

**CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT**

ENDC/PV.345
6 November 1967
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIFTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Monday, 6 November 1967, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. P. WINKLER

(Czechoslovakia)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A.F. AZEREDO da SILVEIRA
Mr. A. da COSTA GUIMARAES
Mr. S. de QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. CHRISTOV
Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV
Mr. T. DAMIANOV

Burma:

U KYAW MIN

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
Mr. A.G. CAMPBELL
Mr. J.R. MORDEN
Mr. A. BERNIER

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. P. WINKLER
Mr. V. VAJNAR
Mr. J. STRUCKA

Ethiopia:

Mr. A. ZELLEKE

India:

Mr. N. KRISHNAN
Mr. K.P. JAIN

Italy:

Mr. R. CARACCILOLO
Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI
Mr. E. FRANCO
Mr. F. SORO

Mexico:

Miss E. AGUIRRE

Nigeria:

Alhaji SULE KOLO
Mr. B.O. TONWE

Poland:

Mr. A. CZARKOWSKI
Mr. E. STANIEWSKI

Romania:

Mr. N. ECOBESCO

Mr. O. IONESCO

Mr. A. COROIANU

Mr. C. MITRAN

Sweden:

Mr. A. EDELSTAM

Mr. R. BOMAN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN

Mr. V.V. SHUSTOV

Mr. V.B. TOULINOV

Mr. V.A. SEMENOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. O. SIRRY

Mr. M. SHAKER

United Kingdom:

Sir Harold BEELEY

Mr. I.F. PORTER

Mr. R.I.T. CROMARTIE

United States of America:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER

Mr. S. DePALMA

Mr. C.G. BREAN

Mr. A.F. NEIDLE

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

1. The CHAIRMAN (Czechoslovakia): I declare open the 345th plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.
2. I should like, as Chairman of today's meeting, to welcome back Mr. Foster, who is joining us again. I think I may say on behalf of the whole Committee that we are sure his contribution to our work will be of considerable value.
3. Permit me to say a few further words before I call on the first speaker on the list for today's meeting. On the eve of the fiftieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, I should like, both on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation and, with the permission of the Committee, as Chairman of this meeting, to congratulate heartily the delegation of the Soviet Union on this great day for the Soviet people.
4. Not only is 7 November the national day of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, but the events marked by this anniversary have had far-reaching significance beyond the boundaries of the Soviet Union -- indeed in the life of nations all over the world. Those events have had a deep influence on the life of the nations of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic as well. They were among the most important factors in the establishment of the independent Czechoslovak State in 1918, and more than twenty years later the heroic fight against fascism and the sacrifices made by the countless victims of the nations of the Soviet Union during the Second World War contributed in a decisive manner to the liberation of my country from Nazi occupation.
5. The role played by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, consistently urging the application of the principles of peaceful co-existence in relations among States with different social and economic systems, is generally known and recognized -- in particular as regards the endeavours to put an end to the arms race and to achieve the goal of disarmament. I think it is most appropriate to recall here in our Committee that it was upon the initiative of the Soviet Government that the question of general and complete disarmament, rightly described as the most urgent issue of the present time and the most important task before this Committee, was placed on the agenda of disarmament negotiations (General Assembly resolution 1378 (XIV)).
6. In concluding these few remarks that I am making with the permission of the Committee, I should like to avail myself of this most significant occasion to extend to the Soviet delegation, and through it to all the Soviet people, our best

(The Chairman, Czechoslovakia)

wishes for success both in their further work in developing their own country and in their efforts to maintain and strengthen peace and security all over the world.

7. Mr. CHRISTOV (Bulgaria) (translation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest pleasure in associating myself with the words of greeting which you have addressed to the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the great October Socialist Revolution. In this connexion I should like to convey to Ambassador Roshchin, the representative of the Soviet Union and a co-Chairman of our Committee, the heartiest congratulations of the Bulgarian delegation.

8. As the representative of a socialist country, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, which is linked by the closest fraternal and friendly ties to the Soviet Union, I should like at this moment to express the sincerest feelings of gratitude for everything which the great October Socialist Revolution has given to my country and to the Bulgarian people, for that inspiring example in the struggle for real political, economic and social liberation, for that enormous disinterested assistance in building a new socialist society.

9. Half a century separates us from those memorable days when, under the leadership of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party created by him, the first socialist revolution in history was accomplished, opening new and wide horizons for the further universal development of the modern world and of all mankind. It would be impossible to list all the events which have filled these fifty years from 1917 to our days. But we all know very well that many and the most important of these events bear the imprint of the great October Revolution, are imbued with its revolutionary spirit and inseparably linked with the work and role of the Soviet State - the offspring of the revolution.

