

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 841st  
MEETING**

Friday, 16 November 1962,  
at 10.55 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

## CONTENTS

Page

### Agenda items 33 and 94:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| <i>Economic and social consequences of disarmament: report of the Secretary-General transmitting the study of the group of expert consultants appointed under General Assembly resolution 1516 (XV) (continued). . . . .</i> | } 265 |
| <i>Economic programme for disarmament (continued) . . . . .</i>                                                                                                                                                              |       |

### Agenda item 35:

- Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):*
- (c) *Industrial development and activities of the organs of the United Nations in the field of industrialization (continued)*
- Consideration of the draft resolution of Jordan and Poland (continued) . . . . .* 268

### Agenda item 39:

- Permanent sovereignty over natural resources (continued)*
- Consideration of the draft resolution of the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources (continued). . . . .* 270

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

## AGENDA ITEMS 33 AND 94

**Economic and social consequences of disarmament: report of the Secretary-General transmitting the study of the group of expert consultants appointed under General Assembly resolution 1516 (XV) (A/5199; A/5203, chap. II; A/C.2/L.647 and Add.1; E/3593/Rev.1, E/3593/Add.1-5) (continued)**

**Economic programme for disarmament (A/C.2/L.646) (continued)**

1. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) recalled that, at the thirty-fourth session of the Economic and Social Council, his delegation had stated that the United Kingdom considered the study of the Consultative Group of experts entitled Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament (E/3593/Rev.1) to be an extremely useful document and entirely endorsed its two main conclusions. The first conclusion was that there were no insuperable economic or social problems which might delay general and complete disarmament under effective control. The second conclusion was that if the resources being used for military purposes could be diverted to peaceful objectives, there would result an improvement in the world economy and in economic and social conditions in the less developed countries.

2. Some of the considerable sums released by an agreement on general and complete disarmament would have to be devoted to the implementation of the agreement, but vast resources would be available for more constructive purposes. That fact had long been recognized in the United Kingdom. Some of those resources might be devoted to the economic development of all countries, developed or developing, as had been set forth in General Assembly resolution 724 (VIII). His delegation had voted for that resolution and only five delegations, all in the socialist camp, had abstained. The proposals before the Committee and the statement made by the USSR representative (840th meeting) led him to hope that the Soviet Union at least had changed its point of view and that it now agreed with the other States Members about that important question. The United Kingdom delegation, for its part, maintained the position it had adopted nine years before.

3. His delegation thought that the Consultative Group of experts had done a great service by refuting once and for all a misconception which for a number of years had concealed or been used to conceal the truth about disarmament, namely, that the prosperity of the free world depended on the production of arms. That false theory had been used to support the allegation that countries such as the United Kingdom were not seriously interested in disarmament, and it was very gratifying that the theory had been refuted. Indeed, the experts had shown not only that it would be easy to prevent a slackening in the economies of countries whose expenditure on armaments would be reduced and then eliminated, but also that the release of additional resources for capital investment would result in a considerable economic advance which would benefit the whole world. The United Kingdom Government had always thought that a satisfactory agreement on general and complete disarmament would be a blessing for mankind, both because it would guarantee peace and because it would result in economic and social benefits.

4. It would, however, be most regrettable if the conclusions of the experts were to give rise to hopes of immediate benefits. Such hopes could only be disappointed in present circumstances. The figures which the USSR representative, at the preceding meeting, had quoted from the study and the various projects which he had mentioned were indeed interesting, but those achievements would have to wait upon effective disarmament. Disarmament would be the result of long and important negotiations with which the Second Committee was not directly concerned. The United Kingdom's record in the long discussions on disarmament held over the past seventeen years was an honourable one and needed no justification in the Committee. The United Kingdom Government would continue to put forward its point of view with honesty and determination in the bodies which were concerned with reaching an agreement, and it hoped that such an agreement would soon become a reality.

