

DEPT. OF POLITICAL AND
SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS
DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS DIVISION
REFERENCE LIBRARY

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

VERBATIM RECORDS

1964

Meetings 188 to 202

(9 June - 28 July)

GENEVA

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:
Mr. A. CORREA do LAGO
Miss L. de VINCENZI
Mr. E. HOSANNAH

Bulgaria:
Mr. C. LUKANOV
Mr. G. GHELEV
Mr. T. DAMIANOV
Mr. I. BOEV

Burma:
U SAIN BWA
U HTOON SHEIN

Canada:
Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
Mr. S.F. RAE
Mr. R.M. TAIT
Mr. C.J. MARSHALL

Czechoslovakia:
Mr. V. PECHOTA
Mr. V. VAJNAR
Mr. A. MIKULIN
Mr. J. CHMELA

Ethiopia:
Ato S. TEFERRA

India:
Mr. K.P. LUKOSE

Italy:
Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
Mr. E. GUIDOTTI
Mr. S. AVETTA
Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI

Mexico:
Mr. A. Gomez ROBLEDO
Mr. Manuel TELLO
Mr. J. MERCADO

Nigeria:
Mr. L.C.N. OBI
Mr. G.O. OJO
Mr. S.H.O. IBE

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

Poland: Mr. M. NASZKOWSKI
Mr. M. LACHS
Mr. E. STANIEWSKI
Mr. A. SKOWRONSKI

Romania: Mr. V. DUMITRESCU
Mr. E. GLASER
Mr. N. ECOBESCU
Mr. C. UNGUREANU

Sweden: Mr. P. LIND
Mr. P. HAMMARSKJOLD
Mr. B. VEGESACK

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Mr. V.A. ZORIN
Mr. L.I. MENDELYEVICH
Mr. V.M. BASKAKOV
Mr. I.M. PALENYKH

United Arab Republic: Mr. A.F. HASSAN
Mr. A. OSMAN
Mr. M. KASSEM
Mr. S.E. IBRAHIM

United Kingdom: Mr. P. THOMAS
Sir Paul MASON
Mr. J.G. TAHOUREDIN
Mr. A.J. WILLIAMS

United States of America: Mr. W.C. FOSTER
Mr. C.H. TIMBERLAKE
Mr. D.S. MACDONALD
Mr. R.A. MARTIN

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

Special Representative of the Mr. D. PROTITCH
Secretary-General:

Deputy Special Representative Mr. W. EPSTEIN
of the Secretary-General:

The CHAIRMAN (Brazil) (translation from French): In accordance with the decision taken by the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at an unofficial meeting on Thursday 23 April, the Conference meets again today after an interval of six weeks. I accordingly have the honour to declare open the one hundred and eighty-eighth plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Before calling upon the speakers on my list I should like, on behalf of the Conference as a whole, to tender to the Indian delegation our condolences on the death of the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Nehru, an eminent statesman and a noble human figure. With Nehru's death, the cause of peace, which is at the same time a ceaseless struggle for the moral and material progress of the peoples of the world, loses one of its most respected champions. The tribute we pay to his memory, distressed as we are at the void which he has left behind him, reflects our conviction that his message will persist in the memories of free men who aspire to live as he did under the sign of peace and progress. I propose one minute's silence in tribute to the memory of Pandit Nehru.

The members of the Committee stood in silence for one minute.

Mr. LUKOSE (India): I should like, on behalf of the delegation of India, to express our deep gratitude and appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the other distinguished members of this body, who have joined in so generous and moving a way in paying a tribute to the memory of the late Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. For us of India Prime Minister Nehru was the very architect of our nation, and our debt to him is limitless. At this time of our great sorrow it has been a source of sustenance for all of us to know that numberless men and women throughout the world have acclaimed Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as belonging to mankind as a whole, and have shared with us our sense of loss and grief.

If I may venture to say so, for us round this table the loss is a special one. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's devotion to world peace was all-consuming, and his abiding interest in disarmament was such that he considered it the most urgent and vital problem facing humanity today. May we all, in true tribute to his great memory, address ourselves with renewed vigour, courageously and wisely, to the great tasks with which this body has been charged.

The CHAIRMAN (Brazil) (translation from French): I should now like to welcome the new representatives who will be working with us: Mr. Antonio Gomez Robledo, Leader of the Mexican delegation, and Mr. Clare Timberlake, Deputy Chairman of the United States delegation. I also wish to express our pleasure at seeing Mr. Valerian Zorin, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, and Mr. William Foster, Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who are again assuming the functions of co-Chairmen of our Conference. I am also happy to note the presence of certain representatives who have worked with us in the past on the disarmament problem: Mr. Peter Thomas, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom; Mr. Naszkowski, Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland; and Mr. Pechota, representative of Czechoslovakia.

