

*United Nations*  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
**THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION**  
*Official Records\**



COPY:  
DO NOT REMOVE  
FROM ROOM  
L-201 (WVRR)

FIFTH COMMITTEE  
83rd meeting  
held on  
Friday, 18 December 1981  
at 9.30 a.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 83RD MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1982-1983 (continued)

Draft report of the Fifth Committee

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

---

\* 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 A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), 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.

81-58784 3154e (E)

**Distr. GENERAL**

A/C.5/36/SR.83  
30 December 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1982-1983 (continued)  
(A/36/6, 7, 38)

Draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/36/L.46) (Parts I, II, III and Corr.1 and 2, and IV)

1. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) said that Part I of the draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/36/L.46) gave an account of the action taken by the Committee in its first reading of the budget estimates for the biennium 1982-1983. Paragraph 9 indicated the results of the decisions taken by the Committee in its first reading of individual expenditure and income sections of the proposed programme budget for the biennium. The following paragraphs dealt with action taken by the Committee on proposals which differed from the Advisory Committee's recommendations and with votes on particular sections of the proposed programme budget. Those paragraphs did not refer to the sections under which the Fifth Committee had approved, in first reading, the amounts proposed by the Chairman on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations.
2. Part II of the draft report indicated the amounts approved in first reading under each section and reflected the action taken by the Fifth Committee with regard to the revised estimates and financial implications. At the current meeting, the Committee would have to take decisions on the total amounts for each section, which would consist of the amounts already approved in first reading, the amounts already approved in connexion with the revised estimates and the amounts already recommended with regard to financial implications. It would be recalled that the Secretariat had been asked to provide information on the effect of changes in rates of exchange; that information was given in Part II. Paragraph 46 would reflect the results of the second reading of the programme budget. Since the amounts for the respective sections had not yet been inserted, they would be read out at the appropriate time.
3. Part III of the draft report gave an account of the Committee's consideration of special subjects relating to item 100. In paragraph 112, the Committee recommended to the General Assembly the adoption of five draft resolutions. In keeping with usual practice, the various decisions adopted by the Committee on questions relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983 had been incorporated in a single text (draft resolution I). Draft resolutions II to V had also already been adopted by the Committee.
4. Corrigendum 1 to Part III reflected the decisions taken at the 82nd meeting. It should be noted that three sections had been added to draft resolution I.
5. Part IV of the draft report was the only part containing draft resolutions on which the Committee had not yet taken decisions.

6. Mr. HOUSHOLDER (United States of America) asked whether the Committee would be voting on the individual sections of draft resolution I or on the draft resolution as a whole.
7. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Committee had already adopted the component sections of the draft resolution.
8. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to Part III of the draft report, said that paragraph 108 was incomplete and paragraphs 109 to 111 appeared to be missing. Moreover, section XX of draft resolution I (A/C.5/36/L.46 (Part III)/Corr.1) was not an adequate reflection of the decision taken at the 82nd meeting.
9. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, before dealing with the draft report as a whole, the Committee should focus on paragraph 46 (A/C.5/36/L.46 (Part II)).
10. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) said that section XX of draft resolution I did not reflect the decision to authorize the Fifth Committee, in the event of a resumed session of the General Assembly, to meet to continue its consideration of the question in order that it might reach a decision. The ultimate purpose of consideration of the question must be made clear.
11. The CHAIRMAN appealed to the Committee to give priority to paragraph 46.
12. Mr. HOUSHOLDER (United States of America) said that, for the first time in the history of the United Nations, the United States would vote against the appropriations for the programme budget. The United States did not welcome that step, but considered it imperative for the future of the Organization to cast a negative vote.
13. Her delegation's record in the General Assembly confirmed beyond any doubt that the United States had done its best to prevent the occasion for that distasteful action. It had repeatedly warned against extravagance. It had unremittingly urged the Secretariat to practise economy, and it had called for prudence and thrift in the provision of financial and human resources. It had, sometimes very nearly alone, consistently supported the Advisory Committee's strong and responsible appeals for economy. Twice in recent years, her delegation had voted against additional budget appropriations.
14. At the beginning of the current session, the United States had renewed its well-known support for zero net programme growth in the budget. It had emphasized that that objective was but the first step in a continuing and ever-intensifying strategy of prudent financial realism. It had made special reference to the responsibility of Member States in that regard. It had called upon all Member States to practise restraint and to seek actively to hold down the costs of the Organization. It had challenged the conventional practice of diverting savings to new expenditures, rather than returning them to the taxpayers of the world.
15. The United States had not advanced those views solely out of national interest. It was more than willing to support the United Nations and other

(Mrs. Housholder, United States)

intergovernmental organizations in which it participated. However, it would neither condone nor excuse waste, excess or disregard for the mounting financial burdens imposed upon the taxpayers of the world by self-serving public institutions.

