

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION
Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
27th meeting
held on
Monday, 6 November 1989
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela)

CONTENTS

Consideration of and action on draft resolutions on disarmament items
(continued)

Organization of work

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be submitted 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 DC2-750,
United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/44/PV.27
14 November 1989
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 69 AND 151 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF **AND** ACTION ON **DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS**

Mrs. CARVALHO (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): It is my honour to introduce draft resolution **A/C.1/44/L.2**, entitled "**Comprehensive programme of disarmament**", which is sponsored by the delegation of **Mexico**.

The preamble to the resolution takes us back 20 years, when the General **Assembly**, as part of the First Disarmament Decade, requested the then Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to work out a comprehensive programme, dealing with all aspects of the problem of the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which would provide the Conference with a guideline to chart the course of its further work and its negotiations.

When the General **Assembly** declared the Second Disarmament Decade, it also called for the elahoration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament with the utmost urgency. The Conference on Disarmament has been dealing with this item for **almost** a decade through an ad hoc committee, of which Ambassador Alfonso Garcia **Robles** has been Chairman since 1981. Everyone is aware of the conviction and the commitment with which Ambassador Rohles has conducted the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the **Comprehensive** Programme of Disarmament, with the firm intention of translating into practical terms the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General **Assembly** devoted to disarmament. That document states that general and complete disarmament under effective international control should continue to be the final objective of the efforts being made in the **disarmament** field.

(Mrs. Carvalho, Mexico)

The **countless efforts** which **have been made since** then are **reflected** in the report of **the Ad Hoc Committee** of the Conference on **Disarmament at its last session**. Regrettably, it **was not possible** to **complete** preparation of the programme for **submission** to the **General Assembly** at the **present session**. Nevertheless, **some progress has been made this year towards harmonizing positions**. Among the **many achievements** are **the adoption of three texts**: the **section on objectives**; **section V E** on **bilateral and multilateral negotiations**) **and the section on disarmament** and **international peace and security**. Also, **four texts were submitted after** negotiation⁸ which led to **new areas of understanding**. Notwithstanding **the desire** of the great majority to complete the programme, it **was decided** to have a breathing space to enable **some delegations to consider in depth** the important task **entrusted to us**.

The Mexican delegation **is** convinced that **declaring** the Third Disarmament **Decade** will give impetus to the **disarmament process** and will reaffirm the continuing validity of the final **objective** of the comprehensive programme of disarmament, that **is, general and complete disarmament** under effective **international** control. **Concluding** the programme would in **turn** be an important contribution to **the success** of this initiative. Ever though **some delegations** continue to show little **enthusiasm for carrying out this task**, many **others, both before and after the work** of the Conference on **Disarmament was completed, have stressed** the need for **us to continue** our work **and keep interest** in this noble purpose alive.

We **are also convinced** that the improvement in the international climate will **have a positive effect** on the resumption in 1991 of **our work** in the **Ad Hoc** Committee on the Comprehensive **Programme** of Disarmament,

Dame Ann HERCUS (**New Zealand**) : On behalf of Australia, Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands and New Zealand, I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution contained in document **A/C.1/44/L. 42**, concerning the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty.

Fourteen Years **ago**, the General **Assembly** adopted a resolution which endorsed the idea of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free **zone** in the South **Pacific**. It invited the countries concerned to carry forward consultations about ways and **m** of achieving the objective and the establishment of such a zone. Many years **have passed**, **but now** we South Pacific countries are finally **able** to bring the completed South **Pacific** Nuclear Free Zone Treaty to the Assembly.

The South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty was adopted on 6 August 1985 by the Heads of Government of the independent and self-governing members of the South Pacific Forum meeting at Rarotonga in the Cook Islands. It came into force just over a year later, on 11 December 1986, with the deposit of the eighth instrument of ratification. Just over a month ago, the eleventh **member** of the South Pacific Forum **became** a party to the Treaty of Rarotonga, as it has **come** to **be known**.

The Treaty prohibits the stationing, **acquisition**, stockpiling, manufacture or testing of nuclear explosive devices by any of the parties to the Treaty. It also prohibits the dumping of radioactive waste at sea by Treaty parties. An **effective** control and verification system was established, providing a means to oversee the observance of the provisions of the Treaty.

