

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 797th  
MEETING

Monday, 1 October 1962,  
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Organization of the Committee's work (continued)</i> .....	11

*Chairman:* Mr. Bohdan LEWANDOWSKI  
(Poland).

### Organization of the Committee's work (A/C.2/212 and Add.1, A/C.2/L.643 and Corr.1 and Add.1) (continued)

1. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained why his delegation had proposed the inclusion in the agenda of item 94 (Economic programme for disarmament) and asked that it should be given priority together with item 33 (Economic and social consequences of disarmament). In reply to certain criticisms, and particularly those of the representative of the United Arab Republic, who had wanted to keep those two items within the first group of questions so that the economic situation could be considered as a whole, he stressed that the question of the economic aspects of disarmament would not be dealt with in sufficient detail if it were not discussed separately. The Nigerian representative had stated that the discussion of those items at the beginning of the session would inject political elements into a supposedly economic debate and would intensify the cold-war atmosphere. However, all the discussions on the economic and social consequences of disarmament, both within the group of expert consultants comprising specialists from various countries and within the Economic and Social Council, had taken place in an excellent atmosphere and had helped to reduce international tension. The Nigerian representative's fears were therefore groundless.

2. The United Nations could no longer ignore the close interest being taken in the problems of disarmament almost everywhere. The time had come to tackle the question frankly so that a joint, serious and careful examination of the problem yielded constructive results. The idea that the Second Committee should deal only with specific and immediate problems was erroneous and contrary to the spirit of the Charter, for all States which became Members of the United Nations undertook the responsibility of solving all problems, big or small—often inseparable—on which the fate of mankind depended. Why should members of the Committee be sceptical and assert that general and complete disarmament would not be achieved, when in fact the General Assembly had already decided to do everything in its power to ensure the success of that immense task?

3. Moreover, would it not be regrettable if, once disarmament had been achieved, each country used the energies and resources thus released merely

for the indulgence of its own selfish appetites, when so many countries were still living in the poverty brought upon them by the colonialism from which they had been emancipated only recently? On the other hand, would it not be Utopian to believe that all those resources would be gathered together in a single fund and that it would be enough for each country to ask in order to receive? The question of how to use those resources on an international scale must therefore be tackled immediately. For that purpose, the Committee must ascertain how both natural and human resources were distributed throughout the world, what the existing needs were and what technical and other means were available for satisfying them. An international plan must be drawn up, with due regard, of course, for the various national plans. It would be a long-term project requiring the efforts of numerous experts for many years. The hoped-for golden age would materialize only if its advent was encouraged by specific action.

4. In view of the importance of the problem and the place which it should occupy in the Committee's work, therefore, the best plan was to separate items 33 and 94 from the other questions and to take them up at the beginning of the session. Such a discussion—which would not necessarily take long—would be extremely valuable.

5. Mr. NAMSRAI (Mongolia) felt that the Committee should make a selection of the most important items on its agenda. The economic development of the under-developed countries was, of course, of capital importance, but no one could deny that a careful and thorough examination of an economic programme for disarmament would reveal many possible lines of action of vital interest for the advancement of those countries. Items 33 and 94 should therefore be separated from the rest of the agenda and considered together at the beginning of the session. For that reason, he supported the proposal of the Soviet Union.

6. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) said he was ready to support the order of business proposed in the Chairman's note (A/C.2/L.643 and Corr.1 and Add.1), which would enable the Committee to take up all the items in rational order. It was therefore preferable to include item 94 in the first group of problems. He had listened with the greatest attention to the reasons adduced by the Soviet Union representative for giving special treatment to the disarmament items. He himself, and undoubtedly all members of the Committee, agreed with the USSR representative that disarmament was a fundamental problem. However, the present debate was not concerned with the obvious importance of the question but with the procedure to be adopted in considering it. The grouping together of items 33 and 94 did not seem to raise any difficulty. But was it really necessary to give them priority? He himself did not think so, for the Committee's function was to concentrate on those problems for which it could find

specific solutions. The solution of the disarmament problem depended on a political decision which would necessarily have to be taken by other bodies. So long as such a decision had not been taken, the consideration of the economic consequences of disarmament would be purely theoretical. How could the Committee discuss the consequences of something that was still in the balance? If it held such a debate, the Committee might lose time which it should devote primarily to the more immediate problems of the economic development of the under-developed countries. Moreover, it would be hard for members of the Committee to take up such complex matters as the economic aspects of disarmament without preparation and without official instructions. Those topics should first be studied carefully by national experts and economists.