16. There must be a change in the attitudes and instincts that had overtaken both the Secretariat and the Fifth Committee in the management of the United Nations and in the financing of its programmes. The international community must learn to live with shrinking resources, to make hard choices and, most importantly of all, to stand by those choices, despite cries of pain which sounded justified but were almost invariably manufactured. Experience and common sense taught the international community that it could not do everything about every problem for everyone. It was time to put that teaching into practice.

17. There were specific causes for the strong feeling of discontent on the part of her delegation and for the negative vote which it would cast. Member States had been informed that the rate of real growth in the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983 was slightly under 1 per cent. They were almost urged to congratulate themselves on a splendid achievement beyond the power of any Member State. The Fifth Committee had voted considerable sums for new positions, programmes and activities in the biennium 1982-1983 and was now asked to persuade itself that the cost of those decisions added only negligibly to the expenses of the Organization. It had been possible to produce the supposedly remarkable achievement by scaling down initial projections of inflation for the next biennium and scaling up the predicted value of the dollar against foreign currencies. What was inexcusable was that the savings had promptly been used for new expenditure. An opportunity to alleviate the cost of participation in the United Nations, without reducing the benefits of membership, had been lost. The United States would continue to do its part, in the hope that the optimistic predictions would be confirmed by reality. If, however, they were not confirmed, the United Nations would have swallowed the agent of another fiscal cancer. At the thirty-seventh session, the Fifth Committee would be presented with a new budgetary tumour and be asked to pay for the therapy needed to treat it.

18. The situation had been aggravated by the highly questionable manner in which the Secretariat had submitted its report on completed, ineffective, marginal and obsolete programmes. There was no reasonable excuse for the submission of the report very late in the session. The subject was hardly a new one, and the Secretary-General had received numerous clear requests from the General Assembly for the report. It should have been available at the beginning of the session. Then it could have been considered in an organized and rational fashion, and true savings could have been realized. The will of the General Assembly had been frustrated by obstructionism.

19. Her delegation yielded to none in its support for the Advisory Committee. The United States had not always agreed with the recommendations of that Committee, but had rarely found it wanting in probity and never in integrity. Her delegation therefore regretted that the Advisory Committee's recommendations had been so frequently repudiated at the current session. The Fifth Committee had fallen below

(Mrs. Housholder, United States)

its normal standard in what was an all-important budget year. In view of the calibre and dedication of the experts chosen to serve the Fifth Committee as members of the Advisory Committee, it was not excessive to describe the treatment accorded to their work as callous disregard. Such behaviour on the part of the Fifth Committee was likely to invite redoubled efforts by others to undermine the Advisory Committee. In the end, the Fifth Committee and Member States would be the victims of such misconduct.

20. Delegations had frequently exhorted the Secretary-General to enforce his policy against efforts to lobby the General Assembly in connexion with specific programmes. Once again, there had been flagrant violations of that injunction. It was the duty of the Secretary-General to ensure that the Secretariat spoke to the General Assembly with one voice. In her delegation's view, confusion and, consequently, unintended expense had been caused by the conduct of the Division of Narcotic Drugs during the consideration by the Third Committee of the draft resolution on the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy (A/C.3/36/L.77), co-sponsored by the United States. The Department of Public Information in order to inflate its resources, had exploited the consensus on information programmes reached by the Special Political Committee. Those were but two examples of a general mode of behaviour which could not be tolerated.

21. Her delegation maintained its objections to certain expenses which had again found their way into the regular budget. The United States did not believe that technical assistance programmes should come under the regular budget. It was not against technical assistance or the provision of such assistance through multilateral organizations. It continued to believe, however, that the provision of such assistance should be exclusively a matter of choice and that assistance was more generously provided and more wisely used when voluntarily given.

