



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 6:	
Economic and social consequences of disarmament (<i>resumed from the 1368th meeting</i>)	223
Agenda item 34:	
Calendar of conferences for 1966	227
Credentials of representatives	227

President : Mr. A. MATSUI (Japan)

Present :

Representatives of the following States, members of the Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, France, Gabon, Iraq, Japan, Luxembourg, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Representatives of the following States, additional members of the sessional committees: Denmark, Ghana, India, Iran, Madagascar, Mexico, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania.

Observers for the following Member States: Bulgaria, Italy, Philippines, Sweden.

Observers for the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Holy See.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, World Health Organization, Universal Postal Union, World Meteorological Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Economic and social consequences of disarmament
(E/4029, E/4042; E/L.1078/Rev.1)
(*resumed from the 1368th meeting*)

1. Mr. AKBAR ADIL (Pakistan) introduced the revised draft resolution submitted by his delegation (E/L.1078/Rev.1) and said that it reflected the opinions expressed by the head of his delegation at the 1368th meeting on the economic and social consequences of disarmament as well as the divergent views of a large number of representatives on the subject, which had been taken into account in the hope of achieving unanimity.

2. It was unnecessary to emphasize the importance of using the resources released by disarmament for the economic and social development of the developing countries, particularly since the latest figures indicated that only 0.6 per cent of the national income of the developed countries, and not 1 per cent as recommended by the General Assembly, was being channelled to them.

3. In order to reproduce the wording of Council resolution 1026 (XXXVII), he suggested that operative paragraph 2 should be amended to read: "*Recommends* that Governments, particularly of those countries significantly involved, continue and develop . . ."

4. Mr. TRIVEDI (India) noted that the question of the economic and social consequences of disarmament had been discussed on many occasions by all members of the United Nations family, and that the draft resolution under consideration was non-controversial. He regretted, however, that it had not been referred to the Economic Committee, where it could have been discussed in greater detail.

5. His delegation considered that, in view of the large number of decisions already adopted on the subject, it would have been better, in the second preambular paragraph, to refer to all the most recent resolutions adopted by the main bodies of the United Nations instead of just quoting a passage from one resolution. For that reason, he suggested that that paragraph should be amended to read:

"*Recalling* General Assembly resolution 1931 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963, Economic and Social Council resolution 1026 (XXXVII), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development recommendation A.VI.10 of 15 June 1964, and the Disarmament Commission resolution of 15 June 1965."

6. It would also be better if the wording used in the last preambular paragraph was that adopted by the Disarmament Commission in its resolution of 15 June 1965 by an overwhelming majority, since representatives of the developing countries on that Commission had taken great pains to draw up a text acceptable to all, and in particular to the developed countries. Accordingly, he suggested that that paragraph should be amended to read:

"*Noting further* the desirability of devoting a substantial part of the resources that will be released through disarmament to the economic and social development of the developing countries, and welcoming the recommendation of the United Nations Disarmament Commission to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to keep this principle in mind in the Committee's negotiations."

7. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that over the years delegations had evolved a practice of submitting draft resolutions on the subject under consideration which could be adopted without reservations, particularly by the major Powers. The draft resolution before the Council which had emerged as a result of consultations between the Pakistan and other delegations was not, however, unexceptionable, since the last preambular paragraph would oblige his own delegation to enter a reservation. The difficulties raised by the Indian representative's proposed amendment to the last preambular paragraph were even greater, and if that amendment was adopted, the United States delegation would request a separate vote on that paragraph.

8. His delegation did not take the language of Council resolutions lightly, and was therefore concerned by the use of the word "substantial" in the last preambular paragraph. He would not attempt to define that word. However, if it were to be given any meaning, surely the suggestion that a substantial part of the net resources released by disarmament should be used to promote the economic and social development of the developing countries was quite unpractical, since it was not politically feasible for the developed countries even to imply that they could transfer resources of that magnitude and also because the developing countries, in the foreseeable future, would be unable to absorb capital of the volume suggested. His delegation's views on the subject did not, however, imply any change in the position it had maintained since 1953, that some portion of the resources released by disarmament should be used to promote the economic and social development of the developing countries.

9. For those reasons, his delegation, which would have preferred wording similar to that contained in previous General Assembly and Council resolutions on the subject, appealed to the Pakistan representative to delete the word "substantial" in the last preambular paragraph, and urged the Indian representative not to press his amendment to that paragraph.

10. Mr. SCOTT (United Kingdom) said that, generally speaking, the draft resolution under consideration was acceptable, and he agreed to the small drafting amendments made by the Pakistan representative.

