

ENGLISH ONLY  
2nd October 1957

NATO CONFIDENTIAL  
WORKING PAPER  
AC/119-WP/84

COMMITTEE OF POLITICAL ADVISERS

ECE AND POLAND'S ELECTRIC POWER RESOURCES

Statement made by the United Kingdom Representative  
at the Committee's Meeting on 30th September 1957

We can accept the revised conclusions proposed by the US Delegation in AC/119-WP/80, subject to the following comments.

2. Our agreement relates to the nature of the reply to be given to Monsieur Sevette's enquiry about the specific proposals now under discussion. We agree that the present scheme is not one which we would wish to see promoted multilaterally, and that we should therefore be discouraging to the ECE Secretariat. However, this does not mean that similar proposals would in other circumstances necessarily be unacceptable. We agree that ECE is not normally the appropriate body to concern itself with investment in a single country. But ECE has already concerned itself with one scheme (YOUGELEXPOR) for the generation of electricity in one country for the benefit of several, and the Electricity Committee is to discuss the possibility of power exchanges between countries of central and southern Europe at its next meeting. Cases calling for multilateral financing may arise which would be appropriate to ECE. Indeed if several countries were to decide that they wished to pursue the scheme now under discussion, there would be good precedent for doing it in ECE.

3. It is important that NATO member countries in their attitude on the present question should not seem to be denying that ECE can consider joint development schemes. This would open the way to damaging attacks by the Russians at the next Plenary Session, especially in view of the grounds on which their proposals for an all-European Economic Agreement was rejected (i.e. that many of the subjects covered by it were capable of being dealt with in the individual committees). Arguments against the present proposals must therefore be particular and not general, and we cannot commit ourselves now as to our tactics in the Electricity Committee if the present question is raised there.

4. Unless the Secretariat and the Poles drop the question (which we think unlikely), it will be extremely difficult to prevent its discussion for long without being openly obstructive. We do not think that obstruction tactics will be acceptable.

5. As regards (c) of the revised conclusions in AC/119-WP/80, we do not disagree that the IBRD would be the appropriate UN agency to approach in schemes of this kind. But we suggest that it would be undesirable for all NATO countries to refer to the IBRD in their

NATO CONFIDENTIAL

replies to the Secretariat. This might seem to commit them to support Polish requests either for membership of the IMF or for IBRD assistance in promoting schemes such as that now in question. Both these points will have to be dealt with on their merits.

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

Palais de Chaillot,  
Paris, XVIe.