7. Although he preferred the Chariman's proposal, he could support a compromise solution such as that proposed by the Yugoslav representative at the preceding meeting. Items 33 and 94 could be taken up together, but after the discussion on the first group of items, dealing with the report of the Economic and Social Council and the economic development of the under-developed countries, had been concluded.

8. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) explained that the only purpose of the suggestion he had made had been to allow the Committee to do its work in the best possible conditions. When the USSR representative had submitted a new item similar to an item already included in the agenda and when he had requested that those two items should be taken up together, the Yugoslav delegation had considered it logical to follow that course. When the USSR delegation had raised the question of priority, he had been prompted solely by technical considerations. There was no need to reaffirm the fact that his delegation favoured general and complete disarmament. The members of the Second Committee, who were to study the economic aspects of disarmament, were well aware that disarmament would lead to general prosperity and, obviously, no one could deny the economic and social advantages involved. Hence, it was not a question of substance, but purely one of procedure. The first group of items listed in paragraph 4 of the Chairman's note contained topics which should be given priority because of the decisions taken by the Economic and Social Council and because of certain time-limits which had to be respected.

9. Actually, the USSR proposal was twofold: to group items 33 and 94 together, which was logical, and to give priority to those items. He would like to make a slight change in the suggestion which he had made at the preceding meeting. In view of the importance of the question, the Committee could fix a date on which it would take up those two items. It would probably finish the first group of items by the end of October and would deal with the appropriate draft resolutions during November. The Committee might therefore decide to take up items 33 and 94 at that point, even if it had not concluded its consideration of the first group of items and the corresponding draft resolutions. Such a procedure would have the advantage of not delaying certain tasks assigned to the Committee by the Council, such as those concerning the proposed United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

10. Mr. KANO (Nigeria) opposed the idea of giving priority to the items concerned with disarmament, but

solely for procedural reasons. He was by no means convinced that the Committee should treat as a matter of great urgency, to the detriment of the smooth progress of its work, a question which was highly controversial and which had been discussed for fifteen years with still no early solution in sight. Since the Committee had a very heavy agenda, he hoped that it would concentrate on the vital problems closely affecting the under-developed countries, particularly those in Africa. He made that proposal not in the selfish interest of those countries, but because the economic development of the under-developed countries was in the whole world's interest. Furthermore, he had only just been informed that item 94 had been included in the agenda of the General Assembly and he would have to ask for instructions from his Government before starting to discuss it.

11. Mr. APPIAH (Ghana) said that no one underestimated the importance of disarmament and its consequences. The present issue, however, was one of procedure; the important thing was to find a means of expediting the Committee's work. In that connexion, while he agreed with those who felt that items 33 and 94 should be considered jointly, he did not believe that they should be given priority. Disarmament was a complex question already being considered by other bodies, and nothing should be done by the Second Committee which might have the effect of hampering that work. It was undeniable, moreover, that if progress in the developing countries had to await effective disarmament, it would most likely be delayed indefinitely. That did not mean that disarmament was undeserving of consideration, but the facts had to be faced. In conclusion, like the Nigerian representative, he had not had an opportunity to consider the matter thoroughly or to consult his Government or experts on the question. He therefore expressed the hope that the Soviet Union would accept the compromise solution proposed by Yugoslavia.

12. Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) said that, in principle, he attached very great importance to the economic programme for disarmament and felt that that item deserved to be given high priority. It was well known that expenditure on armaments was rising steadily and that it absorbed a large part of the national income of the advanced countries. If it continued to increase, little hope could be placed in international co-operation for the development of the under-developed countries. The advanced countries were already limiting their aid to the developing countries and were beginning to show signs of tiring. To be realistic without being cynical, it was necessary to recognize that only progressive disarmament would make it possible to free large sums and to use them beneficially in all countries, particularly in those which required capital investment for their economic growth. Most of the items on the agenda had been considered at previous sessions. None, however, was more important than the question of disarmament.