In **addi** tion, three Protocols to the Treaty were adopted following consultations with the five nuclear-weapon States. One of these Protocols provides for the observance of the **prohibi** tions on stationing, testing and manufacture by the three nuclear-weapon States **with** international responsibility for territories within the **Zone**. Another contains a guarantee against the use or threat of use of

(Dame Ann Hercus, New Zealand)

nuclear explosive devices against Treaty parties. The third Protocol provides **for complete** prohibition on testing of a nuclear explosive device by all five nuclear-weapon States anywhere within the **Zone**.

South Pacific countries have been pleased at the prompt ratification by the Union of Soviet Socialist **Republics** and the People's Republic of China of the two Protocols for which which they were eligible to become parties. It is a matter of regret to us that none of the other nuclear-weapon States has yet agreed **to** support the Treaty of **Rarotonga** through adherence to the Protocols. It is **our** hope that these States will, over **time**, revise their attitudes to the Protocols and agree to give their support. We have however taken note of the fact that two of these nuclear-weapon States have stated that none of their practices or activities within the Treaty area are inconsistent with the Treaty or its **Protocols**.

The South Pacific countries were guided, in their deliberations leading to **the** adoption of the Treaty, by the principles **recognized by the General Assembly** as governing the **establishment** of nuclear-free zones. We were also inspired **by the** Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which recognises the right **of** any group of States **to** conclude a regional treaty which would assure the total **absence** of nuclear weapons in their respective territories. In **addition**, the Final **Document** of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament acknowledges that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in certain circumstances constitutes an important **disarmament** measure.

The Treaty of Rarotonga establishes only the second nuclear-free zone in a populated part of the world. Its only precedent is the Treaty for the Prohibition **of** Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, known as the Treaty of Tlatelolco. But another precedent, of direct regional importance, is the Antarctic Treaty, which demilitarises the area south of **60°** South Latitude. In fact, the areas covered

(Dame Ann Hercus, New Zealand)

by these three Treaties share intersecting boundaries, with the result **that, like a** patchwork, they cover a significant area of **the** southern hemisphere.

Finally, for the first **time** in 14 years, countries of the South Pacific are bringing back to the General **Assembly** the question of the nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. That proposal has, in the intervening period, matured and come to fruition. The Treaty of Rarotonga is now a fact. The establishment of a nuclear-free zone in our part of the world has been accomplished. **We** invite other States **Members** of the United Nations to recognise our achievement, and to support our draft resolution.

Mr. MARTIN (Canada): At the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, a resolution was adopted endorsing the idea of establishing a **nuclear-weapon-free** zone in the South Pacific, and inviting the countries of that region **to** undertake consultations on ways and means of achieving this objective. Canada was pleased to support that resolution.

We commend the States of the South Pacific region for the **dedication** and the realism with which they pursued the **goal** of a nuclear-weapon-free **zone**. Their efforts resulted in the signing, in 1985, of the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty, which is **now** in effect and, in our view, represents an important **contribution** to the cause of nuclear non-proliferation.

Canada regards the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as the most important component of the non-proliferation **régime**, and for that reason we urge adherence to it by all States. **Regional** nuclear-weapon-free zones, such as the Treaty of **Rarotonga**, are important measures that further fortify the **international** non-proliferation régime. However, **they** should **not**, of course, **be** viewed as a substitute for full adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Martin, Canada)

In **the case** of **regions that are characterized** by a **heavy build-up of weapons** and **armed forces**, the negotiation of **disarmament and** confidence- and **security-building measures** should be undertaken. Nuclear-weapon-free zones do not **take into account** conventional arms, which are **capable of** tremendous destruction, nor do they provide a framework *for* disbanding nuclear arsenals.

(Mr. Martin, Canada)

For those reasons the declaration of nuclear-weapon-free zones is not a practical and constructive solution for the security concerns of **all** regions.

Canada supports nuclear-weapon-free zones provided they do meet certain criteria. Such **zones** must attract the support of all the countries in the region concerned in **order** to be effective. They must also contribute to **enhancing** the **security of** the region **itself**, as well as that of the broader international community. The Treaty of Rarotonga, in our view, **satisfies** those conditions and on that basis we regard it as a positive and significant achievement, which we applaud.