5. His delegation had at first had some misgivings about resolution 891 (XXXIV) of the Economic and Social Council because it had thought that further studies might have precisely the effect of raising premature hopes and expectations; but that resolution had finally left the Governments concerned to make the studies mentioned, which had enabled the United Kingdom delegation to vote for the resolution. It was in the same spirit that it approached the draft resolution contained in the draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.2/L.646) and the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.647 and Add.1). It was not for him to ask the sovereign States represented on the Committee whether the consultations concerning the formulation of an international programme of assistance, which the Soviet Union draft resolution recommended, or additional studies on the economic and social consequences of disarmament would be profitable before there was any clear indication that a disarmament agreement would soon be concluded. As its contribution to the work of the Consultative Group, the United Kingdom Government had submitted a very detailed account of its expenditure—a much more detailed account than those submitted by some Governments which professed a deep interest in those problems—and further studies by the United Kingdom would add nothing to its knowledge of those problems or of their solutions.

6. His delegation therefore concluded that the eight-Power draft resolution was more suited to present needs and expectations than the Soviet Union text. The eight Powers had wisely concurred in the decision of the Economic and Social Council to leave Member States to decide whether further studies on the economic and social consequences of disarmament were necessary or useful. Indeed, that draft resolution followed closely resolution 891 (XXXIV) unanimously adopted by the Council and, if it were put to the vote in its present wording, the United Kingdom delegation would certainly support it. The Soviet Union draft declaration, on the other hand, contained proposals which, despite the great importance of the problem, were premature. His delegation would be glad to consider the proposals again when progress had been made towards an agreement on general and complete disarmament under satisfactory control, and it hoped that the Soviet Union delegation would not press its proposal for the time being.

7. Mr. LYCHOWSKI (Poland) said that the two draft resolutions before the Committee dealt with similar problems and differed mainly in their scope and immediate objectives. After the statements by the United States and United Kingdom representatives, it seemed that the difference was primarily one of points of view. While the eight-Power draft resolution, in referring to the economic and social consequences of disarmament, only evaluated what had already been done in that connexion by the Consultative Group of experts set up under General Assembly resolution 1516 (XV), the USSR draft proposed a new step forward. The main idea of the Soviet draft was contained in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which requested the Secretary-General, without waiting for the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament, to hold with the Governments of under-developed countries consultations on their development needs as a whole with a view to formulation of an international programme of assistance to be submitted to the General Assembly at its eighteenth session. His delegation thought that such a programme, if it could be

formulated, would throw considerable light on the whole question and expedite the conclusion of a treaty on disarmament. For that reason, it supported the proposal made in the operative part of that draft.

8. Operative paragraph 3 of the eight-Power draft resolution also contained some proposals for future programmes. Although it seemed that the tenor of the studies mentioned was not sufficiently clear, the sponsors appeared to be aware of the need to continue the action initiated in implementation of General Assembly resolutions 1378 (XIV) and 1516 (XV) and continued by the study on the economic and social consequences of disarmament. There again, the difference between the two draft resolutions lay in the scope of the subsequent studies. It should be noted that the studies called for in the eight-Power draft resolution, which would apparently deal mainly with information, plans and policies for making the necessary economic and social adjustments in the event of disarmament, would mainly concern a relatively small number of highly developed countries, which would have to tackle the hardest problems of conversion. The draft resolution contained few provisions that would encourage further studies on the economic and social consequences of general disarmament for the less developed countries. His delegation believed that the main effort should be concentrated precisely on that aspect, because, leaving aside some hypothetical generalizations, there was so far little knowledge about the possible consequences for those countries.

9. The excellent work of the Consultative Group of experts was essentially based on the belief, deep-rooted in some highly developed countries, that disarmament would have adverse effects on their levels of production and employment and hence on their levels of living. The study of the experts clearly showed that post-war reconversion had been far greater than would be required by disarmament. The experts had found that, with very rapid disarmament, some 6 or 7 per cent of the active population of the United States, including the armed forces, and 3 1/2 to 4 per cent of that of the United Kingdom would require a change in occupation. Such occupation changes, spread over a number of years, would be greatly aided by the normal operation of the economy. On the whole, the conclusions of the experts would probably dispel any fears that disarmament might result in great economic upheavals in countries requiring reconversion after the reduction of military expenditure.