10. During half a century filled with a hard struggle against the hostile forces of imperialism, by a gigantic effort of radical reconstruction, heroically overcoming incredible difficulties, the Soviet peoples, inspired by the revolutionary ideas of October, built the first socialist State and raised it to the heights of modern civilization, creating unique conditions for the flowering of the economy, technology, science and culture for the benefit of all. As a result of all this, the Soviet Union is paving in our time new ways for the future of mankind, sending its sputniks to the moon and neighbouring planets, setting a magnificent example which proves that there is no limit to man's daring or achievements, when the work and energy of millions of people are free and directed towards peaceful creation.

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

11. In these days, not only in Leningrad, the cradle of the Revolution, and in Moscow, the capital of the Soviet Union, but also at other places throughout the world, hundreds of millions of people are worthily celebrating the enormous impact of the great October Socialist Revolution and of the ideas which it has been radiating for already half a century. There can be no doubt that, at the celebrations which are being held elsewhere on this occasion, reference will be made to the decisive significance of the October Revolution for the liberation of many peoples and countries from colonial servitude, to the great impetus given by the October Revolution to the process of social transformation and the extraordinary forward movement leading to the progress in all spheres which the world owes to that event.

12. I am convinced that, besides admiring the great achievements of the Soviet Union in the building of socialism, in industry and technology and in all branches of science and culture, the peoples of the world note with gratitude the role of the Soviet Union in international life as a decisive factor in the struggle against war, for the elimination of all hotbeds of conflict, and as the most powerful and the staunchest defender of peace. The call for peace, as has often been pointed out, was the first cry of the new-born Soviet State. Its first step in the international arena was the historic Decree on Peace signed by Lenin, proclaiming peace as the fundamental aim of the foreign policy of the new State.

13. Steadfastly pursuing this aim, the Soviet State showed at the very beginning of its existence that the most reliable means and the shortest way to put an end to wars and to establish peace in relations between States was the way of disarmament. Lenin called disarmament the "ideal of socialism" and set it as the immediate practical aim of Soviet foreign policy. It should be remembered that the first Soviet proposals for general disarmament - or for partial disarmament if other countries would not agree to general disarmament - were submitted at the Genoa Conference.

14. From then on, for half a century, the Soviet Union has steadfastly pursued the struggle for peace, submitting many proposals on disarmament and suggesting a

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

number of new approaches. This Committee knows the Soviet proposals (ENDC/PV.193, pp.27 et seq.; ENDC/123, pp. 4,5) for the reduction of armed forces and for the reduction of military expenditure, and the Soviet plan for general and complete disarmament under strict international control (ENDC/2/Rev.1). It is also aware that, when the atomic threat began to loom over the world, the Soviet Union was the first to raise the question of prohibiting the manufacture and use of atomic weapons and of eliminating the stockpiles of such weapons (AEC/PV.2, pp.65 et seq.)

15. We realize, of course, that today disarmament problems are a cause of great concern to all countries. These problems profoundly affect the most vital interests of the peoples of the whole world. It is common knowledge that the arms race and the consequent dissipation of enormous material resources, labour and intellectual energy are draining away the vital forces of the popular masses. The tension created by the accumulation of ever newer and more improved means of mass destruction causes steadily growing concern and a widespread feeling of danger. In these circumstances all countries are faced with difficult tasks relating to the problems of security, economic development and the life of the nation as a whole. But how many countries can solve such tasks by their own means? Are there any such countries at all?

16. Precisely in this connexion, when questions of what I would call world significance arise, it seems to us that the special part played by the Soviet Union in the struggle for disarmament should be noted. At this moment, when we congratulate the delegation of the Soviet Union to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament on the occasion of the great anniversary of the Soviet peoples and the Soviet State, historical truth compels us to emphasize that the Soviet Union has not only made the disarmament problem the fundamental aim of its foreign policy. With all the authority and the enormous influence of the world's first socialist State, it has also raised the question of disarmament as the paramount concern of all mankind and has confirmed it as the central problem of the modern world.

17. There is no aspect or particular point of the whole range of disarmament problems which has not been the subject of one Soviet initiative or another. All these initiatives and proposals, even when they have related to individual disarmament measures because of the need to take into account the possibilities of a given moment, have always been directed towards the historical perspective, the great aim of general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

18. At the current session of the Committee the Soviet delegation has repeatedly confirmed this fact when discussing the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. And we should now like to express once again our delegation's hope that the efforts for the conclusion of such a treaty are nearing the desired result, and to state our conviction that this will be yet another decisive step on the road to disarmament, opening new possibilities for the solution of other problems, leading to the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

19. Inspired by the ideas of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and in the hard struggle for their realization, for the strengthening of peace and the security of peoples, the Soviet Government recently submitted a draft resolution at the twenty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly on one of the most important questions of our time: the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Since the question of nuclear disarmament measures was frequently touched upon by many delegations when the draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons was discussed, I venture to quote a passage from the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Mr. Gromyko, in the United Nations General Assembly:

"The Soviet Government suggests that each State signing the convention should undertake not to use nuclear weapons, not to threaten their use and not to induce other States to use such weapons. We are also proposing that each State party to the convention should undertake to exert the utmost effort with a view to the prompt achievement of agreement to end the production and to destroy all accumulated stockpiles of nuclear weapons under a treaty of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

"These are the key provisions of the draft convention which the Soviet Government is submitting for the attention of all State Members of the United Nations. Their essence may be expressed still more succinctly: the Soviet Union is proposing that nuclear weapons be done away with politically and that the road further, towards their physical scrapping, be sought now.