Canada supports draft resolution **A/C.1/44/L. 42**, which we regard as an **opportunity** for this important forum to acknowledge the laudable achievement of the countries of the South **Pacific** in reaching agreement on and bringing into effect the Treaty of Rarotonga.

Mr. TANASIE (Romania) (interpretation from French) : I have the honour to introduce draft resolution **A/C.1/44/L. 36**, entitled "Reduction of military **budgets**", dated 30 October 1989. The delegations **of** the following countries are sponsors of the draft resolution: Angola, the **Byelorussian** Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, the **German** Democratic Republic, Indonesia, **Nigeria**, Peru, the Philippines, the Union of Soviet Socialist **Republics** and my **own** country, **Romania**.

In its **preambular** part the draft resolution repeats ideas that were aired at considerable length in the general debate in the General Assembly. They are the **result of** an **improvement** in the present international situation. **The** desire was expressed to reverse the arms race and military expenditures, which **constitute** a heavy burden for the economies of all nations and threaten in turn national peace and security. The draft **resolution expresses** the **conviction** that the reduction of military expenditures as a result **of** the progress in disarmament negotiations will

(Mr. Tanaaie, Romania)

have favourable **consequences** on the world economic and financial **situation**. At the **same time** the draft resolution reaffirms that the **resources** released through the reduction of military expenditure⁸ could be reallocated **to** the economic and **social** development **of** all **States**, **particularly for** the benefit **of** the developing **countries**. Finally, **the** draft resolution expresses the firm conviction that the reduction of military expenditures will have a positive impact on the process **of** strengthening confidence and improving in **international security** and **co-operation** among **States**.

In its operative part the draft **resolution** first affirms two things.

Paragraph 1 refers **to** the praiseworthy efforts made by countries in a number of sessions devoted to the reduction of military budgets. Paragraph 1, which gives an assessment **of** the effort⁸ and activities that have **been** pursued, **welcomes the** work of the Disarmament Commission on the identification and elaboration **of** a set of principles **that** should govern further action of **States** in the field of the freezing and reduction **of** military **budgets**.

In paragraph 2 note is taken **of** the work of the Conference on Disarmament and attention is **drawn to** that work as providing useful guideline⁸ for further action **in the** field of the freezing and reduction **of** military budgets. The paragraph **takes** into **account** the contribution and the position of all countries in the work being done by the Conference on **Disarmament**; consequently all States retain their sovereignty in determining the course **of** action to be taken in respect **of the** principles offered by the United Nations. The Conference on **Disarmament** also should find in those principles, which are **made available**, support for **its** **activities** in the interests of **promoting** disarmament **negotiations** being conducted in that important forum.

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

In the penultimate paragraph the Secretary-General is requested to submit to the **forty-sixth** session of the General Assembly a progress report on the implementation of the draft resolution; and in the final paragraph it is decided to include in the provisional agenda of that session an item entitled "Reduction of military budgets".

My delegation, along with the other sponsors of the draft resolution, shares the conviction that the **Disarmament** Commission, by making **maximum use of its** capacity and competence, has done very important work in the definition and preparation of principles **to** govern future action by States in the field of freezing and reducing military budgets. This bears witness to the enhanced role the Commission might play in the formulation of recommendations on **complex** disarmament problems, all in an effort to reflect the views along those lines expressed by many countries during the present session. Those principles are particularly topical today in view of the favourable **outlook** for disarmament negotiations. They are at the same **time an important** contribution **by the** United Nations to the disarmament cause and they could support action by States along those lines.

May I express the conviction that this draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. de La Raume (France) (interpretation from French): I wish on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community to deal with the **question** of **chemical** and bacteriological (**biological**) weapons inscribed in the **General** Assembly agenda under item 62.

The Twelve consider that, **more** than ever, the **total** elimination of chemical weapons is one **of** the key tasks **of** the international community, and **to** that end they are fully determined to Achieve, as speedily as **possible**, the conclusion of a

(Mr. de La Baume, France)

convention, which would be global, universal and verifiable, dealing with the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and their destruction. Only such a convention would **make** it possible **to free** mankind once and for all from the scourge of chemical weapons.

The Twelve wish to express their satisfaction at the results of the Conference on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, called by one of the **members** of the European Community and held in Paris from 7 **to** 11 January this year. The final document adopted by consensus by the 149 participating States affirms the resolute commitment of the whole international community **to** the total and speedy elimination of chemical weapons.