10. However, the study was far less clear with regard to future economic disarmament programmes. The experts referred to four over-all studies of the total needs of the less developed countries; those studies mentioned a yearly sum of \$6,000 to \$8,000 million, a figure based, according to the experts, on a conservative estimate, the most important element of which was an annual per caput target rate of increase of only 2 per cent. The reason for that conservative approach was not that the under-developed countries would be unable to absorb a larger flow of investment capital. The experts themselves believed that, under certain conditions, the opposite would be true. The reason was simply that the authors of the study had to start from the idea that the available capital would be rather small and that, as a consequence, the investment programmes should be based on the available resources rather than the actual needs of the less developed countries. For the first time, the study had been turned around by the

draft resolution submitted by the USSR delegation. If, after consultation with the under-developed countries, the Secretary-General were to draw up an international aid programme as called for by operative paragraph 3 of the Soviet draft, the world's true economic development potential—provided adequate means could be assigned for the purpose—would stand revealed for the first time since the founding of the United Nations.

11. There was wide-spread doubt, especially among the economists of the highly developed countries, about the political feasibility of a large-scale allocation of resources released by general disarmament to the rapid development of under-developed countries. They believed, not without reason, that even though disarmament came about, the amounts hitherto spent on the arms race would certainly be employed to meet some countries' most pressing domestic needs, particularly to cut taxes. The argument was certainly valid, but the Soviet draft resolution showed that even a mere 20 per cent of the present military expenditure, if used for the development of under-developed countries, would bring them some \$500,000 million over the next twenty-five years. During that same period, the countries currently shouldering the heavy burden of their military expenditure would add some \$2,000,000 million to their economies. There could be no doubt that a measure whereby national economies saved 80 per cent of their current expenditure while the remaining 20 per cent became the most powerful instrument for the development of the under-developed countries would completely transform the world economy.

12. His delegation believed that the idea of an international programme of assistance, mentioned in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution contained in the Soviet draft declaration, would, if adopted by the General Assembly, greatly strengthen the idea of general and complete disarmament and encourage the vision of an economically prosperous future world delivered from the fear of a nuclear holocaust. Moreover, it would constitute a basis for practical action to be taken under the auspices of the United Nations, once general disarmament had been achieved. His delegation supported the draft resolution concerning the conversion to peaceful needs of the resources released by disarmament and believed that the draft could serve as the next stage of the General Assembly's action on general and complete disarmament and its economic consequences for the whole world.

13. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) said that, generally speaking, his delegation favoured both draft resolutions, which, in the words of the Soviet draft, were inspired by "lofty ideals of peace". Those ideals could be put into effect in different ways. Some believed that consideration of the economic and social aspects of disarmament was premature so long as disarmament itself was not achieved. Others—and the Netherlands delegation shared their view—believed that the lot of mankind, assuming disarmament became a reality, ought to be studied beforehand. It was in fact essential to be ready in time to deal with the problems of transition arising from disarmament and to convert armaments resources to peaceful uses. That was the view underlying the eight-Power draft. To prepare for a future free from such a heavy burden was no easy matter, because it was difficult to draw the line between real possibilities and dreams. The document submitted by the USSR delegation abounded in noble ideals but failed to indicate how to apply them. The draft

resolution with which it concluded was contingent on too many factors. By contrast, the eight-Power draft was properly balanced. It clearly showed the advantages of disarmament for mankind in general and the developing countries in particular. It praised and endorsed the conclusions of the study of the Consultative Group of experts and gave due recognition to Economic and Social Council resolution 891 (XXXIV). Its fitting conclusion was that Member States could not relax in their efforts to help the developing countries and should on the contrary redouble them. His delegation had often stressed the need for accelerating those efforts. He would therefore have no hesitation in supporting that draft resolution.

14. Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation favoured the Soviet Union draft resolution. It was quite evident that the resources released by general and complete disarmament would further economic and social progress in all countries without distinction, but for the developing countries their effect would usher in a new era. It had to be noted that the limited resources currently devoted to assistance could not reduce the widening gap between the developing and industrial nations. However, a small fraction of the immense resources devoted to armaments would, if used for that purpose, be enough to complete the process of equalization. That was why the economic disarmament programme before the Committee deserved its full attention.

15. There seemed to be general agreement that the adoption of measures to speed economic development should not await the conclusion of a disarmament agreement. However, the release of resources resulting from disarmament would create a new situation pregnant with possibilities which should not be overlooked. There also seemed to be general agreement on the need for undertaking certain studies as an extension of the work of the Consultative Group of experts; it was on the scope and nature of those studies that opinions were divided. The United States and the United Kingdom seemed prepared to recognize the usefulness of separate studies carried out by individual States, but opposed the idea of an economic disarmament programme drawn up by the United Nations in consultation with the Governments concerned. Because the disarmament time-table could not yet be foreseen, they failed to see on what bases consultations could be held aimed at formulating an international programme.

16. His delegation, on the contrary, was convinced that many problems should be worked out without awaiting the conclusion of a disarmament agreement. Thus, there was nothing at present to indicate that, in the event of disarmament, the resources released would automatically be used to assist the developing countries. Such a programme should be prepared within the United Nations; it would answer the question raised by the United States concerning the exact proportion of the resources released which the advanced countries would be prepared to devote to the developing countries. A sudden increase in assistance to those countries raised the problem of their capacity to absorb it. They could do so only after adopting certain plans, prepared in advance and providing for co-operation between donor and recipient countries and hence including action to be taken both internationally and nationally. Lastly, economic reconversion was certainly a domestic question, but it should be studied as part of an over-all international plan in which the problems of increased assistance to the developing

countries would receive special attention. Along those lines, it would be useful for countries to exchange views and experiences on specific questions such as the reclassification of military personnel and the redirection of research towards peaceful ends. Such exchanges should lead to effective co-operation or concerted action. Certainly, the process of reconversion would itself be costly: for instance, expenditure would have to be earmarked for the retraining of the labour force and its transfer, if need be, to the most promising sectors of the economy. There again, plans should be drawn up in advance and, very often, within the framework of international co-operation. Lastly, the fear had frequently been expressed that disarmament might cause a drop in primary commodity prices. Although there need be no fear of a problem of world-wide proportions, since peaceful production consumed as much of those commodities as military production, some international action would nevertheless be needed in case the reduction of strategic stockpiles should cause a lowering in market prices.

17. Those few examples certainly showed that there were problems to be solved before a precise disarmament schedule was drawn up. His delegation therefore rejected the view that the preparation of an international programme would be premature or represent a loss of time for the Secretary-General and the Governments concerned. Moreover, the work involved in an economic programme for disarmament would serve to intensify the efforts aimed at the conclusion of a disarmament agreement and to remove all the obstacles in its way. For all those reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation supported the Soviet draft resolution and hoped that it would be adopted by the Committee.

*Mr. Allana (Pakistan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

### AGENDA ITEM 35

#### Economic development of under-developed countries (A/5220) (continued):

#### (c) Industrial development and activities of the organs of the United Nations in the field of industrialization (A/C.2/L.649/Rev.1, E/3600/Rev.1, E/3656, E/3656/Add.1) (continued)

#### CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION OF JORDAN AND POLAND (A/C.2/L.649/REV.1) (continued)\*

18. Mr. TELL (Jordan), submitting the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.649/Rev.1), pointed out the modifications made by the sponsors to their original text (A/C.2/L.649 and Add.1) to take into account the suggestions of Hungary, Pakistan and France.