13. The Chairman, in his note on the organization of the Committee's work, proposed following the practice of dividing the items before the Second Committee into two groups. If items 33 and 94 were taken together, the question of disarmament would be second in the list of items forming the first group and would therefore automatically have some priority. The Soviet Union might perhaps make clear whether it wished the agenda to be divided into three groups of items, with the two items relating to disarmament

forming a separate first group. He wondered whether that solution was really essential since, with the present order of items, the question of disarmament would be one of the very first the Committee would have to take up.

14. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) as surprised at the Committee's wasting precious time on a procedural matter which raised no problem. On the matter of substance, it was generally recognized that disarmament would release considerable sums which could be used to accelerate the progress of the developing countries. As regards the procedural aspect, Yugoslavia had already put forward a view which should not give rise to debate. It was pointless to quibble over which was the most urgent item. Tunisia considered the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to be the most urgent question, particularly since it already was a priority item, the committee of experts having to be designated by November 1962 under Economic and Social Council resolution 917 (XXXIV). While not wishing to take a position on the substance of the Soviet Union's proposal, his delegation could agree to the inclusion of the disarmament topics in the first group of items to be considered by the Committee, as favoured by the Lebanese representative. However, it appealed to the representative of the Soviet Union to accept the Yugoslav proposal, which would otherwise have to be put to the vote.

15. Mr. UMARI (Iraq) agreed with the Lebanese representative and also suggested that the representative of the Soviet Union should clarify his position.

16. Mr. EL BANNA (United Arab Republic) said that it was difficult to arrange the items in a manner which would take all factors into account. In the case of the economic development problems, the logical order would be to take up successively the question of external financing of development, international trade problems, the social aspects of development and the actual programmes. Even if the practice of recent years was followed, it would readily be seen that, for some, priority should be given to one item, while for others it should be given to another. Like Tunisia and Yugoslavia, his country considered the problems of trade to be of vital importance to the developing countries. It was sufficient to bear in mind that, for those countries, the losses resulting from the unfavourable trend of the terms of trade considerably exceeded the amount of assistance they received. However, disarmament was just as essential, if one considered the importance, for the developing countries, of freeing even a fraction of the \$120,000 million which nations spent annually on armaments. Consequently, it was difficult to establish an order of priority.

17. As Yugoslavia and other countries had proposed, a compromise solution should be adopted. He wished to point out, however, that item 38 (Population growth and economic development) should be included in the first group of items. If it was desired to consider the items relating to economic development and, therefore, such matters as expediting the rate of growth, increasing per caput income and raising the level of living, the impact of population growth could not be ignored, particularly since all the documents on the subject which were before the Committee indicated that population pressure was likely to thwart efforts to raise the level of living.

18. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the practice followed by the Committee in recent years was by no means sacrosanct. Some regarded the system of dealing with groups of items as the ideal solution. His delegation considered that practice far from ideal. If, for example, the proposal of the representative of the United Arab Republic was adopted, the Committee would be submerged under a group of heterogeneous items and it would be difficult for it to concentrate on any given problem. Although the Lebanese representative had analysed the position very clearly, the fact nevertheless remained that, if the problems of disarmament were included in the group of items relating to economic development, the entire discussion would become diffuse.

19. The Tunisian representative had no doubt been unable to refrain from commenting rather petulantly on the relative urgency of various items. That was an understandable reaction, and the Soviet Union would be the last to minimize the importance of an international conference on trade problems, as it had itself proposed that item. The fact was, however, that his country wished to consider all the problems on a practical basis. It was not a question of relegating the economic development of the under-developed countries to third or fourth place; rather, it was a question of discussing, not the method of allocating \$14 million in technical assistance, but the thousands of millions of dollars which might become available for that purpose. In a word, it was a question of tackling the question as a whole and not in bits and pieces.

20. Yugoslavia had put forward a constructive alternative: it called for the Committee to turn to the consideration of questions connected with disarmament at a specific date set in advance by the Committee, whether or not the debate on the other items had been concluded. If the Yugoslav representative specified the target date he had in mind, he could perhaps provide the solution which was being sought.

21. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, in submitting the suggestions which were set forth in his note, he had not intended to impose upon the Committee any specific order for the consideration of the items on its agenda. The Committee had before it several proposals to amend those suggestions. After the various delegations had expressed their views, it would be for the Committee to decide what procedure it considered best.