(Mr. de La Baume, France)

In the view of the Twelve, **the appeal in the statement for the redoubling of efforts in the Geneva negotiations, has to a very large extent been complied with.** This gave an additional political impetus, whose results we can already gauge. The number of observers was considerably increased, which is an excellent sign from the standpoint of the need for universality with regard to the future convention- It can and must be further increased, in conformity with the Paris Declaration. This new impetus also helped the negotiations to make progress. There were noticeable improvements in the draft convention, the remaining problems were better identified and common efforts made it possible to outline solutions to overcome them. The Twelve wish to stress in this connection the fundamental importance they attached to the creation of an effective verification system. We believe that the experimental inspections carried out this year in certain chemical installations produced useful results with regard to the necessary solutions.

In our view, this progress cannot conceal the diverse and complex nature of the questions outstanding, but we are convinced that by following up the hard work done this year it should be possible to make significant progress on the key questions that deserve special attention. The Twelve are determined to contribute actively to this work so that the convention may be rapidly concluded.

The Twelve feel that the increasing risk of proliferation is a matter for concern. They have adopted measures to control the export of some chemical materials which could be used for chemical weapons. However, they believe that these measures, which are meant to make proliferation difficult, must be considered only temporary in nature. The most effective means of eliminating all risk of proliferation lies, in their view, in the implementation of the future prohibitive convention.

The Twelve reiterate the importance they attach to the procedure concerning the Secretary-General's inquiry in case of alleged use of chemical weapons.

(Mr. de La Baume, France)

In this connection, they welcome, the new proposals of the Group of Qualified Experts concerning technical guidelines and procedure. They consider that States should facilitate their implementation, as recognized in the report, by making available to the Secretary-General qualified consultants and experts, and analytical laboratories.

The Twelve welcomed the convening of the Canberra Conference, which took place from 18 to 22 September 1989, with the participation of representatives of Governments and industry, and especially the declaration adopted by the industrialists during that Conference. They consider that the support thus given by the representatives of the world chemical industry to the Geneva negotiations is one of the most useful contributions to the current negotiations and an excellent augury for the implementation of the future convention on the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons.

They noted with satisfaction the results of the Wyoming meeting at the ministerial level between the United States and the USSR. They welcome the positive contribution this has made to the process of the elimination of chemical weapons.

The Twelve attach great importance to the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction. They hope that an increasing number of States will accede to the Convention and that the existing system can be strengthened.

In this context, they support the measures adopted to creating greater confidence in the fields covered by the Convention and encourage all States to contribute to its effective implementation. Therefore, they cannot but encourage States that have not yet done so to contribute to the implementation of these

(Mr. de La Baume, France)

measures and to consider, among other things, the implementation of the Convention in all its aspects.

Several draft resolutions have been submitted under agenda item 62. The Twelve hope that it will again be possible to reach a consensus on this important question.

Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic) : I should like to introduce today draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.3, entitled "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war", on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, Cuba, Hungary, Mongolia, Romania and, of course, my own delegation.

In its operative part of the draft resolution the General Assembly reaffirms the view that the undertakings by two nuclear-weapon States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is a decisive step towards lessening the danger of nuclear war. It also expresses the hope that those nuclear-weapon States which have not yet done so will make similar declarations regarding non-first-use of nuclear weapons.

Finally, the Geneva Conference on Disarmament is requested to commence negotiations on the item in its agenda concerning prevention of nuclear war and to consider, inter alia, the elaboration of an international instrument of a legally binding character laying down the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The delegation on whose behalf I am introducing the draft resolution have decided to make this move because they believe that the danger of nuclear war will not vanish so long as nuclear weapons exist. They believe that a binding renunciation of the first-use option would be one guarantee that would make a nuclear exchange impossible. And they believe that the generally shared recognition of the fact, that a nuclear war cannot be won and therefore must never be fought inherently precludes the first use of nuclear weapons, and that

(Mr. Dietze, German Democratic Republic)

commitment by all nuclear-weapon States to the non-first-use principle would be a concrete manifestation of the political resolve to ensure that a nuclear war will never be fought.