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

"Sometimes the question is posed: would it not be preferable right away to agree to eliminate nuclear weapons completely? That would indeed be much better. And our country is willing to take this step. It is not we who are afraid of radical solutions ensuring the complete removal of the threat of nuclear war. The Soviet Union has repeatedly advanced proposals for complete nuclear disarmament, and we are prepared to accept it this very moment."

(A/PV.1563 (provisional), p.66)

"We mention this today", said Mr. Gromyko, "not because on the eve of a great jubilee we should like once again to demonstrate the humaneness of the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union. We are in duty bound to raise anew the pressing questions of disarmament at the session of the General Assembly of the United Nations by awareness of the fact that unless we intervene in a most determined way in the field from which there originates immense danger for the destinies of all mankind - the field of the nuclear armaments race - all plodges of dedication to the ideals of peace proclaimed in the United Nations Charter will remain a dead letter". (ibid., p.62)

20. The humaneness referred to by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union is reflected with particular clarity in the struggle for peace and disarmament and assumes exceptional importance in the atomic era of today. There is no doubt that the greatest hopes for solution of the problems of disarmament derive from the fact that disarmament is the unchanging ideal of socialism, as Lenin taught, and the primary aim of Soviet foreign policy; because this foreign policy is rooted in the nature of the socialist system, in those lofty ideals which the October Revolution proclaimed fifty years ago.

21. For this reason, in expressing to the delegation of the Soviet Union once again our sincerest and heartiest greetings on this great anniversary, we salute all the historic achievements of the October Revolution and the unceasing struggle of the Soviet Union for peace and disarmament, for disarmament and peace, in the profound belief that it will be crowned with success.

22. Mr. BURNS (Canada): In view of the references which you, Mr. Chairman, and the representative of Bulgaria have made to the fact that tomorrow will be the fiftieth anniversary of the great events which resulted in the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Canadian delegation would like to offer

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

congratulations to the people of the Soviet Union on the great development of their economy and society which has been obtained in the past fifty years. We should also like to offer to the Russian people our best wishes for even greater progress and prosperity in the next fifty years. Everyone realizes, I think, that if that is to come about it must be in a world of peace.

23. In recent statements the Canadian delegation has commented on amendments proposed by the Mexican (ENDC/196) and United Arab Republic (ENDC/197) delegations. We feel that an exchange of views on suggested amendments as well as on the draft treaty language contained in documents ENDC/192 and ENDC/193 is essential to the process of negotiating the form of a final draft, a process which we hope will soon be completed. In my statement today I shall offer some observations on the amendments which have been proposed by the Romanian delegation in document ENDC/199, and on the amendments which have been proposed by the Brazilian delegation in document ENDC/201. I shall commence with the Romanian proposals. There are certain amendments having the same general effect which have been proposed by both delegations.

24. The first amendment proposed by the Romanian delegation is that after the third preambular paragraph of the draft treaty there should be inserted the following:

"Recognizing that the danger of a nuclear war can be eliminated only by the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons, the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, and the destruction of all existing stock-piles of such weapons and of the means of their delivery".

In the view of the Canadian delegation that statement relates to general and complete disarmament and therefore goes beyond the scope of the treaty we are endeavouring to negotiate, which should be confined to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. The Canadian delegation feels that the ninth, tenth and eleventh paragraphs in the preamble of the United States and USSR draft treaties (ENDC/192/193) express in a more appropriate way the relation which should exist between an agreement on non-proliferation and further measures of disarmament facilitating the way towards general and complete disarmament. Of course, the language in those preambular paragraphs could no doubt be improved, and the Committee has heard suggestions concerning how that might be done, which we understand the co-Chairmen are carefully considering.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

25. The next proposal by the Romanian delegation is to add a paragraph to the preamble citing the principles set out in General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX) (ENDC/161). The Canadian delegation does not feel that it would be appropriate to do that. As we understand it, the object of a preamble is to explain the general purpose of a treaty and the circumstances which render it desirable that it be concluded, and it would not be customary to include specifications for its formulation. The representative of Romania, in explaining why he proposes the inclusion of those four principles, has said in effect that they constitute precise criteria forming the basis for the establishment of an appropriate treaty. The Canadian delegation has previously contested such a view, pointing out that the principles are not precise in meaning, in particular because the term "proliferate" or "proliferation" is not defined but is given different meanings by different parties. Paragraph 2 (b) of the resolution, speaking of "an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations", is also very imprecise. Obviously, as we have heard here, what certain delegations define as "an acceptable balance" is not considered by other delegations as acceptable at all.