22. As a matter of principle, the United States believed that it was wrong to assess sovereign Governments - all or any - for the support of organizations that were committed to the destruction of one of their number. No Member of the United Nations could claim to have trouble-free relations with all other Members. The purpose of the Organization was to provide a medium for the solution of problems, if that was the wish of Members, when they arose. It would clearly be a violation of the Charter for the United Nations to finance the destruction of its own Members, however bitter relations among them. It was for that reason that the United States opposed various appropriations to fund activities which advanced the goals of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

23. Such other national liberation movements as the South West Africa People's Organization were not recognized entities under the Charter. They had no status in the United Nations and therefore no entitlement to benefits from it. Member States might well wish to finance them. If so, that was their own business and properly their own expense, not a legitimate expense of the United Nations.

24. Her delegation was aware that, by force of circumstance, it was about to vote against the appropriations for the programme budget at a time when the United Nations was preparing to welcome a new Secretary-General. He was not the object of

/...

(Mrs. Housholder, United States)

the strong reservations expressed by her delegation. The United States could only wish the new Secretary-General well in the office he was about to assume. If there was a message for him in her statement, it was that he faced a most formidable task in bringing the affairs of the Organization under control. He would have the support of her Government in the efforts which it anticipated he would vigorously undertake. The new Secretary-General would need the support of all delegations. The United States therefore called upon all Governments to give him full support and urged the Fifth Committee to give that support vitality by putting its affairs in order.

25. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the proper and economical management of financial resources was essential to the effectiveness of any international organization. As far as the activities of the United Nations were concerned, the Soviet Union believed that there must be a rational use of appropriations with a view to achieving the objectives laid down in the Charter. On the basis of its examination of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983, his delegation was obliged to state, with regret, that the financial contributions of Member States continued to be spent ineffectively, uneconomically and, very often, for purposes inconsistent with the Charter. Despite the Secretary-General's statements concerning the policy of savings, very little had been done to stabilize the budgetary expenses of the Organization.

26. The budget appropriations for the biennium 1982-1983 totalled over \$1,500 million - some \$160 million more than the revised appropriations for the biennium 1980-1981. Such a rate of growth in the programme budget was unjustified and far exceeded the growth rates of Member States. The appropriations exceeded the amounts that they would be able to make available to the United Nations. Such an inadmissible state of affairs caused his delegation the greatest concern.

27. Despite repeated appeals by the General Assembly, the Secretariat had once again been late in submitting information on activities identified for termination and on the resources that would consequently be released. Delegations had therefore been unable to assess the scope of new programme activities or to determine how the resources released could be used to implement them. The Secretariat had also failed to follow the General Assembly guidelines relating to the identification of high-priority and low-priority activities. Member States had thus been denied the opportunity to take necessary decisions on the redistribution of resources. His delegation was aware that the relevant documents had been prepared and submitted to the General Assembly. The Assembly should not, however, receive such important documents a couple of weeks before the end of its session, but early enough to enable it to study them in depth and reach appropriate conclusions.

28. His delegation had repeatedly stated its disagreement with the Secretariat's policy of systematically increasing the staff, which led to unjustified growth in the budget. The United Nations already had a large staff and substantial resources for temporary assistance, consultants and experts. The proposals to create new posts, to reclassify a number of posts and to convert temporary posts to

(Mr. Palamarchuk, USSR)

established posts were therefore unjustified. Most of the proposed reclassifications did not reflect an increase in the duties and responsibilities of the staff members in question, but were a means of granting promotions. The result was further unjustified expenditure.

29. The additional appropriations required as a result of inflation and currency fluctuations were, in large part, attributable to the deepening crisis in the capitalist countries. The practice of economy, the better management of programmes, the redistribution of resources and intrabudgetary adjustments were appropriate ways of meeting the increased costs. It should be borne in mind that the responsibility for the instability and inflation of the regular budget lay primarily with the capitalist States.

30. His delegation objected to the inclusion in the proposed programme budget of a provision for the United Nations bond issue, the purpose of which had been to finance activities that were contrary to the Charter. His delegation would not contribute to the expenditures concerned.

31. According to Article 17 of the Charter, the budget of the United Nations was administrative. His delegation felt that technical assistance should be excluded from the regular budget and should be covered by the budget of UNDP.

