



Chairman: Mr. Walter GUEVARA ARZE (Bolivia).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)
(A/8003 and Corr.1, chaps. I to VI, VII (sect. A, paras. 234 to 239), VIII, X (sects. A to C), XI (sects. B to D, F to J and L) and XIII (sects. A to C and E); A/8003/Add.1)

1. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs), replying to questions raised at the preceding meeting regarding the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1124 on the economic and social consequences of disarmament, said that in his note (A/C.2/L.1128) the Secretary-General had made provision for consultants in order to ensure that necessary data which did not reach the United Nations through the usual government channels could be gathered and analysed. The draft resolution allowed the Secretariat considerable latitude in the designation of advisers. The Secretariat had considered it desirable, in the light of similar experience in connexion with the consultative group of experts on the economic and social consequences of disarmament, which had been constituted in application of General Assembly resolution 1516 (XV), to convene a committee of ten experts to prepare a carefully-thought-out document for the consideration of Governments. The desired results could not be attained if resources were too limited.

2. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines), after having announced that Colombia had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1124, said that many speakers had reiterated their dedication to the cause of disarmament and their keen awareness of the urgency of ensuring the development of the developing countries. It had become clear that the difference of opinion in the Committee was not between the developed and the developing countries. He was certain that the Secretary-General and his staff would implement the draft resolution, if it was adopted, with the utmost objectivity.

3. He had also introduced some substantive changes in the light of members' comments. The beginning of the fourth preambular paragraph should be revised to read: "*Encouraged* that the super-Powers have at last recognized that there are compelling reasons to prevent...". Operative paragraph 1 (c) should be incorporated in operative paragraph 1 (a), which would read:

"To formulate proposals for the guidance of Member States, the specialized agencies and the International

Atomic Energy Agency, other organizations in the United Nations family, as well as non-governmental organizations concerned, in order to establish the link between the Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade so that an appropriate share of the resources that are released as a consequence of progress towards general and complete disarmament would be used to increase assistance for the economic and social development of developing countries;"

4. The concluding part of operative paragraph 1 (b) following the words "intensified negotiations" should be revised to read: "aimed at progress towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control".

5. Operative paragraph 2 should be revised to read: "*Requests* Member States, specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, other organizations in the United Nations system as well as non-governmental organizations concerned...". In operative paragraph 3, the words "through the Economic and Social Council" should be inserted after the word "hereon".

6. The Chilean representative's suggestion (1344th meeting) that the resolution should mention a specific percentage of the resources released by disarmament which should be allocated for the development of the developing countries could be taken into account by Governments when they prepared their comments pursuant to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. As to that representative's suggestion that the Secretary-General should consult intergovernmental experts, he pointed out that the report would in any event be reviewed by government representatives when it was submitted to the General Assembly.

7. Turning to the objections raised by the United States representative at the previous meeting, he said, first, that adoption of the draft resolution definitely would not lead to a conflict of jurisdiction between the First and Second Committees, both of which, ever since the item had been placed on the agenda of the General Assembly, had been considering the aspects of the disarmament question falling within their respective fields of competence. It was only fitting that the Second Committee, which had actively participated in the preparation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)), should take the initiative in establishing a link between disarmament and development.

8. Secondly, the objection that the report would lead to duplication of efforts was unfounded, for he was confident that the Secretary-General would include only matters relating to the economic and social aspects of disarmament.

9. Thirdly, the assertion that the draft resolution proposed to instruct Governments was equally groundless, for the Secretary-General was merely requested to formulate proposals for the guidance of Governments, which were requested to submit their own comments and recommendations. In any event, the Secretary-General's proposals would be reviewed by the General Assembly.

10. Fourthly, it was a sign of pessimism to state that the draft resolution was counter-productive. New ideas required time to mature, and once the report was before the General Assembly in 1973, the concept of a link between disarmament and development would be more firmly established.