11. His delegation experienced the same difficulties, however, in connexion with the use of the word "substantial" in the last preambular paragraph as those referred to by the United States representative, and for exactly the same reasons. If that word were maintained, his delegation would be obliged to enter a reservation, as had been done by the United Kingdom representative in connexion with similar wording used by the Disarmament Commission at its June 1965 session. If the Indian representative's amendment were adopted, the United Kingdom delegation would support the United States representative's proposal for a separate vote on that paragraph.

12. Mr. MAREI (United Arab Republic) thanked the Pakistan representative for having taken some of his delegation's observations on the original text of the draft resolution (E/L.1078) into account, and said that

he was in general agreement with the Indian representative's observations and proposed amendments.

13. He suggested that the title of the draft resolution should be the same as that of Council resolution 1026 (XXXVII), namely, "Economic and social consequences of disarmament: Conversion to peaceful needs of the resources released by disarmament", in order to emphasize the final objective.

14. Referring to the observations of the United Kingdom and the United States representatives, he said it was vital that the word "substantial" should be retained in the last preambular paragraph, and assured them that the developing countries would indeed be able to absorb resources of the magnitude suggested.

15. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that France which, together with the United Kingdom, had abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolution 1837 (XVII), had nevertheless submitted a comprehensive reply in 1962 to the first of the Secretary-General's questionnaires. It had also, in 1963, transmitted the information, although in summary form, it had been requested to send.

16. His Government had co-operated in those studies because it sympathized with the idea that the developing countries should benefit from a proportion of the savings achieved as a result of reducing military expenditure. In view of the growing disproportion between the extent of the studies undertaken by the United Nations and the less than promising prospects of general and complete disarmament, his delegation had considerable misgivings respecting the value of extending the scope of such studies.

17. The Pakistan representative's initiative was, however, laudable, since it was based on an idea which the French delegation had supported in the past and would again support in the future when effective disarmament would make it possible to provide the international community with new tools in its struggle against under-development. For the time being, it would be unrealistic for the Council to extend the scope of the studies that had been undertaken, since it would give a false impression of the amount of assistance that developed countries were able to provide to the developing countries. France preferred to continue its policy of economic, technical and cultural co-operation at levels and under conditions which represented one of the most effective methods of contributing to the development of the developing countries.

18. For those reasons, France had not replied to the Secretary-General's most recent inquiry and would probably adopt a similar attitude as regards any further such inquiries; it would abstain in the vote on the Pakistan draft resolution.

19. Mr. RAE (Canada) thanked the Pakistan representative for his initiative in submitting his draft resolution which represented a genuine effort to reconcile the views of a large number of delegations on a subject of great interest to all.

20. The Indian representative's proposed amendments raised some difficulty for his delegation since they had not been given due consideration and because, quite

apart from the additional resolutions which he had listed, there were others to which reference should be made; the Council should be consistent in the matter and he urged the Indian representative not to press his proposals.

21. His delegation was, however, prepared to accept the drafting amendments proposed by the sponsor, but preferred that the wording used in previous resolutions on the subject should be followed in the last preambular paragraph, in which reference should be made to the desirability of using a portion of the net resources released by disarmament for promoting the economic and social development of the developing countries. It was true, however, that the word "substantial" had been used by the Disarmament Commission, and if it was retained, his delegation would regard the words "the desirability of using a substantial part of the net resources so released" not as constituting a precise governmental commitment in any way, since the Canadian Government and Canadian constitutional process did not work in that way. His delegation would regard that paragraph as evidence of his Government's desire to do what it could, and, only after actual and concrete disarmament measures permitted, to divert a proportion of the net resources now required for defence purposes to purposes of economic and social development in the developing countries.

22. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his discussions with the head of the Pakistan delegation had given him the impression that no draft resolution on the economic and social consequences of disarmament would be submitted at the Council's present session. The USSR delegation had thought that no further resolutions on the subject were necessary, since the matter had been thoroughly discussed in the past and a large number of resolutions had been adopted and directives issued by the General Assembly and by the Council. Those resolutions and directives provided the entire United Nations family, including the regional economic commissions and the specialized agencies, with a sound legal basis for continuing work on the subject. Studies, both national and international, were being carried out, a great deal of information was being received by the United Nations Secretariat from governments as well as international bodies, and periodic reports based on that information were being submitted to the Council and General Assembly on the progress made.

23. Moreover, the present international situation was not exactly conducive to the promotion of further work in the field under consideration. It would be better to wait until circumstances were more propitious before the Council adopted a further resolution on the subject, and he suggested that the Pakistan representative should re-submit his draft resolution at a more favourable time.