32. Since the budget included unjustified expenditures and contained appropriations for unlawful activities, his delegation would vote against the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

33. His delegation could not support draft resolution VII on an increase in unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 1982-1983. Under the Charter, expenditures for international peace and security came exclusively within the purview of the Security Council and it was a violation of the Charter to accord the Secretariat authority in such matters. Nor could his delegation support draft resolution VIII on the Working Capital Fund for the biennium 1982-1983.

34. Mr. MERIEUX (France) said that his delegation would reluctantly have to abstain in the vote on the budget. The growth rate of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983, although well below the rate for the two previous budgets, was still much too high, even when inflation was taken into account. While some effort to contain expenditure had been made by the Secretariat, the absence of any real redeployment of resources was regrettable, and in that regard he deplored the fact that document A/36/658 had been issued too late to be of any practical use. His delegation also strongly objected to the hiring of consultants for work that could be performed by staff members.

35. His delegation had reservations concerning the conduct of the Fifth Committee, which had too often approved additional appropriations in disregard of the opinion of ACABQ and thus considerably increased the financial burden on Member States, and that of the other Main Committees, which had not taken sufficient account of the financial implications of their decisions.

(Mr. Merieux, France)

36. His delegation's decision to abstain, rather than cast a negative vote, should be construed as a sign of encouragement to the Secretariat.

37. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote against the programme budget appropriations for 1982-1983. He expressed his delegation's profound dissatisfaction at the failure of the General Assembly to redeploy resources in order to avoid appropriations for new activities. Relying on its own estimate, his delegation had concluded that the real addition in the programme budget was between 1 and 2 per cent. The Group of 77 in the Committee, exercising the power of decision inherent in their block vote, had decided that none of the savings suggested by the Secretary-General in his special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations (A/36/658) should be taken now. He regretted that decision, which had influenced the way in which his delegation would vote. The fortuitous cash savings arising from the strength of the United States dollar were quite irrelevant in that context and could easily be reversed by the same operation of chance. The General Assembly had been calling for the redeployment of resources for the past seven years, and his delegation had been giving warnings of its concern on that account since at least 1979. Its warnings had not been heeded, and the time had come for it to show its disapproval in the only way open to it.

38. The next biennial budget should aim for a real reduction in the resources devoted to it. That was not the same thing as a real reduction in the programme of activities. An efficient organization could achieve more with less resources than an inefficient one with more. For too many years, the United Nations had indiscriminately added activities to its programme, regardless of their priority or utility. A period of rational and controlled slimming would greatly improve the Organization's efficiency. A fortiori, his delegation expected any activities added to the 1982-1983 programme budget at the thirty-seventh session to be covered by the redeployment of resources, thus avoiding supplementary appropriations. His delegation's voting on future programme budgets would be determined in the light of the Organization's success in achieving those aims.

39. While the failure to redeploy resources at the current session would have been sufficient in itself to determine his delegation's negative vote, there had been additional cause for dissatisfaction. The recommendations of ACABQ had been overturned more frequently than ever before by decisions which had seemed to his delegation to fly in the face of reason. Moreover, a new trend had emerged: the Committee had begun to appropriate funds for activities which had been proposed neither by ACABQ nor by the Secretary-General. That trend was deeply disturbing.

40. It was the first time that the United Kingdom was voting against the initial estimates for a budget period. His delegation hoped that it might be the last. The remedy lay with those countries which wielded the majority of votes in the General Assembly. He wished to make it clear that his delegation appreciated the very real efforts by the Secretary-General and his staff to exercise severe budgetary restraint.