Lastly, I should like to express to the Ethiopian delegation our best wishes for the speedy recovery of our colleague Ambassador Abate Agede.

With your permission, I should now like to address the Conference as representative of Brazil, and in that capacity to say first of all that it is a great honour and pleasure to take part for the first time in the work of this distinguished body.

Few international gatherings have aroused such interest in the world as this Conference on disarmament. We are here to carry out an assignment given us by the United Nations, whose General Assembly expresses through its members the decisions of the international community. The General Assembly has several times expressed its concern at the disquieting prospects for the peace and security of mankind presented by the arms race, and particularly by the unlimited stockpiling of nuclear weapons of destruction.

We should bear in mind that general and complete disarmament -- an ideal formula, yet so difficult of attainment -- is not an end in itself, but merely a means of achieving peace and security, the constant object of the United Nations, to which the Charter refers no less than 34 times. Consequently, our task is essentially to find ways and means of bringing about disarmament so as to achieve peace and security.

(The Chairman, Brazil)

This fundamental consideration partly explains our difficulties. We cannot purely and simply, by a stroke of the pen, make all armaments illegal, if that does not help to increase the prospects of peace and security. We must be prudent and objective. We must keep in touch with realities and study the possible effects on peace and security of our decisions -- that is, assuming that they deserve general approval. In the present international situation, where the points of friction are so numerous and so serious, the task is difficult; it will be long and must be undertaken with care.

Brazil was selected to take part in this Conference when the decision was made to increase the group of negotiators by adding eight new members to the ten comprising the Disarmament Committee. These ten represented on an equal footing the Western Powers members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the socialist Powers of the Warsaw Pact. The group of eight did not receive any special mandate. Their terms of reference under resolution 1722 (XVI) were in no way different from the general mission entrusted to the negotiating group of eighteen nations. However, it is easy to see from the discussions of the General Assembly that it intended to add to the Disarmament Committee a group of countries, not belonging to either of the major military alliances, which could play a mediating role.

Like the former Brazilian Foreign Minister in his speech of 24 March (ENDC/PV.177), my delegation stresses yet again that we have always considered our mandate in this Conference to be unfettered by any previous condition but that derived from our membership of the United Nations. All the Members of the United Nations, whatever the body on which they are serving are obliged to remain strictly faithful to the aims and principles of the Charter. That obligation will always show us the line of conduct to be followed in each particular case.

There is certainly no magic formula for disarmament. We have before us a difficult path on which each step must be carefully considered, so that it may make a real contribution to world security. Any proposal by any Power -- great or small, nuclear or non-nuclear -- should be studied with equal attention. The President of Brazil said a few days ago at a press conference that Brazil, ever faithful to the United Nations, would accept any course arising from the Organization's universality and was genuinely inspired by the general interest. Brazil would not accept any course

(The Chairman, Brazil)

which was based on particular interests, ambitions for power, or Utopian pretensions. It is on that footing of objective judgment and independent decision -- I again quote President Castello Branco -- that the Brazilian delegation will continue to examine all proposals submitted here and itself make suggestions when it thinks fit.

I shall not examine every project on which this Conference will have to express an opinion, but shall confine myself to saying how we think our work should be carried on. My delegation believes that the time has come to pass from general considerations to the examination of concrete points. This Conference has before it plans for general and complete disarmament. We should discuss them chapter by chapter, article by article. Many difficulties will no doubt appear, some of them technical. It therefore seems to me that we should seriously consider the setting up of technical bodies which would enable us to overcome those difficulties. We might set them up at once or create ad hoc bodies to meet the practical needs arising in our discussions. I venture to say that in many cases the lack of a political decision is merely a consequence of lack of adequate technical knowledge and I am firmly convinced that our work could be considerably expedited and lead to practical results if we could conduct political negotiations and technical discussions simultaneously.

My delegation, I repeat, wants this Conference to pass from generalities to the discussion of specific points. While we examine plans for general and complete disarmament, we can at the same time examine those collateral measures which offer the greatest prospects of reaching an agreement. Here, too, my delegation would like to see as objective and as precise an examination as possible. In my view we have had quite enough general discussions on collateral measures; we should now select those on which agreement would appear easiest and examine them one by one.