22. Mr. NAHAPPAN (Federation of Malaya) was surprised at the observations made by the USSR representative in regard to the grouping of items. At the sixteenth session that procedure had enabled the Committee to save time during the general debate and to complete its work by the appointed time. At the current session, the number of meetings would probably be the same but the number of speakers would be larger. It would seem therefore that the Committee would have to use the same procedure. In regard to the consideration of the two items bearing on disarmament, his delegation thought that the Yugoslav proposal was the most practical one and should be adopted.

23. Mr. MALM (Sweden) recalled that the item on population growth had been submitted by Denmark and Sweden. It was true, as the representative of the United Arab Republic had said, that there was a very close connexion between population growth and economic development. It therefore seemed natural that

that aspect could be discussed during the general debate on economic development. However, as the question had never been discussed before and as it was necessary to establish as much common ground as possible on several of its specific aspects, it might perhaps be more advisable to consider it separately, as the Chairman had suggested, with delegations being allowed to make observations on it during the general debate on the first group of questions.

24. In reply to the USSR representative, Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) said that the Committee might begin its consideration of items 33 and 94 on or about 15 November. Under the Yugoslav proposal, the Committee would first begin the general debate on items 12, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39 and 84 of the Assembly's agenda, listed in paragraph 4 of the Chairman's note, but would not discuss items 33 and 94, which would be dealt with separately on 15 November 1962, regardless of the progress made in the consideration of the items of the first group. After having completed the consideration of those two items, the Committee would, if necessary, resume its discussion of the first group.

25. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the discussion which had just taken place had been highly useful since it had made it possible to define the Committee's programme. The best course would probably be to adopt the Yugoslav proposal that the Committee should decide to begin on 15 November its consideration of items 33 and 94, whatever progress might have been made in the discussion of the first group of items. As it seemed that the Committee was prepared to accept that proposal, it might perhaps not be necessary to put it to the vote.

*The Yugoslav proposal was adopted.*

26. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of the United Arab Republic whether he maintained his proposal for the inclusion of item 38 in the first group of items.

27. Mr. EL BANNA (United Arab Republic) said that he had merely wished to draw the Committee's attention to the possibility of including the item on population growth in the first group, in accordance with the Chairman's suggestion about dividing the items into two groups. He had not, however, intended to open a procedural discussion thereon and he accepted the Chairman's proposal, contained in paragraph 6 of document A/C.2/L.643 and Corr.1, that the Committee consider item 38 immediately after concluding its study of the first group of questions.

28. The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Committee whether they accepted the Swedish representative's proposal that item 38 should be considered separately, on the understanding that members might express their views on that item during the general debate on the first group of items.

*The Swedish proposal was adopted.*

29. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should approve the note he had submitted (A/C.2/L.643 and Corr.1 and Add.1), as amended by the Yugoslav and Swedish proposals.

*It was so decided.*

30. The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Committee to inform the Secretariat as soon as possible of the date on which they would be prepared to take the floor in the general debate on the first group of items.

31. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) thought that the general debate, which had become a tradition, was of considerable value in making known the general views of delegations on all the items on the agenda of the session. In view of the greater number of representatives who would take the floor, however, it was to be feared that the debate might continue indefinitely and that the Committee would be unable to keep to the target date of 15 November that it had just set. The Committee might try forthwith to forestall that danger. For example, whenever the Committee took up a new item, the Chairman might at the outset set the closing date for the list of speakers. Similarly, so far as draft resolutions were concerned, delegations could be asked to submit their drafts fairly early in the general debate. When the draft resolutions came under discussion, a time-limit could also be set for the submission of amendments.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that he intended to take the necessary action to facilitate the Committee's work and to ensure that the time-limits were respected. But it seemed difficult to take a decision immediately on the list of speakers. He would keep the question in mind and, when the Committee had made some progress in its work, he would consult it with a view to fixing the closing date for the list of speakers and the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions and amendments. He would, above all, make every effort to organize the Committee's work in the best possible way and, at the same time, would attempt to keep to the prescribed time-limits, while affording delegations the time necessary for them to prepare themselves for the general debate and to study the draft resolutions.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.