41. Mrs. de HEDERVARY (Belgium) said that in the course of the past session her delegation had, by its vote, expressed its disapproval of several decisions taken in the Committee which had increased the appropriations. Her delegation could not support draft resolution VI C, which also would increase the burden on Member States. It regretted that the transfer of resources between programmes during the biennium 1982-1983 would be almost non-existent. However, in recognition of the genuine efforts to contain budgetary growth made by ACABQ, by the Secretary-General and, in particular, by the Office of Financial Services, her delegation would abstain in the vote on the budget, rather than cast a negative vote.
42. Mr. BETTINI (Italy) said that his delegation was dissatisfied and had strong reservations concerning the proposed programme budget and the debate at the current session. For example, there was the discriminatory recalculation of the scale of contributions and the decision to increase the Working Capital Fund. Too little attention had been paid to the recommendations of ACABQ. The special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations (A/36/658) had been submitted very late in the session. There was also an unfavourable geographical distribution of personnel as far as Italian nationals were concerned. His Government appreciated the efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff to keep the level of the budget within the limits of low growth and hoped that that policy would be continued. He would abstain in the vote on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983, as a sign of encouragement and goodwill. However, it was his Government's recommendation that the budget should be interpreted as a framework and a limit for Secretariat activities. In other words, when there were new activities to be financed, they should be financed not from new resources but from resources released by redeployment.
43. Mr. HOLBORN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation would vote against the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983, which it felt was not a fair reflection of the financial and economic problems facing the world. There was a nominal increase of approximately 20 per cent in the budget. His Government was especially concerned about the increases in the Working Capital Fund and the scale of assessments.
44. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the States members of the Group of 77, said that they were disappointed, because the Group of 77 had made many efforts at co-operation with other delegations. The statements heard at the present meeting had not convinced the Group of 77. When the Committee had begun its work on agenda item 100, the Group of 77 had made a statement giving its position on the concept of zero real growth, which it regarded as an arbitrarily imposed concept having no legal basis. The debate had become frozen in positions of principle, which the Group of 77 had been unable to overcome in such areas as UNCTAD, UNIDO and information and on such political questions as liberation movements. The Group of 77 had had a right to expect more co-operation, justice and equity. However, some delegations had sheltered behind ACABQ in order to cut the budget. The recommendations submitted by ACABQ were only the recommendations of an Advisory Committee and were not infallible. Some delegations were invariably critical of the developing countries, but the Group of 77 could not allow itself the luxury of delaying United Nations decisions and compromising the development of the majority of Member States.

(Mr. Bouzarbia, Algeria)

45. The alarmist views expressed about inflation were not convincing. It was unrealistic to say that the Organization was unable to limit its budgetary growth. However, development should not be checked by efforts to place the issue in a static context and to impose measures that were not approved by all. Moreover, inflation and monetary instability primarily affected the developing countries. The solution must be sought through global negotiations. The countries of the Group of 77, with a sense of their responsibilities, both national and international, would continue the struggle for the promotion of fair international solutions through negotiation.

46. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) said that his delegation had welcomed the proposal of the Secretary-General to restrict real growth of the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983 to zero, and it fully appreciated the efforts made by the Secretariat and, in particular, by the Office of Financial Services.

47. In spite of the many virtues of zero growth, the gross expenditures for the forthcoming biennium represented, in nominal terms, an increase of almost 15 per cent over the revised appropriations for 1980-1981, owing mainly to inflation. The fact that the final estimate of expenditures for the current biennium remained within the original estimates was due primarily to favourable variations in exchange rates and was not necessarily due to a concern for economy, absorption, an increase in productivity and implementation of other rationalization measures.

48. His delegation was very concerned at the prevailing trend to override the recommendations made by ACABQ and to add resources on top of existing resources without close examination of possibilities for economy, absorption and redeployment.

49. His delegation was concerned also about so-called procedural anomalies, which added a substantial burden to the budget without an established orderly process being followed. His delegation regretted that, partly owing to the late submission of the report on special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations (A/36/658), the Committee had lost the chance of saving a substantial amount of resources by failing to take a definitive decision on the elimination of programme elements which had low priority.

50. His Government's contribution to the United Nations in 1980 had been \$250 million, and that was giving rise to a serious problem domestically. Under the circumstances, the decision to increase the Working Capital Fund was regarded as yet another negative element. On the basis of the above considerations, his delegation would vote against the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

51. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the proposed programme budget. It was a budget of constraints, and those budgetary constraints must be continued. His delegation welcomed the special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations (A/36/658), but action must be taken on it quickly if the savings which it represented were to be realized. Only if the

(Mr. Pedersen, Canada)

Secretariat and Member States worked productively could his delegation continue to give positive consideration to programmes. Delegations must be on their guard against padded budgetary requests. While the increase in the Working Capital Fund had saved the Organization from insolvency, the United Nations was still on shifting sands. His delegation's positive vote was also a signal to the developing countries and showed willingness to support programmes to benefit them. His delegation, in turn, looked to them for co-operation in holding down expenditures.