26. Sub-paragraph (d), stating "There should be acceptable and workable provisions to ensure the effectiveness of the treaty", is indeed very vague in its terms and could also mean different things to different parties. I would repeat that the Canadian delegation considers that the inclusion of those principles taken from General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX) would be unhelpful and unnecessary.

27. The third amendment proposed by the representative of Romania suggests adding to the existing language in the preamble, which states: "Undertaking to co-operate in facilitating the application of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities" (ENDC/192, 193), the following words: "in accordance with the bilateral or multilateral agreements concluded by them". The Canadian delegation understands that International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards are, in accordance with the statute of the Agency and in practice, always established through agreements concluded between the Agency and the country to have its activities safeguarded. Therefore, although there would be no objection in principle, that addition to the existing text would seem redundant.

28. I referred to the fourth suggested amendment in a brief intervention, (ENDC/PV.340, para.42) immediately after the representative of Romania had first proposed it. That amendment would appear on the face of it to permit all States to

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

undertake research on the application of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. To allow freedom to conduct research and to develop and use nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes would be the principal effect of the amendments introduced by the Brazilian delegation, and I shall reserve my comments on that question and those proposals until later in this statement.

29. The fifth amendment proposed by the Romanian delegation would change the words at the top of page 2 in the draft treaty text given in document ENDC/193 from "Declaring their intention" to "Expressing their determination". The Canadian delegation finds the original language more appropriate in relation to the benefits to be available to -- not to be forced upon -- non-nuclear-weapon States. To add the words "accepted by all States signatories to the Treaty" after the word "procedures" would in our opinion be undesirable. It is generally agreed that a separate international arrangement should be made in regard to these procedures. If an acceptance by all States signatories to the treaty is to be made a condition, it could permit considerable delay and obstruction.

30. The sixth amendment proposed by the Romanian delegation would suggest that the elimination from national arsenals of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery should take place before agreement on general and complete disarmament. That would be contrary to the principle upon which negotiation for general and complete disarmament is to be based: namely that there should be a balanced reduction of nuclear and conventional armaments (ENDC/5, p.2).

31. The article III-A proposed by the Romanian delegation would in our view go beyond what it is reasonable to expect the nuclear Powers parties to this treaty to agree to. We have again the introduction of the imprecise term "as soon as possible". What if the nuclear Powers do not find it possible within five years to stop manufacturing nuclear weapons and to destroy those they have? There is an implied threat in the second sub-paragraph proposed by the Romanian delegation from which it would appear that the duration of the treaty would be no longer than five years if this article III-A were accepted as an amendment.

32. The article III-B proposed by Romania enters into the difficult problem of guarantees. At the moment the Canadian delegation must say that it believes that, if delegations insist on including guarantees of any sort in the substantive articles of the non-proliferation treaty, we shall probably be here until this time in 1968, if not longer. The delegation of Nigeria has proposed an additional article to the

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

treaty dealing with this subject, which is set out in document ENDC/202. We intend to offer some further comments on this question when we discuss the proposals of Nigeria as a whole, as we hope to do in a later intervention. The Canadian delegation understands that the co-Chairmen are studying the problem of guarantees against nuclear aggression, a problem which concerns many countries. It seems that that problem would be more readily soluble if the desired guarantee were to be given in the form of some instrument other than the non-proliferation treaty.

33. The Romanian delegation also suggests amending article IV by inserting the words "on a basis of equality" between "nuclear energy for peaceful purposes" and "without discrimination". Surely "without discrimination" means "on a basis of equality", and therefore the proposed amendment would seem to be redundant.

34. The effect of the amendment proposed by the Romanian delegation to article V would be that amendments made to the treaty subsequent to its entry into force could apply only to the nations which themselves ratified them. It would seem that the co-Chairmen should consider the effect of that proposed amendment. It appears to the Canadian delegation that a change of that nature might make the treaty more widely acceptable.

35. The second amendment to article V proposed by the Romanian delegation, that there should be provision for a review conference every five years, would seem to be in line with the thinking of a number of other delegations. No doubt the co-Chairmen will be considering that proposal.

36. The Romanian delegation proposes deleting from article VII the last sentence, which states in the existing drafts: "Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events it regards as having jeopardized its supreme interests." We do not understand why a nation which intended to take the drastic step of withdrawing from the treaty should not be prepared to explain why it was doing so. Withdrawal from the obligations imposed on the parties by their adherence to the treaty would be taken in general to mean that the withdrawing party intended to acquire or produce nuclear weapons. It seems very clear that this could induce a chain reaction which might lead to the complete breakdown of the treaty. The Canadian delegation feels that the taking of such an important step would require explanation and an examination of the problem, with a view to preventing such an unfortunate result.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

37. I shall now make a few comments on the amendments (ENDC/201) put forward by the representative of Brazil at our 343rd meeting.