24. He also questioned the wisdom of adopting the framework for national and international studies and activities regarding economic and social aspects of disarmament as set out in the annex to the draft resolution, since such studies were already being carried out. It would be better, in his view, to submit that framework to governments for consideration, particularly since it had not

been thoroughly discussed and it was uncertain whether it covered all relevant topics.

25. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) referred to operative paragraph 2 of and the annex to the draft resolution and drew attention to paragraphs 34-37 of the thirty-first report of the ACC (E/4029), which described the establishment, by the ACC, of a committee of representatives of agencies concerned to co-operate with the Secretary-General in developing a programme of studies in respect of the economic and social consequences of disarmament. That Committee had already met twice, and had prepared a draft questionnaire on the economic and social consequences of disarmament which was reproduced in annex I to the ACC report and in annex II to the Secretary-General's report (E/4042). That draft questionnaire was rather more sophisticated than the one proposed in the annex to the draft resolution under consideration, and might represent a more adequate formula in connexion with efforts to attain the goal that the Council had set itself.

26. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) welcomed the statement by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs. The work being carried out by the Inter-Agency Committee was useful and should be continued. However, it was not necessary for the Council to approve the frameworks which had been drawn up; the Secretary-General could transmit them directly to governments which could utilize them as they judged necessary in carrying out their studies of those questions.

27. A suitable time would undoubtedly come for the Council to return to the draft resolution. He reminded the Pakistan representative that the Soviet delegation had played a major role in the General Assembly in promoting the preparation of studies of the economic and social aspects of disarmament; that was a sufficient indication of its goodwill and of the importance it attached to work in that sector. It was on the initiative of the Soviet delegation that a number of resolutions on that subject had been adopted by the General Assembly and by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. The fact remained that draft resolutions such as that under discussion could only be effective when they were adopted unanimously, and that the effect on world opinion would be contrary to what was desired if a number of delegations abstained in the vote.

28. Mr. WILMOT (Ghana) said he did not consider that the objections raised by the United States representative and supported by the United Kingdom representative to the inclusion of the word "substantial" in the final preambular paragraph were valid. The preamble to the draft resolution did not ask governments to assume any commitments; it merely noted the desirability of using a substantial part of the resources released by disarmament for promoting development, and he failed to see how that desirability was annulled by the prevailing political situation in the United States of America.

29. The capacity of the developing countries to absorb a substantial part of the resources released by disarmament depended on the terms on which the resources

were offered; if, for example, they were made available free of charge, the developing countries would have no difficulty whatsoever in absorbing them.

30. Nor did he find any substance in the Soviet representative's argument that current political tensions made it undesirable to adopt the draft resolution at the present time. The draft resolution exhorted governments to continue and develop their studies of the best way of using the resources released by disarmament. The very fact that the Disarmament Commission had resumed its work, which might reach a successful conclusion in the foreseeable future, gave fresh urgency to the need to prepare the ground for the peaceful use of such resources.

31. He appealed to the Council to adopt the draft resolution, which was essentially non-controversial.

32. Mr. AKBAR ADIL (Pakistan) thanked the delegations which had supported the draft resolution.

33. In reply to the Soviet representative, he said that there appeared to have been some misunderstanding about the question of withdrawing the draft resolution; the head of his delegation had agreed in informal consultations that he would make every effort to meet the views of the Soviet delegation, but he had given no undertaking that he would withdraw the draft resolution. The Pakistan delegation would in fact have preferred to submit a more strongly worded resolution but had agreed to the present draft in recognition of the fact that a draft resolution of the kind could be effective only if it could command substantial support from the Council.

34. The Soviet representative had argued that it was not opportune to consider the draft resolution in view of current international tensions. The Pakistan Government was only too well aware of those tensions, which imposed a heavy burden on its budget and diverted resources from more positive activities, but he appealed to the Soviet delegation to consider that it was always opportune to plan for peace and progress. If the Council waited until all political tensions had been eased and all problems had been solved, it might have to wait indefinitely. He hoped that by adopting the draft resolution the Council could inform world opinion, that when disarmament was achieved, measures would be ready for alleviating the lot of many millions of human beings at present living in hunger and squalor.

35. With reference to the objections raised by the United States and the United Kingdom representatives to the word "substantial", he hoped that the interpretation given by the Canadian representative would enable them to withdraw their reservations. If the release of resources by disarmament did not result in substantial contributions to development, the under-developed countries would indeed be in a most unhappy position.

36. His delegation had great admiration for the notable contribution which France was making to the promotion of economic and social development and was grateful for the aid received from that country. He appreciated that the French Government might not be in a position to reply to the questionnaire within the framework con-

tained in the annex to the draft resolution, but he hoped that it would at least be able to indicate the progress made in its studies of the economic and social aspects of disarmament. He appealed to the French delegation to reconsider its intention to abstain from voting.