In submitting the present draft resolution its sponsors felt reassured by the progressive implementation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - as a step towards reducing the risk of nuclear war. A favourable element in that context is the start of the negotiations on conventional armed forces in Europe, their eventual goal being that neither side should have the capability of launching a surprise attack. Other welcome developments are measures taken by nuclear Powers with regard to the establishment and operation of nuclear-risk-reduction centres, as well as initiatives concerning the establishment of a multilateral nuclear alert centre to reduce the risk of misinterpretation of unintentional nuclear launchings.

(Mr. Dietze, German
Democratic Republic)

All **these are topical developments** and therefore they were duly reflected in the **prambular part** of the draft **resolution** at hand.

We hope that **the present draft resolution**, contained in document **A/C.1/44/L.3**, **will be supported by Member States** for the **sake of mankind's survival**, as well as **in the interest of lasting peace and durable international security**.

Mr. OGRYZKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic!) (interpretation from Russian): On behalf of the **delegations of Cameroon, Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian SSR**, I have the honour to **draw the attention of members of the First Committee to the draft resolution** contained in document **A/C.1/44/L.22** on **"Implementation of General Assembly resolutions in the field of disarmament"**.

The **initiative** represented by the draft **resolution stems from the conviction** mentioned in the **third preambular paragraph**,

"that the implementation of the recommendations of the General Assembly in the field of disarmament can play a significant role in the attainment of the purpose of the Charter of the United Nations".

It **is** an objective fact that an **increase** in the level of agreement among **States on resolutions leads** to a greater degree of implementation. Being in favour **of the implementation of the recommendations of the General Assembly of the United Nations**, we **are** in duty **bound to foster** the adoption of **recommendations** that have **the greatest possibility of being carried out**. For **this reason and also taking into account the improvements** in the general political climate, in **operative paragraph 2 Member States are invited**

"to promote, in so far as possible, the elaboration and adoption of the resolutions of the General Assembly in the field of disarmament by consensus",

(Mr. Ogryzko, Ukrainian SSR)

since this maker easier the process of their implementation,

The draft resolution would invite

"all Member States that have not yet done so to make available to the Secretary-General their views and suggestions on ways and means to enhance the implementation of General Assembly resolutions in the field of disarmament".

Since answers to such questionnaires in the past have come in rather slowly and since there is a need to reduce the number of matters examined each year, it is proposed in paragraph 6 that the General Assembly decide to revert to this question not in one year, as has recently been the case, but in two years, at its forty-sixth session.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.22 are grateful to all delegations whose constructive proposals made it possible to work out a text more acceptable to those that were unable to support previous draft resolutions on this matter. Taking into account the positive attitude of all delegations to this draft resolution, the sponsors have removed from the preamble any mention of previous resolutions,

In conclusion, allow me to express the conviction that the members of the First Committee, demonstrating their decision to work on mutually acceptable, controllable and effective measures of disarmament, through inter alia the implementation of United Nations resolutions in this field, will support the draft resolution on this matter which we have submitted.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should now like to refer to the manner in which the draft resolutions to be considered by the First Committee have been organized into clusters.

(The Chairman)

Last week the Committee began the second stage of its work as defined by its programme of work and time-table, namely, consideration of and action on draft resolutions on disarmament agenda items 49 to 69 and 151. As members know, the meetings to be held until 8 November will be devoted to the introduction of the draft resolutions which the Committee has before it and any observations that delegations wish to make on those.

The Committee has already been informed of my intention to distribute to its members, as has been traditionally done, an unofficial document containing a list of all the draft resolutions on disarmament items organized in clusters. Following the consultations that I have held with the officers of the Committee, I am now able to present to the Committee a document reflecting the programme as proposed by the Chairman, containing also the draft resolutions organised into 16 different clusters. This document will be distributed during this meeting.

As members of the Committee are aware, in recent years a certain technique has been used for the organisation of clusters of items. The officers of the Committee have taken this into account in organizing the draft resolutions on the basis of the most logical and practical criteria and, in so far as possible, the contents of each item have also been taken into account. I would repeat that the officers of the Committee have been guided by a desire to facilitate and streamline the work of the Committee so that it can make the most efficient and effective use of the time and conference-service resources available to it during this stage of its work.