38. The principal effect of the amendments proposed to articles I and II of the draft treaties presented by the United States and the Soviet Union in documents ENDC/192 and 193 would be to remove the prohibition on the acquisition or development and production of "other nuclear explosive devices". In the proposed amendment to article IV the language used would permit for all countries research, production and the use of "nuclear explosive devices for civil uses".

39. There is therefore no ambiguity about what has been advanced by the representative of Brazil. He proposes, in sum, that the draft treaty should be amended so that any signatory to the treaty should be allowed to produce and use nuclear explosive devices for peaceful purposes. Members of the Committee will recall the statements of the experts assembled here for the drafting of the Secretary-General's report (A/6858) on the effects of the acquisition of nuclear weapons. Their statements were to the effect that there was no difference between the explosion of a nuclear weapon and a nuclear explosion for peaceful purposes. Besides that, we have had repeated statements to the same effect by the nuclear Powers represented in this Committee. No one in this Committee has attempted to show how a peaceful nuclear explosion could differ from the explosion of a nuclear weapon --- and for a very good reason. It is impossible to do so.

40. So a nuclear explosion "for civil uses" is equivalent to the explosion of a nuclear weapon. There is no essential difference between nuclear explosions, whatever the purpose of their use. Therefore the effect of the proposed Brazilian amendments would be that, while nominally prohibiting the acquisition or production of nuclear weapons, the treaty would in effect permit them, provided that the country producing and developing them stated that they were for peaceful purposes. That, of course, would make a treaty so amended complete nonsense. It suggests an analogy. A man who had been advised that alcohol was very bad for his health declared to his wife and friends that he would never, never drink cognac or vodka but that he reserved his right to drink as much whisky as he liked, as it was of course non-alcoholic if declared to be used for medicinal purposes. The Canadian delegation hopes that, after further consideration, the Brazilian delegation will not insist on the amendments it has proposed to articles I, II and IV.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

41. The Canadian delegation is also unable to agree with the proposed Brazilian amendment to article VII, on the duration of the treaty and the right of withdrawal therefrom. Our reasons have already been given with reference to the amendment to that article proposed by the Romanian delegation.

42. The Brazilian proposal for a new article II-A reads as follows:

"Each nuclear weapon State Party to this Treaty undertakes the obligation to negotiate at the earliest possible date a Treaty for the cessation of nuclear arms race and for the eventual reduction and elimination of their nuclear arsenals and the means of delivery of their nuclear weapons."

We doubt that an article in those terms would really be more effective than the declaration of intent proposed in the existing United States and Soviet drafts: namely, to put a stop to the arms race and to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear arsenals. We have criticized in connexion with one of the Romanian proposals the use of the term "earliest possible date" as having no specific meaning. Furthermore, the proposed Brazilian article is open to the same objection as that which we cited in regard to one of the proposed Romanian articles: namely that it calls for the elimination of nuclear weapons while saying nothing about the principle of parallel reduction of conventional armaments. This principle is one of the bases of general and complete disarmament.

43. However, in spite of our objections to the proposals advanced by the Brazilian and Romanian delegations in this particular matter, we would say that there seems to be a desire on the part of a good many countries whose representatives have spoken in discussing the terms of the draft treaties to have a substantive article under which the nuclear Powers would make some more specific and positive commitment to proceed to real disarmament measures than a declaration of intention in the preamble. We hope the co-Chairmen will give attention to that matter. We should think that a formulation along the lines of the article IV-C proposed by the delegation of Mexico (ENDC/196) might be about as far as it would be realistic to expect the nuclear Powers to go.

44. The Brazilian delegation has proposed a new paragraph in article VI which would refer to the rights and obligations of signatory States under regional treaties, and this would have the effect of making a substantive article of what is stated in the last paragraph of the preamble in the United States and Soviet Union drafts. The

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

delegation of Mexico has made a somewhat similar proposal, upon which the Canadian delegation has previously commented. In our view the Mexican formulation is more appropriate. While we do not think that amendments such as those proposed are essential, we should have no objection if a text could be agreed upon.

