/40/L.25

Report of the Fifth Committee

Rapporteur: Mr. Falk MELTKE (German Democratic Republic)

1. At its 60th meeting, on 12 December 1985, the Fifth Committee, pursuant to rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, considered the statement by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/40/81) on the programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/40/L.23, A/40/L.24 and A/40/L.25 and the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/40/7/Add.18). The observations of the Committee on Conferences were presented orally by its Chairman.
2. Statements and comments made in the course of the Committee's consideration of this item are reflected in the relevant summary record (A/C.5/40/SR.60).

DECISION OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE

3. The Fifth Committee decided, by a recorded vote of 86 to 10, with 10 abstentions, to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolutions A/40/L.23, A/40/L.24 and A/40/L.25, additional appropriations totalling \$1,873,000 would be required under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987, apportioned as follows:

	\$
Section 1	395 000
Section 27	1 000 000
Section 29	478 000

An additional appropriation of \$74,500 would also be required under section 31 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an increase of the same magnitude in the estimates of income under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment). Conference-servicing requirements would arise for 1986 and 1987 which are estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$1,736,900 and \$2,070,300, respectively. The actual additional appropriations that might be required in that respect would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted at a later stage during the current session for 1986 and at the forty-first session for 1987.

4. The voting was as follows:

In favour: Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden.

5. Statements in explanation of vote were made by the representatives of France, Italy and Kenya. The representatives of Algeria, Bolivia, Cameroon, Jamaica, Mauritania and Zaire stated that, had their delegations been present during the vote, they would have voted in favour of the decision.