As regards the time-table for the adoption of decisions on the draft resolutions, in keeping with past practice, once a decision has been taken on a given cluster of items we shall proceed to the next cluster. However, in following

(The Chairman)

this procedure we shall maintain the **greatest** degree of flexibility **possible**. Whenever it **can** be determined in advance with **some degree of precision**, I shall announce to **the members** of the Committee the **exact** day on which a given cluster of **items** will be taken up,

The procedure to be followed in the adoption of **decisions** on each **cluster** of **items** will be as follows. **First, representatives** will be given an opportunity to make whatever **statements** they wish on the draft **resolutions** within a given **cluster** of **items**, with the exception of explanations of vote. Next, delegations **wishing to do so** may explain their **positions** or their **votes** on one **or more of** the draft **resolutions** belonging to a given cluster of **items**, before a decision **is** taken. After the Committee **has** taken action on the draft **resolutions** belonging to a given **cluster**, delegations wishing to do **so** may explain their **positions** or votes.

(The Chairman)

So that the work in the Committee may proceed **systematically** and efficiently I urge delegations in so far as **possible to confine** themselves to a single **statement** on the draft resolutions belonging to a given **cluster** of draft **resolutions**. This applies to both explanations of position and **explanations** of vote.

May I take it that the Committee agrees with this programme of work and with the procedures which I have **just** outlined and which, incidentally, are the **same as have been** used by the Committee in the past?

If I hear no objections I shall take it that the Committee approves **the** suggested **programme**.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) : As representatives will recall, last week the Chair briefly brought to the attention of delegations the new budgetary procedures involved in the functioning of the contingency fund. **As this** fund is a crucial new mechanism for the preparation of the draft **budget** and will affect draft resolutions **with** financial implications I have asked Mr. **Régis Duval**, Chief of the Political, **Legal** and Common Services Service of **the United Nations** Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance, to attend this meeting of the Committee and to give delegations information about this important matter.

Before I call on Mr. **Duval** I call on the Secretary of the Committee, **Mr. Kheradi**, to **make** a few **comments** in this connection.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) : As you have noted, the question relating to the operation of the contingency fund was referred to by the Chairman at the Committee's 21st meeting. It will also be recalled that on two occasions to date this matter has been addressed by the Committee's Bureau, at

(Mr. Kheradi)

meetings which included the participation of representatives from the Budget Division. Accordingly, at this stage I shall attempt to provide very brief background information on the issue before Mr. Régis Duval provides more elaborate details as necessary and answers any queries that might be raised.

The General Assembly in its resolution 41/213 approved the new budget process which is to be followed, beginning with the 1990-1991 biennium. This new process includes the creation for each biennium of a contingency fund, set at \$15 million for 1990-1991, to finance additional expenditures not included in the proposed programme budget. Therefore, additional resources arising out of the consideration of statements of programme budget implications will, from now on, be considered within the context of the contingency fund.

Under the new budget process outlined in the annexes to General Assembly resolutions 41/213 and 42/211, expenditures additional to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991, which appears initially in document A/44/6/Rev.1, are to be accommodated within the contingency fund of \$15 million as I said.

In the case of draft resolutions which provide that the proposed activities should be carried out "from within existing resources" the statement of programme budget implications would need to indicate clearly the mode of absorption, namely, the modifications required to the relevant programme budget. If the total of the additional programmatic expenditures proposed by the Main Committees and put forward in statements of programme budget implications of draft resolutions were to exceed the resources available within the contingency fund some of the proposed new activities would be implemented only through postponement, termination or modification of existing activities; otherwise they will have to be deferred until a later biennium. In this context each statement of programme budget implications must provide alternatives for accommodating the proposals involving additional costs through redeployment of resources or modification of other activities.

(Mr. Kheradi)

I thank the Committee for the opportunity to provide this very brief backdrop to this issue and Mr. Duval will be available, as stated, for further explanations.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on Mr. Duval, Chief of the Political, **Legal** and Common Services Service.

Mr. DUVAL (Chief, Political, **Legal** and Common Services Service): I welcome the opportunity to provide the Committee with additional information on the implementation of the new budget process as it affects the procedure applied for many years with regard to programme budget implications.