45. However, while speaking of agreements to exclude nuclear weapons from certain regions, I should like to cite a statement made this year in the discussion of General Assembly item 91, "Treaty for the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America". On 27 October Mr. Mendelevich, representing the Soviet Union, is reported to have said that this treaty (ENDC/186) contained some provisions which introduced an element of ambiguity. He said this was confirmed by various interpretations given by the signatories themselves. Contracting Powers were allowed to carry out peaceful nuclear explosions with devices similar to nuclear weapons; and this, he declared, could not be reconciled with the aims of the treaty. Between military devices and those for peaceful explosions there were no distinctions of principle; so States producing so-called peaceful explosions would also have the ability to produce nuclear weapons. Mr. Mendelevich stated that the Soviet Union had informed the participants in the treaty negotiations of its views regarding the matter. The Soviet Union had declared that a solution to the problem had to be found which would close any loophole. The inclusion of a provision on peaceful explosions could only complicate matters. Mr. Mendelevich said that the Soviet Union had expressed the hope that its views would be taken into account by negotiators, but the treaty still contained this provision.

46. In concluding, I should like to quote a paragraph from the Secretary-General's report on the security and economic implications for States of the acquisition and further development of nuclear weapons. I suppose that all of us have read this most impressive report carefully, and I shall be constantly referring to it as we continue our deliberations:

"The basic facts about the nuclear bomb and its use are harsh and terrifying for civilization; they have become lost in a mass of theoretical verbiage. It has been claimed that the world has learnt to live with the bomb; it is also said there is no need for it to drift unnecessarily into the position that it is prepared to die for it.

The ultimate question for the world to decide in our nuclear age -- and

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

this applies both to nuclear and non-nuclear Powers -- is what short-term interests it is prepared to sacrifice in exchange for an assurance of survival and security." (A/6858, para. 42)

I think the last sentence is of particular interest to us in our negotiations here. What short-term interests are our countries prepared to sacrifice in exchange for an assurance of survival and security?

47. We know that the only long-term assurance of survival and security will be the elimination of nuclear weapons and, with their elimination, the ending of the possibility of nuclear warfare. We realize also that this elimination of nuclear weapons must be attained by a series of progressive measures. It has been agreed generally in the United Nations that the first and the most urgent of those measures is that on which we are now negotiating, a treaty to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. If we do not succeed in agreeing on this treaty, there is little prospect for further progress towards general disarmament and the nuclear disarmament which is the most important component of it. Therefore I would emphasize again the great responsibility borne by all nations represented here to put the long-term interests of their countries and of all the world ahead of their short-term interests. Only if we keep the long-term interests constantly in view will there be hope for progress and hope for an eventual assurance of survival and security.

48. Mr. ECOBESCO (Romania) (translation from French): The special character of our meeting today is due to the fact that it is being held on the very eve of the fiftieth anniversary of the great October Socialist Revolution, which has been the event of this century in world history.

49. During the five decades which have followed that moment, which was a crossroads in the history of a great people as well as in the destinies of mankind, gigantic changes have taken place in the life of the whole of human society. Many countries and peoples, among them Romania, have chosen the path of the construction of a new society, the socialist society. The world socialist system constitutes in our days an integral part of the modern world and exerts an undeniable influence on its progress. At the present time no international problem, including the problem of disarmament, can be solved in a lasting and natural manner without the direct participation of the socialist States.

(Mr. Ecobesco, Romania)

50. In proclaiming the ideas of peace and friendship among peoples, the October Revolution acquired a merit of historic scope. The Soviet Government, denouncing the unjust treaties and agreements imposed on the peoples by the Tsarist Government, proclaimed in its first legislative act, the Decree on Peace, the principle of the establishment of relations between States on the basis of equality and mutual respect.

51. The road travelled by the Soviet Union during the fifty years of its existence is impressive. During that period it has become a great industrial Power, endowed with advanced technological and scientific resources, in certain extremely important fields of modern research. The achievements of the Soviet Union in the study and conquest of outer space -- and we have lately witnessed brilliant exploits -- in the use of atomic energy, rocket technology, electronics, and other fields are important contributions to mankind's scientific and technical progress and arouse the admiration of the whole world. The many-sided and complex picture of the progress achieved by the world's first socialist State is acclaimed with deep sympathy over the whole earth.

52. In sharing the Soviet Union's proper feelings of joy and pride on the occasion of this glorious jubilee, Romania and the whole Romanian people convey to it, in the spirit of fraternal friendship which marks the relations between the two countries and peoples, sincere congratulations and heartfelt wishes for new and greater successes. We have particular pleasure in extending to the Soviet delegation in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, on behalf of the Romanian delegation, our warmest congratulations on the great event of the fiftieth anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution.

53. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland): I have particular pleasure in joining the previous speakers in conveying our most cordial and best wishes to the representative of the Soviet Union and to the Soviet delegation on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Great Socialist Revolution.

54. A half-century ago a new era in the history of mankind was opened: the first socialist State was born. It has based its system of government upon social justice; it has undertaken the ambitious task of creating a new society where man does not exploit his fellow man, where all men have truly equal political, social and economic rights, where one nation does not oppress another nation. These principles have

(Mr. Czarkowski, Poland)

mobilized and united the people of the Soviet Union in achievements never before known in history. They have permitted the reshaping of a backward country into a most modern and universally developed State, the first in the world, which plays today the role of a decisive stabilizing factor in the maintenance of international peace and security.