52. Mr. HENTEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that they continued to support a policy of financial restraint as the starting-point for the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983 but felt that the administration and financing of United Nations activities should be seen in a wider context. The Nordic States did not wish to hamper the flexibility and dynamic character of the work of the United Nations and would therefore vote in favour of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

53. They favoured the economical and effective use of the resources allocated and believed that a greater effort should be made to cover new activities by funds released from activities that were obsolete, marginally useful or ineffective. It was therefore regrettable that the special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations (A/36/658), which was intended as the basis for a review of the proposed programme budget, had been submitted so late in the session. He hoped that future reviews would be submitted at an early stage.

54. Mr. HICKEY (Australia) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the proposed programme budget to show its support for the Secretary-General's efforts to provide a budget approaching zero real growth and to give the incoming Secretary-General a vote of confidence. Nevertheless, it was seriously concerned about certain aspects of the budget and the review process carried out in the course of the Committee's recent deliberations. It should not be forgotten that as a result of favourable exchange rate movements the budget had received a windfall boost in savings, which could not be lost sight of in assessing the degree of real growth within the budget. The appeals by some programme managers for a restoration of the budget cuts recommended by the Advisory Committee, and in some cases for additional resources, not only reflected a degree of disloyalty to the Secretary-General but also indicated a lack of real commitment to budgetary restraint. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee had been overturned on a number of occasions, and it was to be hoped that in future all delegations would pay greater heed to the expert advice provided by ACABQ. His Government was somewhat sceptical about the allowances made for inflation within the budget and felt that more restraint should have been shown in handling the financial implications of the draft resolutions adopted during the current session of the General Assembly.

55. In spite of those reservations, he reiterated his delegation's support for the commendable degree of restraint shown by the Secretary-General in formulating his budget and expressed satisfaction at the tireless efforts of the Budget Division to improve budgetary control within the United Nations. It was hoped that the

/...

(Mr. Hickey, Australia)

precedent set by the Secretary-General's policy of zero real growth would be reinforced by maximum fiscal restraint in future years.

56. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon), after associating himself with the statement made by the representative of Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77, said that in order to avoid wasting resources it was necessary to rationalize the activities of the Secretariat, particularly the managerial activities. The Group of 77 had for a long time been promoting rationalization in the field of programming and budgeting. All Member States should demonstrate the political will necessary to initiate global negotiations, bring about disarmament and reduce tension throughout the world. If that was done, it would be possible to reduce the budget because it would not be necessary to request additional resources in those areas in coming years.

57. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to approve appropriations in second reading under individual sections of the proposed programme budget.

Expenditure sections

Section 1. Over-all policy-making, direction and co-ordination

58. A recorded vote was taken on section 1 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

59. An appropriation of \$34,175,000 under section 1 was approved in second reading by 93 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

60. Mr. FALL OULD MAALOU (Mauritania) said that, if his delegation had been present for the vote on section 1, it would have voted in favour of the appropriation.

Section 2. Political and Security Council affairs; peace-keeping activities

61. An appropriation of \$72,862,000 under section 2 was approved in second reading without a vote.

Section 3. Political affairs, trusteeship and decolonization

62. A recorded vote was taken on section 3 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Israel, Japan.

63. An appropriation of \$18,774,200 under section 3 was approved in second reading by 98 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

64. Mr. TRAORE (Togo) and Mr. BARREIRO (Uruguay) said that, if their delegations had been present for the vote on section 3, they would have voted in favour of the appropriation.

Section 4. Policy-making organs (economic and social activities)

65. An appropriation of \$1,992,400 under section 4 was approved in second reading without a vote.

Section 5A. Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation

66. An appropriation of \$3,228,900 under section 5A was approved in second reading without a vote.

Section 5B. Centre for Science and Technology for Development

67. A recorded vote was taken on section 5B of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

68. An appropriation of \$3,658,100 under section 5B was approved in second reading by 96 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

Section 6. Department of International Economic and Social Affairs

69. A recorded vote was taken on section 6 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq,

Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

70. An appropriation of \$44,112,100 under section 6 was approved in second reading by 91 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

Section 7. Department of Technical Co-operation for Development

71. A recorded vote was taken on section 7 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Israel, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

72. An appropriation of \$16,030,300 under section 7 was approved in second reading by 91 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

Section 8. Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters

73. An appropriation of \$3,323,500 under section 8 was approved in second reading without a vote.

Section 9. Transnational corporations

74. A recorded vote was taken on section 9 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

75. An appropriation of \$9,029,700 under section 9 was approved in second reading by 93 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