19. Mr. RENAUD (France) said that despite the consultations which had taken place among various delegations, major differences of opinion persisted in the Committee; for that reason, his delegation, together with four other delegations, was submitting an amendment (A/C.2/L.673). The sponsors of the original draft resolution had insisted on retaining the reference to one organizational structure. To the sponsors of the amendment, it seemed that since an Advisory Committee of experts had been established under the terms of Economic and Social Council resolution 873 (XXXIII)

to deal with the same problems, it would be wrong to force a solution upon it at the outset when it was supposed to find a solution itself. In other words, the remedy should not be decided upon before the diagnosis had been made. Moreover, while the sponsors of the amendment willingly admitted that co-ordination was absolutely essential, they were not sure that the best way of achieving it was by establishing a single organizational structure. It could, of course, be argued that there was no more magical power in the word "co-ordination" than in the words "organizational structure", but the sponsors of the amendment were giving the experts precisely the task of finding means of ensuring closer co-ordination, whereas the reference to "one organizational structure" meant that the means to be used to attain the desired objective was being selected a priori.

20. The French delegation also wished to suggest a few drafting changes. In the second preambular paragraph of section I of the draft resolution, the word "related", which was rather vague, should perhaps be replaced by the words "concerned with industrialization". In the operative part of section II, the word "favorables" would be a better translation into French of the word "favourable" than the word "avantageuses".

21. Mr. THAJEB (Indonesia) supported the initiative taken by Jordan and Poland and considered that the broadening of the terms of reference of the Advisory Committee of experts would facilitate United Nations efforts to promote the industrial development of the developing countries. He was glad to note the progress already made in that respect in the Secretariat, especially by the establishment of the Industrial Development Centre and the appointment of a Commissioner for Industrial Development. But there were still some activities which should be undertaken within a single organizational structure. It was a fact that natural resources were closely linked with industrialization, and that fact had been recognized in the structure of ECAFE, where the two matters were dealt with by a single committee. That practice might also be adopted at Headquarters. By combining interdependent fields in that way, duplication and overlapping were avoided and more effective action was possible.

22. Indonesia had been prepared to vote in favour of the draft resolution in its original form because it had felt that the wording did not prejudge the question of organizational structure. However, it would support the revised draft resolution because it appeared to meet the objections raised. In any event, there was no question of undertaking a radical structural reform: by establishing a close link between United Nations activities in the field of natural resources and in the field of industrialization, it was intended merely to achieve a gradual change, for the Secretariat would require some time to carry out the necessary reorganization of its activities.

23. With regard to section II of the draft resolution, the Indonesian delegation believed that the proposed studies were of major importance and came within the scope of the Committee for Industrial Development. The developing countries would utilize those studies in preparing their future economic development programmes. The Indonesian delegation would therefore unreservedly support the revised draft resolution.

24. Mr. TOMEH (Syria) believed that it would be possible to take into account the views of the sponsors

\*Resumed from the 834th meeting.

of the draft resolution and those expressed in the five-Power amendment. Actually, the United Nations was not the only organization dealing with industrialization or the study of industrialization: he need only mention the FAO study on water resources and the FAO/UNESCO study on natural resources. It was necessary, therefore, that the text of the draft resolution should clearly reflect the various institutional aspects of the problem. Furthermore, the text should also clearly indicate what was being done nationally and internationally in the field of industrialization. For those reasons, he proposed some amendments (A/C.2/L.677) intended to modify the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of section I of the draft resolution as follows:

"Taking into consideration that the efforts of the United Nations (including the specialized agencies and the regional economic commissions) in the field of industrial development should be closely co-ordinated with the activities in the field of natural resources, as well as in all other related fields, since the process of industrialization is dependent upon adequate progress in these fields,

"Recommends that the Advisory Committee established under Economic and Social Council resolution 873 (XXXIII) take into account in its work and recommendations:

"(a) The advisability of dealing with problems of industrial development, natural resources and energy within one organizational structure, and

"(b) The possibility of bringing about a closer co-ordination of all activities related to industrialization at the national, regional and international levels;"

He hoped that that text, which was a synthesis of all the views expressed, would be unanimously adopted.

25. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) recalled, for the record, how much his country was doing to promote the industrial development of the economically under-developed countries by helping them to increase their industrial production capacity and by purchasing their manufactured goods in greater quantities than any other country. The United States, which had been able to appreciate the endeavours made by the sponsors of the draft resolution in the Committee for Industrial Development and the Technical Assistance Committee, welcomed the changes that had been made in the original text, for the new version was preferable to the old. His delegation shared the view that the problem of industrial development should be viewed in the widest possible perspective. That included natural resources and many other related fields. The problem of transport, as highlighted by the representative of the United Arab Republic (799th meeting), and those of financing or of the establishment of economic projections, should not be forgotten.

26. Of the \$6,000 million that it had lent since it was founded, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development had devoted \$2,000 million to the development of transport, over \$1,000 million to the development of industry proper and over \$2,000 million for energy.

27. Nor should it be forgotten that many organizations were currently concerned with industrial development. Examples in the United Nations included the Industrial Development Centre, the Resources and Transport Branch, the Fiscal and Financial Branch and the

Economic Projections and Programming Centre. For their part, FAO and several other organizations were concerning themselves with natural resources, particularly water resources. It would be especially difficult to consolidate all those various activities within a single framework. The question of trade, which was touched on in section II of the draft resolution, would be the central issue in the debates of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the experts taking part in that conference would assuredly be more conversant with those matters than were the members of the Committee for Industrial Development. Furthermore, the meetings of IMF, the Commission on International Commodity Trade and the GATT committees were also concerned with international trade. For all those reasons, the United States delegation would support the five-Power amendment.

28. The general aims of section II of the draft resolution were acceptable, but it would be preferable if the present wording were slightly amended in order to reflect more accurately the various activities of the institutions; to that end, he was submitting some amendments (A/C.2/L.679). It would be more accurate to replace the words "its studies" at the beginning of the operative paragraph by the words "its study", since in point of fact the studies proper were prepared by the Secretariat and not by the Committee for Industrial Development. It would also be better to substitute for the end of that paragraph, following the words "capital goods on favourable terms", the words "and suggests that the Committee for Industrial Development be kept informed of the activities of international bodies concerned with trade".

29. Mr. EL BANNA (United Arab Republic) said he thought it unnecessary to recall the vital importance of industrialization for economic development, for it represented the only means of expanding and diversifying production and trade and of securing a better distribution of national resources and a higher standard of living. Like the United States, the United Arab Republic was aware that many organizations were concerning themselves with the question of industrial development and hoped that the tasks that would be entrusted to the Committee for Industrial Development would not duplicate the functions of any of the other bodies concerned with development. His country also agreed with the United States that co-ordination should apply equally to transportation, financing and the marketing of surplus foodstuffs—which allowed the beneficiary countries to save foreign currency for the purchase of equipment—or to the policy followed by the powerful economic blocs. For those various reasons, he supported the five-Power amendment; he suggested, however, that the end of paragraph 1 of section I should be left unchanged.

30. Furthermore, although it was important to study the relationship between trade and industrialization, it would be regrettable if the Committee for Industrial Development were on that account to neglect the consideration of such questions as the training of personnel or the establishment of development banks. Assuredly, industrialization might be hampered if the trade structure was unsatisfactory and the developing countries experienced great difficulty in exporting their products or in importing capital goods on favourable terms. Nevertheless, the Committee for Industrial Development should not attempt to tackle the whole question of trade, which was already being dealt with elsewhere. He accordingly shared the view of the United States representative.