I have little to add at this point to the very clear explanations provided by the Secretary of the Committee. I should like at this stage to make only at this stage to make a few points. As has been said, the procedure would be initiated if the resources available in the **contingency fund** were insufficient to meet the requirements of the draft resolution under consideration. First, I should say that the provision of 315 million, which represents the contingency **fund** for **1990-1991**, represents approximately 0.75 per cent of the budget for that biennium. That is a small amount both in absolute and **in** relative terms. Secondly, it is perhaps worth noting that the provision of **\$15** million should accommodate additional expenditures for the biennium. Thus, decisions which will be taken by the General **Assembly** both at the forty-fourth and at the forty-fifth sessions would, to the extent that they have programme budget implications, be eligible for financing against that provision. The proportion of the **\$15** million to be assigned to the first year of the biennium has not been specified in any **resolution**. The annex to General **Assembly** resolution 42/211 merely that:

"While prudent use of the fund requires that it should not be exhausted before the end of the period of use, no pre-determined proportion for a given year should be set, pending review of the question, in **the** light of experience

(Mr. Duval)

with the actual operation of the fund." (resolution 42/211, annex, sect. B, para. 2))

Such a **decision** will presumably be taken in a few weeks before the end of the forty-fourth session.

Another point on which some additional explanation should perhaps be given is the modus operandi of selecting the activities newly **mandated** by the General **Assembly** to be financed from the **contingency** fund.

(Mr. Duval)

Here, **there is** one point that I should like **to make** very emphatically: this is not going to be on a first-come-first-served basis. Resolutions adopted at the beginning of the session will not have first call on the resources of the contingency fund; they will not be given priority over resolutions adopted towards the end of the session.

Let me explain the procedure that will be followed. Once all draft resolutions with programme-budget implications have been adopted - at the end of **November** or early in **December** - a wrap-up paper, a consolidated statement of all those **draft** resolutions, will be prepared, and at that point it will be possible to determine whether there are sufficient resources in the contingency fund. Clearly, if there are sufficient resources no problem will arise, and additional appropriations will be approved by the General Assembly without any difficulty. On the other **hand**, if it is determined that the resources in the contingency fund are insufficient the Fifth Committee, on the basis of the Secretary-General's proposals, will determine which activities can be financed. With regard to those activities that cannot be financed from the contingency fund, the procedure that was outlined by the Secretary of the Committee a few minutes ago - redeployment from low-priority activities already approved, or **postponement** of the new activity to a future biennium - will be activated, and a decision will be made by the Fifth Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): **Does** any delegation wish to **request** further information or clarification?

Mr. HYLTIENIUS (Sweden): The explanation that has **just been given by Mr. Duval**, of the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance, was very **interesting**. My delegation would like to **know in what way the Fifth Committee - if** the matter goes to that Committee - will **make its decision**. Will a group be set up within the **Secretariat**? If so, will the Department for Disarmament Affairs be

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

represented on it when it comes to matters pertaining to the work of the First Committee?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on Mr. Duval to answer that question.

Mr. DUVAL: In the event that the resources in the contingency fund should prove to be inadequate, the proposals submitted to the Fifth Committee for priority designation would be subject to review and scrutiny by the Programme Planning and Budgeting Board, which is the senior Secretariat group that usually advises the Secretary-General on budget policy and budget decisions. In theory, this Board is chaired by the Secretary-General, but because of his heavy commitments the Secretary-General frequently delegates the chairmanship to the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation. The seven members of the Board are as follows: the Under-Secretary-General for the Department of Administration and Management; the Under-Secretary-General for the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs; the Under-Secretary-General for the Department of Conference Services; the Under-Secretary-General for the Department for Special Political Questions, Regional Co-operation, Decolonisation and Trusteeship; the Assistant Secretary-General in the Secretary-General's Office; the Assistant Secretary-General, Controller; and the Assistant Secretary-General for the Office of Human Resources Management.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank Mr. Duval for the information that he has provided and for accepting the invitation to this meeting.

I understand that the document containing the Committee's work programme - arranged according to clusters of items - has been distributed. I wanted to ensure that delegations would receive it as soon as possible to enable them to carry out

(The Chairman)

consultations or to receive instructions from their Governments, as the case might be. It is hoped that this will help the Committee to deal expeditiously with this important stage of its work. Indeed, we hope that it will be possible to complete this stage on schedule.

I have been asked to announce that this afternoon at 4.30 there will be a meeting of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 25 and of countries interested in becoming sponsors.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.