11. Mr. CUBILLOS (Chile) said that his delegation had been persuaded not to submit any official amendments to the draft resolution in order not to complicate the work of the Committee. Although Chile would vote for the draft resolution, it would have preferred a more precise text, for the reasons given at the preceding meeting. It would have been better to specify in the draft resolution that the Secretary-General should appoint an intergovernmental group of experts whose recommendations, together with the views of Governments, could be submitted to the General Assembly at the time of the first biennial review of progress in the implementation of the International Development Strategy.

12. Chile would also have preferred to see included in the text a reference to a percentage quantification of the resources saved through disarmament that should be devoted to economic and social development. He hoped that when Governments made known their views, in accordance with operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, they would refer to the desirability of such a percentage quantification.

13. In any case, Chile intended to raise those two points again when the Secretary-General submitted the report requested in operative paragraph 3, at the time of the first biennial review of the implementation of the International Development Strategy.

14. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the proposed version of operative paragraph 1 (a) appeared to take account of the explanations given by the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs. The Secretary-General was now asked not to prepare a plan of action, which might be regarded as ambitious or premature, but only to formulate proposals for the consideration of the Committee. He also welcomed the revisions to operative paragraph 1 (b), which referred to the final goal that all Member States wished to attain, namely, general and complete disarmament, even though it must be regarded as a distant ideal.

15. He had some doubts not so much about the draft resolution itself, but about the Secretariat's approach to the financial implications. He understood why the Secretary-General had chosen the same number of experts as on the earlier occasion, when the General Assembly had requested a study on the economic and social consequences of disarmament. The original text of the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to take the desired steps in consultation with such advisers as he deemed necessary. It seemed somewhat excessive to consider both the establish-

ment of an expert group and the designation of consultants. He hoped that the Secretary-General would make an effort to reduce the resources proposed in his note (A/C.2/L.1128) for consultant services. If a committee of ten experts was convened, surely one consultant in addition should suffice.

16. With respect to sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of operative paragraph 1, he asked whether the intention was that the Member States of the United Nations, and the specialized agencies and other bodies concerned, should submit their observations and recommendations only after the Secretary-General had formulated the proposals envisaged in sub-paragraph (a), or whether the converse was intended, namely, that Member States would put forward suggestions immediately and the Secretary-General would take them into account in formulating his proposals. He assumed that the first interpretation was the correct one.

17. France would vote for the draft resolution, although it still had some doubts concerning the group of experts, and agreed with Chile that an intergovernmental group would be preferable, particularly if there were to be consultants in addition. Although general and complete disarmament was a noble ideal, he was fully aware that at present the path to that ideal was blocked, and it would be difficult to get any specific or positive results in the near future. He was obliged to take a sceptical view, above all, about the possibility that results could be achieved by 1973, the date set for the first evaluation and appraisal of progress in the implementation of the International Development Strategy.

18. Nevertheless, he did not wish to prevent the beginning of a programme that would cover a longer period than the two or three years envisaged in the draft resolution, and might eventually achieve useful results for the cause of development. Any such programme, especially one that would favour a parallel programme to achieve general and complete disarmament, would be helping to achieve the aims of the Charter.

19. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) said that, although the original text had not gone much beyond similar texts that had been adopted on other occasions, the revisions now proposed were a considerable improvement. He hoped that before voting the Committee would have sufficient time for consultations, with a view to reaching unanimous agreement, or at least full agreement among the developing countries.

20. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) said he wished to explain why the suggestions made by the Philippines did not meet the four difficulties that the United States had with the draft resolution.

21. With respect to the jurisdictional problem, he had not intended to suggest that the Second Committee had no responsibility for considering the economic and social consequences of disarmament. The draft resolution had originally requested the Secretary-General to prepare a plan of action, and that had now been changed to a request that he should formulate proposals. However, his basic understanding of the draft resolution was unaltered. A plan of action to establish a link between disarmament and development must necessarily be addressed to the two

questions it was proposed to link. There was already a resolution before the First Committee on the subject,¹ and another committee established by the General Assembly, the Committee on Disarmament, was also working on the disarmament problem, to establish guidelines and policies. In addition, there was the Second Committee's own action concerning the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

22. He believed that the resolution sought to do more than just say there was a link between disarmament and development. He did not understand the meaning of the phrase "to formulate proposals for the guidance of Member States" if it did not refer both to disarmament and to development, with a view to establishing a link between them. It would be more appropriate for the United Nations bodies concerned with disarmament to produce plans or proposals so that a committee of experts could be established to advise the Secretary-General.