Section 10. Economic Commission for Europe

76. An appropriation of \$26,178,800 under section 10 was approved in second reading without a vote.

Section 11. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

77. A recorded vote was taken on section 11 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.



In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

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

78. An appropriation of \$28,166,400 under section 11 was approved in second reading by 94 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

Section 12. Economic Commission for Latin America

79. A recorded vote was taken on section 12 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

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

80. An appropriation of \$60,365,300 under section 12 was approved in second reading by 93 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

Section 13. Economic Commission for Africa

81. A recorded vote was taken on section 13 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

82. An appropriation of \$35,945,700 under section 13 was approved in second reading by 97 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

Section 14. Economic Commission for Western Asia

83. A recorded vote was taken on section 14 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

84. An appropriation of \$16,283,100 under section 14 was approved in second reading by 93 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

Section 15. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

85. A recorded vote was taken on section 15 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

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

86. An appropriation of \$57,168,800 under section 15 was approved in second reading by 84 votes to 10, with 10 abstentions.

Section 16. International Trade Centre

87. An appropriation of \$9,246,200 under section 16 was approved in second reading without a vote.

Section 17. United Nations Industrial Development Organization

88. A recorded vote was taken on section 17 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

89. An appropriation of \$72,942,200 under section 17 was approved in second reading by 92 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

Section 18. United Nations Environment Programme

90. An appropriation of \$10,235,400 under section 18 was approved in second reading without a vote.

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

91. At the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, a recorded vote was taken on section 19 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

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

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Israel.

92. An appropriation of \$8,312,200 under section 19 was approved in second reading by 91 votes to 9, with 3 abstentions.

Section 20. International drug control

93. At the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, a recorded vote was taken on section 20 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey,

Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

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

Abstaining: none.

94. An appropriation of \$6,141,600 under section 20 was approved in second reading by 92 votes to 10.

Section 21. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

95. A recorded vote was taken on section 21 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

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

Abstaining: United States of America.

96. An appropriation of \$30,270,700 under section 21 was approved in second reading by 93 votes to 10 with 1 abstention.

Section 22. Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator

97. A recorded vote was taken on section 22 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

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

Abstaining: Romania.

98. An appropriation of \$5,136,700 under section 22 was approved in second reading by 94 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

Section 23. Human rights

99. An appropriation of \$10,517,300 under section 23 was approved in second reading without a vote.

100. Mr. CULLEN (Argentina) reiterated the reservation expressed by his delegation during the first reading of section 23 with regard to the provision for temporary staff (A/C.5/36/SR.39, para. 28).

101. Mr. PEREZ (Chile) reiterated the reservation expressed by his delegation in the Third Committee, the Fifth Committee and the plenary Assembly with regard to the section under consideration.

102. Mr. BARREIRO (Uruguay) said that, although his delegation had joined in the consensus on section 23, it wished to recall the reservations which it had expressed in the Third Committee.

103. Mr. ORON (Israel) said that, if section 23 had been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained because of certain financial implications on which his delegation had already stated its position.

Section 24. Regular programme of technical co-operation

104. A recorded vote was taken on section 24 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Italy, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Israel, Japan, Mongolia, Poland.

105. An appropriation of \$30,995,400 under section 24 was approved in second reading by 87 votes to 12, with 5 abstentions.

Section 25. International Court of Justice

106. An appropriation of \$8,675,300 under section 25 was approved in second reading without a vote.

Section 26. Legal activities

107. An appropriation of \$13,145,900 under section 26 was approved in second reading without a vote.



Section 27. Public information

108. A recorded vote was taken on section 27 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

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

109. An appropriation of \$63,156,100 under section 27 was approved in second reading by 81 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions.

Section 28. Administration, finance and management

110. A recorded vote was taken on section 28 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

111. An appropriation of \$274,557,900 under section 28 was approved in second reading by 81 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

112. Mr. RALLIS (Greece) said that his delegation had intended to abstain in the vote on section 28, rather than to vote in favour of the appropriation.

Section 29. Conference and library services

113. A recorded vote was taken on section 29 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

114. An appropriation of \$247,970,300 under section 29 was approved in second reading by 86 votes to none with 16 abstentions.