37. His delegation had considered the framework for studies and activities in annex II to document E/4042, to which the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs had referred, but it had preferred to annex to its draft resolution the framework provided by the Secretary-General in his *note verbale* (see E/4042, annex I) as being simpler and more likely to contribute to uniformity. As the Soviet representative had pointed out, the governments of Member States were free to modify the framework to suit their convenience.

38. He had no objection to the amendments suggested by the Indian delegation, but he thought that they might be unacceptable to some other delegations, and he would prefer not to incorporate them in the draft resolution, particularly at such a late stage.

39. Mr. KRÁLIK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had always taken an active part in the discussion of the economic and social consequences of disarmament; Czechoslovakia was a member of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and was contributing to its success. He agreed, however, with the Soviet representative that, in view of the current international situation, the time was not ripe to adopt the draft resolution; if it were put to the vote, his delegation would be obliged to abstain.

40. Mr. GMOSE (Austria) said that in view of his country's neutral position, he would be unable to support the draft resolution in spite of his sympathy with its purpose. Austria strongly supported all efforts to reach agreement on disarmament and had reduced its own armed forces to a minimum. That would continue to be his Government's policy in the future.

41. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized that his delegation's attitude to the draft resolution did not imply any change in its policy with regard to studies of the ways in which resources released by disarmament could be applied to the advancement of the developing countries. There was no doubt that general and complete disarmament would release very considerable resources for that purpose and his delegation's record in the General Assembly and the Conference on Trade and Development clearly indicated that it strongly supported every effort in that direction. At the present juncture, however, the Council would be closing its eyes to reality if it adopted the draft resolution, and such action could have only a negative effect on world opinion.

42. He appealed to the Pakistan representative to withdraw the draft resolution.

43. The PRESIDENT suggested that further discussion of the draft resolution be deferred until a later meeting in order to allow delegations to hold informal consultations.

44. Mr. RAE (Canada) supported the President's suggestion. It was most important that a draft resolution of the kind should receive the widest possible support and informal consultations might make that possible. He, for one, would also welcome an opportunity to consider the framework contained in annex II to document E/4042, to which the Under-Secretary for Social and Economic Affairs had referred.

45. Mr. AKBAR ADIL (Pakistan) said that his delegation was willing to accept the President's suggestion.

It was agreed to defer further discussion of the draft resolution until a later meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 34

Calendar of conferences for 1966 (E/4099, E/4111)

46. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report by the Secretary-General (E/4111), containing the recommendations of the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences on the draft calendar of conferences for 1966 (E/4099).

47. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation was ready to support the provisional adoption by the Council of the calendar of conferences for 1966 in document E/4099, subject to its review at the resumed thirty-ninth session. The Council should bear in mind, however, the request by the General Assembly in resolution 1987 (XVIII) and should consider the possibility of reducing the number and duration of the meetings of its functional commissions and other subsidiary bodies. The Council had decided to maintain the established time-table of the meetings of those bodies for the current year, but it would need to review the schedule of meetings for 1966. A decision would, for example, have to be reached on the desirability of holding a meeting of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning in the coming year.

48. He agreed with the suggested dates for the next summer session of the Council but it might be desirable to resume the practice of convening the Co-ordination Committee a week or two before the opening of the Council's session. That would enable the Committee to dispose of a number of minor items on its agenda in advance

and to concentrate its attention on major items during the session itself.

49. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that his delegation was also prepared to support the provisional adoption of the calendar of conferences.

50. He sympathized with the suggestion to reduce the number of meetings but did not agree that it should be done in the way suggested by the French representative. The best procedure would be to reduce the duration rather than the frequency of sessions. On several occasions during the current session the United States delegation had stated that the Council's work was unbalanced in that insufficient attention was given to social and human rights and to questions relating to the status of women. The work of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning had both social and economic aspects, and he hoped that it and the functional commissions would continue to meet annually.

51. His delegation would express its views at the resumed thirty-ninth session on the suggestion that the Co-ordination Committee should meet in advance of the opening of the Council's summer session.

52. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council adopt provisionally the draft calendar of conferences for 1966 (E/4099), with the amendments recommended by the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences (E/4111, para. 2), subject to review at the resumed thirty-ninth session in the light of any relevant action by the General Assembly and when more information would be available regarding the 1966 programme of meetings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

It was so decided.

Credentials of representatives

53. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the report of the President and Vice-Presidents on the credentials of representatives to the thirty-ninth session of the Council (E/4112).

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.