23. With regard to the problem of duplication, the proposals to be put to Member States must have a specific content, and if they concerned disarmament, then the competence of the duly constituted bodies must be drawn on; otherwise, there would be duplication. But if the competence of those bodies was to be made use of, it would be better to leave the question to them. Nothing in the proposed version of the draft resolution met his objection that Governments were entitled to allocate as they saw fit any resources that might be released by disarmament. The new wording proposed for operative paragraph 1 (a) in which the Secretary-General would be asked "to formulate proposals for the guidance of Member States" still implied that the Secretary-General was being asked, with the assistance of advisers, to instruct Governments on how they should dispose of their own resources. The Government of the United States would certainly regard that as presumptuous.

24. The representative of the Philippines had asked how the text of the draft resolution could be regarded as counter-productive. If one of the aims of the draft resolution was to mobilize public opinion and government action in establishing a link between disarmament and development, and in moving towards disarmament and towards the release of funds for development, it was important that Governments should say whether or not the proposed action would help to that end. As far as the United States Government was concerned, the draft resolution was counter-productive.

25. The fourth preambular paragraph of the proposed text stated "that the super-Powers have at last recognized that there are compelling reasons to prevent what might become an uncontrollable escalation of the nuclear arms race". The United States Government would regard that statement as impertinent, in the light of its efforts during twenty-five years in the United Nations and elsewhere to make progress in disarmament. It was simply not true that the United States had only now recognized the compelling reasons referred to, and such a suggestion should be regarded by the United States people and their Government as an affront. It

was counter-productive to suggest what the motives of Governments might be, and the draft resolution, designed to help improve the situation, in fact would make it harder for his Government to respond to the basic intentions of the sponsors.

26. It was an unwise limitation of the draft resolution to refer specifically in the preamble to the super-Powers. The question of the relationship between disarmament and development was not one for any particular Government or group of Governments. The Secretary-General's report on the *Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament*,² based on replies from Governments, had shown that the high cost of arms was a typical problem in developing countries, where weapons expenditure was rising faster and constituted a drain on development capacities. Furthermore, the proposal to delete from operative paragraph 1 the reference to "limitations of arms" made the draft resolution less generally applicable to all Governments, large or small, and left only the general and abstract hope of progress towards general and complete disarmament.

27. In short, he did not find that the problems he had raised at the preceding meeting were in essence solved by the changes proposed. The United States did not oppose any effort to link the promise of disarmament with the release of resources for economic and social development, or appropriate discussions of the economic and social consequences of disarmament. But it did oppose the implications of some elements of the draft resolution, which presumed to propose measures to use resources that were not yet available. It would be better to concentrate on the separate problems of disarmament and development, while affirming the link between them, and not to consider spending \$65,000 to implement the draft resolution.

28. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that the wording of the fourth preambular paragraph, to which the United States had objected, was the closest possible adaptation of the wording used in the *Introduction to the Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization* (A/8001/Add.1, para. 19). He had not intended to give offence, and had not thought he could do so by using the wording of a United Nations document.

29. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan) said that he would vote for the draft resolution because he was in sympathy with its motives; but he could not support it without reservation. It lacked firmness, and was not acceptable to the Powers that would be responsible for translating it into practice. However, he would vote for it in view of its importance in relation to the International Development Strategy.

30. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the debate on the draft resolution should be postponed until the revised text was available to the Committee in all languages.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

¹ A/C.1/L.535.

² United Nations publication, Sales No. 62.IX.1.