55. Thanks to the Great October Revolution, Poland in 1918 regained its national independence after 150 years of partition. During the Second World War we were saved by Soviet victory from complete annihilation by Nazi Germany. After that war we received generous assistance from the Soviet Union, permitting us quickly to rebuild our country from devastation. All that is fully recognized in Poland and will be remembered for ever. That is why we in Poland celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the Great Socialist Revolution together with the Soviet Union, our friend and ally.

56. Let me conclude by wishing the Soviet people new successes in multiplying the realization of the ideas of the Great Socialist Revolution in the further development of their country and in their struggle for lasting peace, to which we here in this Committee try to contribute.

57. Mr. AZEREDO da SILVEIRA (Brazil): I did not intend to take the floor today, but I could not remain silent after what was said by the representative of Canada. In the first place, as I emphasized when I presented the Brazilian amendments, those were amendments presented by my Government, and I cannot accept a statement that any of those amendments would make the treaty complete nonsense. I have explained time and time again in this Committee and elsewhere the reasons why we are convinced that the non-proliferation treaty, which we consider an important step towards general and complete disarmament, should not in any way prejudice the economic and social development of the developing nations of the world. That is our main preoccupation; but we are not trying to simplify our position. We think that the real problem of nuclear explosive devices is a problem of control. What we do believe to be nonsense is speaking about these devices without knowing what we are going to decide about control. We do not know, nobody here knows, how we are going to effect control. So we have a very big loop-hole that has not yet been covered, and we are preoccupied with a secondary aspect of the possibility of proliferation.

(Mr. Azeredo da Silveira, Brazil)

58. The basic point is to have good controls and safeguards. If you have good controls and safeguards, you have the possibility also of controlling nuclear explosions. What has always surprised me in this Committee is that we are basing the non-proliferation treaty on one fact -- and I believe it is a realistic fact -- that we can rely on the will of the super-Powers because the nuclear weapons themselves can provide the necessary deterrent. If the deterrent works with regard to the super-Powers, which is more difficult than with the small, non-nuclear Powers, it would certainly work for the non-nuclear and poor nations of the world. I cannot imagine any poor nation or any nation that is not a military nuclear Power using peaceful devices as armaments even if it wanted to; it would not have the power to use them. The deterrent would work in a much stronger way with a non-nuclear-weapon Power. Even if the device might have some characteristics which are the same as those of a bomb, how could a poor, non-nuclear country use a peaceful nuclear device for war, considering the power of the deterrent?

59. What we are doing here is basing all our negotiations on the deterrent. We know that the super-Powers will not attack each other or any other secondary nuclear Power, because they will not be in a position to defend themselves, and that would work in the same way with the non-nuclear Powers. We also believe that nobody is going to put a stop to the intelligence of man. We believe we are far-sighted in this regard, for we believe that in a very few years everybody will be using nuclear explosive devices; and it is going to be very hard to prevent these explosive devices from proliferating if we do not have adequate controls.

60. As the Committee knows, in most of the countries where experiments are being conducted with nuclear explosive devices, those devices will have to be handled not only by governmental officials but even by private enterprises. How are we possibly going to stop the technicians and scientists in private enterprises from learning the technology of peaceful nuclear devices? Therefore I do not think it is nonsense to believe that we should now go a little further and study this problem in a very serious way in order to try to find out what are the necessary controls for allowing countries to use peaceful nuclear devices for their development.

(Mr. Azeredo da Silveira, Brazil)

61. In addition to that, we also believe, as I have stated here, that peaceful explosions are a necessary step in the acquisition of nuclear technology. The representative of Canada has mentioned here a meeting of experts last year. In principle we had agreed not to go too far into that; but, as he has mentioned that fact, I must also mention other facts about that meeting. I was present at that meeting, which had as its chairman the representative of Canada. We also put forward some questions. For instance, we asked the scientists whether it would be possible for a country to make a bomb without conducting experiments, without having an explosion; and they all said -- because they could not avoid saying it -- that that was very possible, that with a blueprint one could make a bomb. What does that mean? That means that if a country were cornered tomorrow, if it found itself in such a position, for the sake of its security, because of its special regional, strategic or tactical situation, that it needed to have a bomb, that country would be able to make a bomb without any testing.

62. Do you know the killing power of a bomb? Yesterday I watched television programme produced by French Television. It showed that a twenty-megaton bomb would kill directly everyone in an area of three and a half square kilometres; it would kill everyone in an area of eight square kilometres by blast; it would kill everyone in an area of fifteen square kilometres by burning; and it would kill everyone in an area of about twenty square kilometres by radioactivity. That means that if a country wished to produce bombs and could not have explosions, even if its first bomb failed it would be satisfied if its second, third or fourth bomb were to explode. That is the difference between a nuclear bomb and a conventional bomb.