31. Mr. BOLT (New Zealand) said that his main concern was that the draft resolution should gain the widest support and he was glad to see that the revised version was more flexible. However, although it was not untrue to say that the draft resolution prejudged the question by speaking of the advisability of dealing with problems "within one organizational structure", the five-Power amendment also prejudged the question by emphasizing solely methods of co-ordination. Since it was agreed that the Advisory Committee of experts would have to study the question in detail, it would be preferable to adopt a text which, like the one suggested by the representative of the United Arab Republic, did not force the Committee to take sides, while stating sufficiently clearly what the different delegations had in mind. In section II of the draft resolution, the words "as well as the long-term influence of the industrialization of the developing countries upon the structure, direction and volume of world trade" were redundant, since they actually described one of the aspects of the relationship between industrialization and international trade. It would be better to delete them and add the phrase suggested by the United States representative.

### AGENDA ITEM 39

**Permanent sovereignty over natural resources (A/4905, A/5060, A/5225, A/AC.97/5/Rev.2, A/C.2/L.654 and Corr.1, E/3511, E/L.914, E/L.915, E/L.918, E/L.919, E/SR.1177-1179, E/SR.1181) (continued)**

**CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE COMMISSION ON PERMANENT SOVEREIGNTY OVER NATURAL RESOURCES (A/C.2/L.654 AND CORR.1) (continued)\***

32. Mr. MONTENEGRO (Nicaragua) said that he would support the draft resolution because recognition of the permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources was an acknowledgement of the legitimate aspirations of peoples and a partial rectification of the errors of the past. The United Nations should go even further and prevent any recurrence of the violations of State sovereignty and of the right of self-determination of peoples which had inevitably resulted in the past from the conclusion of contracts between small countries and large consortiums. The small countries had been forced into the same relationship with them as the worker had had with his employer before the adoption of labour legislation; driven by the need for capital, they had often been forced to grant concessions to large companies which had thus been able to secure monopoly rights to the detriment of the interests and even of the dignity of the host State. The expropriation

and confiscation measures which had been taken were therefore a defensive reaction against such injustices and they would disappear only if all the parties concerned were prepared to respect the freedom and accept the true equality of their partners. Unfortunately, the countries which had adopted legislation to defend their interests had often been branded as nationalistic and the monopolies had taken retaliatory measures, sometimes even imposing boycotts. Since the old agreements had not been concluded between truly equal partners, it could not be asserted that they should all be observed; it could even be claimed that the small countries were entitled to call for their modification.

33. Mr. KOUMBOU (Congo, Brazzaville) said that the draft resolution was of vital importance because the sovereignty of peoples over their natural resources was an inalienable and indisputable right. The time had passed when the colonialists could enjoy plundering territories of their wealth and it would be pointless to launch into an indictment of a completely bygone era. He would vote for the draft resolution because his country wished to ensure its economic independence in order to enjoy effective political independence. Several amendments had been submitted (A/C.2/L.655 and A/C.2/L.668-670), but since they expressed opposing views, they were difficult to reconcile. The best course, therefore, would be for the Committee to confine itself to the existing text, which was balanced and realistic.

34. A great deal of private capital was being invested in his country, which was working on a code to provide the best guarantees for the Congolese State and for the investors: the latter were certainly entitled to derive profits from their capital, but they should not be guided solely by speculative aims. Indeed, their right ended where the right of the State and of the population began. As stated in paragraph 4 of the draft, nationalization, expropriation or requisitioning should be based on grounds or reasons of public utility, security or the national interest. That wording was especially reasonable as the paragraph later provided for compensation of the owner, in accordance with the rules in force in the State taking such measures in the exercise of its sovereignty and in accordance with international law. Private capital was undoubtedly a great help to the African countries, which had vast resources that they were not yet able to exploit, but it should be supplemented by international co-operation and assistance. The United Nations would be failing in its mission if it did not promote the economic development of the still under-developed countries. It should therefore adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

\*Resumed from the 835th meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.