Section 30. United Nations bond issue

115. A recorded vote was taken on section 30 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: None.

116. An appropriation of \$17,220,300 under section 30 was approved in second reading by 88 votes to 13.

Section 31. Staff assessment

117. An appropriation of \$229,525,500 under section 31 was approved in second reading without a vote.

Section 32. Construction, alteration, improvement and major maintenance of premises

118. A recorded vote was taken on section 32 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho,

Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

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

Abstaining: Israel, Italy, Romania, United States of America.

119. An appropriation of \$36,989,500 under section 32 was approved in second reading by 89 votes to 10 with 4 abstentions.

Income sections

Section 1. Income from staff assessment

120. The estimate of \$233,396,800 under income section 1 was approved in second reading without a vote.

Section 2. General income

121. The estimate of \$33,871,600 under income section 2 was approved in second reading without a vote.

Section 3. Revenue-producing activities

122. The estimate of \$17,284,600 under income section 3 was approved in second reading without a vote.

123. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) informed the Committee that the figures given in paragraph 45 of document A/C.5/36/L.46 (Part II) would be corrected and completed, as necessary, before the document was submitted to the plenary Assembly.

124. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolutions contained in part IV of document A/C.5/36/L.46.

Draft resolution VI A

125. At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution VI A.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Belgium, France, Italy, Romania.

126. Draft resolution VI A was adopted by 85 votes to 14 with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution VI B

127. Draft resolution VI B was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution VI C

128. At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution VI C.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda,

Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Romania.

129. Draft resolution VI C was adopted by 89 votes to 13, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution VII

130. At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution VII.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Romania.

131. Draft resolution VII was adopted by 89 votes to 10, with 1 abstention.

132. At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution VIII.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica,

/...

Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Israel, Netherlands, Portugal.

133. Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 81 votes to 18, with 3 abstentions.

134. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) informed the Committee that the necessary corrections would be made to Part IV of document A/C.5/36/L.46 before it was submitted to the plenary Assembly.

135. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted for the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983 but with some reservations. He therefore wished to endorse the comments made by the representatives of Australia and Canada in explaining their votes before the vote. His delegation also endorsed the appeal for efficiency and economy in administering the budget which many delegations had uttered in the course of the Committee's consideration of item 100.

136. Mr. van HELLENBERG HUBAR (Netherlands) said that his delegation had voted for the proposed programme budget only because it appreciated the efforts made by the Secretary-General to present a zero growth budget and on the understanding that the Secretariat would continue to make strenuous efforts to establish priorities and evaluate existing programme activities in the light of the over-all principle of zero growth, which his delegation supported. His delegation hoped that the new Secretary-General would follow the example set by his predecessor in that connexion.

137. Ms. CONWAY (Ireland) said that her delegation had voted for the proposed programme budget so that the United Nations would have adequate financial resources to perform its extremely important functions, but shared the view that such resources should be concentrated where they could do the greatest good. It had also voted for the proposed programme budget because the Secretary-General had made every effort to stay within the limits dictated by budgetary stringency. It had been disappointed at the late submission of the document containing the special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations and hoped that, in future, all budgetary documents would be considered in the budgetary review process and would tend towards the elimination of obsolete or marginal activities in order to focus on truly important programmes.

138. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) informed the Committee that, as a result of the issue of Corrigendum 1 to Part III of document A/C.5/36/L.46, the table of contents given in Part I would have to be amended to include the two items considered at the Committee's 82nd meeting, namely, "Use of experts and consultants in the United Nations" and "The formulation, presentation, review and approval of programme budgets". The appropriate figures would be inserted in paragraphs 1 and 3 on page 4 of Part I. Corrigendum 2 to Part III give the final text of draft resolution IV as adopted by the Committee, which replaced the text given on page 19 of Part III. The French version of paragraph 62 (Part III) would be corrected to include the record of the roll-call vote, and the English and French versions of paragraph (k) of section I of draft resolution A/C.5/36/L.41/Rev.1, which was reproduced in paragraph 109 of Corrigendum 1 to Part III, would be changed to reflect the oral revisions made by the representative of Algeria at the 82nd meeting.

139. The CHAIRMAN said that, if here was no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the draft report contained in document A/C.5/36/L.46 (Parts I, II, III and Corr.1 and 2, and IV).

140. It was so decided.

#### COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

141. After an exchange of courtesies, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Fifth Committee had completed its work for the thirty-sixth session.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.