63. Now I should like to say something about what Mr. Burns called an analogy. I believe he was trying to make a joke, although nobody laughed very much. We are not asking to be allowed to drink as much whisky as we want. We are only asking to be allowed to drink Coca Cola, because we want peaceful technology; we want something that is only for peaceful purposes. We do not wish to drink alcohol, as Mr. Burns suggested. On the contrary, Brazil has never presented any idea in favour of acquiring nuclear weapons. We have never opposed any line of the proposed drafts in such a way as to imply our having the desire or even the idea of being allowed an option of becoming a nuclear-weapon country. In that respect my country deserves all credit.

(Mr. Azeredo da Silveira, Brazil)

64. I would remind Mr. Burns that many countries have tried to prohibit the consumption of alcohol but have not been successful. Just to say that one must not manufacture or drink alcohol does not prohibit it but stimulates the production and consumption of alcohol to even higher levels than before. I will not speak of other parallels with other undesirable activities; but this might be the case as far as peaceful nuclear technology is concerned. Some countries will go ahead and try to acquire the technology; because it is going to be very hard to stop progressive ideas in the heads of people, and they might be forced by some idea which is unrealistic to do something that would not be considered lawful by the world community.

65. We do not intend and have never intended to do so. The tradition of my country is to respect treaties, and we have made many sacrifices for them in the past, even when some of those treaties were not entirely in favour of our national interest. We do not intend to drink whisky behind the bar, so to speak. We intend to be frank and honest and to try to have a better treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. That has always been the attitude of my country. We are not in any way against the interests of the super-Powers. On the contrary, we are trying to help them and to look at their problems as we look at our problems. We have always taken a very rational and very practical position. We are not against them, and we do not think they are against us. We are only negotiating a treaty, and we are trying to show them our preoccupations and also to show them that they should take into consideration the preoccupations of a large number of countries concerned with their own progress and development.

66. We think this is the problem of our century. It is a challenge to everybody; and we believe that the solution to under-development has to come through concerted action by all countries -- not through a confrontation but through co-operation that will bring concerted action by all countries in favour of development. We believe that this is a basic challenge of our century, and we believe that in this basic challenge is to be found even an inspiration and a basis for world peace.

67. I wish to say only a few more words, to clarify one point. The resolution that was presented in the United Nations (1911 (XVIII); ENDC/117) was presented by all Latin-American countries without exception. Even the new countries that have

(Mr. Azeredo da Silveira, Brazil)

joined the Latin-American group signed that proposal. So there is a consensus in the Latin-American countries that we should fight for our development; and a new consciousness of what a non-proliferation treaty should be is growing and becoming stronger every day.

68. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, allow me to thank you as the Chairman of today's meeting and as representative of your country, and to thank also the representatives of Bulgaria, Canada, Romania and Poland for their words of greeting in connexion with the Soviet Union's great celebration: the fiftieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

69. The Great October Socialist Revolution has had a great influence on the social and political life of many countries of the world. It came when the First World War was at its height, when many millions of people were being hurled into mutual destruction, and it called for an end to the war and the establishment of peace. As preceding speakers have already pointed out, one of the first acts of the Soviet Government was the Decree on Peace adopted on 8 November 1917 after a report by Lenin.

70. Since that time the Soviet socialist State has consistently carried out a policy of strengthening peace and developing good neighbourly relations with all countries, a policy aimed at achieving disarmament and ensuring the security of the peoples.

71. Mr. Brezhnev, Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in his report of 3 November to a joint ceremonial meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR, pointed out that --

"The Soviet Union advocates renunciation of attempts to decide questions of relations between two social systems by war. We urge the governments of the bourgeois countries to heed the voice of the peoples calling for peace and lasting security.

"The Soviet Union deems itself bound to do everything in order that these aspirations of the peoples may be realized. Precisely for this reason it is carrying on, and will with unflagging energy carry on, the struggle for general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

"We also consider useful such partial steps towards this goal as agreements on prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, on prevention of the further spread of such weapons, and on prohibition of their use.

"We attach great importance to the United Nations and shall strive with other freedom-loving and peace-loving States to bring about its transformation into an effective organ of international co-operation for the defence of peace and the rights of the peoples.

"Together with its allies, the USSR will steadfastly continue the struggle for a lasting peace in Europe and against everything that threatens the security of the European peoples; it will advocate the mutually-advantageous co-operation of States with different social systems on the basis of the well-known principles of peaceful co-existence."

72. Allow me to thank you once again for your congratulations on the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and, for my part, to express my best wishes to the delegations of the countries members of the Committee which have congratulated us on the fiftieth anniversary of the Soviet State.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 345th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador P. Winkler, representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

"Statements were made by the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Canada, Romania, Poland, Brazil and the Soviet Union.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 9 November 1967, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 12 noon.