I should like to take this opportunity to recall a suggestion made here by the Brazilian delegation on a partial ban of underground nuclear tests (ENDC/PV.177, pp.9, 10). My delegation considers that all disarmament measures should go hand in hand with adequate controls ensuring that the agreements will be respected. Nevertheless, the problem of controls has turned out to be one of the most difficult to solve. We should continue to devote attention to it. I consider that one of the

(The Chairman, Brazil)

most important results that could be achieved by this Conference would be to ensure that any decision on disarmament, however partial and limited, would be accompanied by the establishment of a control system. We should not, however, make control an obstacle to disarmament. When it is clear that a specific ad hoc control is not necessary for the adoption of certain disarmament measures, it does not seem to me to be logical to insist on that control. That was the criterion which led to the signature of the Moscow Treaty (ENDC/100/Rev.1), in which control was not stipulated since it already exists in fact, being exercised by the national systems of detection and identification.

As a logical consequence of that criterion, my delegation considers that we could ban immediately, without establishing a special control system, underground tests powerful enough to be detected and identified by national systems. My delegation has said that it was prepared to submit a draft on this subject. However, there is one point which we must determine: what should be the limit of power for banned explosions? In other words, what is the technically correct limit above which underground tests can be detected and identified by special control systems? My delegation considers that there would be no point in submitting the draft which it has prepared if we did not possess the technical information needed to settle this point, or indeed if the Conference is not prepared to study this information itself. In our opinion this could only be done if we agreed to set up a technical sub-committee.

Moreover, this Conference has not yet decided whether it is going to examine in a concrete manner, despite previous opinions and proposals, possible methods of establishing a link between a reduction of expenditure on armaments and international co-operation for the economic development of the peoples of the world. My delegation considers that the Eighteen-Nation Committee, without of course excluding the various organs of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, is an adequate forum for the formulation of such measures. There can be no doubt that world public opinion, particularly in the developing countries, expects this Conference itself to determine the means of allocating to economic development the resources released by a reduction in the manufacture of arms.

It is not my intention to prolong my first speech in my capacity as Brazilian representative. Let me say in conclusion that I am proud of having been called upon to occupy this post, in which I shall endeavour to be the faithful interpreter of the desire for peace and co-operation of the Brazilian Government and people.

Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): First my delegation would like to associate itself with the tribute with which you, Mr. Chairman, opened this session. Since the last meeting of the Conference the world has grieved over the death of a great leader, Prime Minister Nehru of India. Our deepest sympathy goes out to the people of India at this time of sadness. The vitality of Indian democratic institutions is one of his legacies. That vitality has been amply demonstrated in the past few weeks. But in India, as in the world at large, mankind has suffered a great loss. As our Indian colleague so ably said, in the disarmament field we shall miss here a genuine source of inspiration. President Johnson has said in this connexion:

"It is not just as a leader of India that he served humanity. Perhaps more than any world leader, he has given expression to man's yearning for peace. This is the issue of our age There could be no more fitting memorial to him than a world without war."

The ideal of Prime Minister Nehru remains our goal, and in his memory we renew our pledge to seek its realization.

I should now like to extend greetings to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Protitch, who is again assisting us. Let me also welcome back to our table my distinguished co-Chairman, Deputy Foreign Minister Zorin, who participated so actively at the beginning of this Conference in the spring of 1962. I am glad also to see so many familiar faces around the table -- members of delegations who were here when I was last here in February.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to extend particular greetings to you, who have assumed the extra responsibilities of the Chair on your first day at the table; and also I wish to extend greetings to our new colleague from Mexico, Mr. Gomez Robledo. I also welcome those others here who are participating in our deliberations for the first time. Finally, let me say to our colleague from Ethiopia that we wish our former colleague, Ambassador Agede, an early recovery from his grievous wounds.

I join you here today with President Johnson's instruction to make every effort to find a basis for early agreement on safeguarded -- and I emphasize "safeguarded" -- alternatives to the arms race. You may remember that, in his year-end exchange with Chairman Khrushchev, President Johnson said:

(Mr. Foster, United States)

"... the time for simply talking about peace ... has passed -- 1964 should be a year in which we take further steps toward that goal."

In a recent speech to the Associated Press in New York President Johnson again made the point that 1964 was a year in which the United States would work "to reach agreement on measures to reduce armaments and lessen the chance of war."

Like the measures achieved in 1963, the cut-backs in production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons announced by the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and my country (ENDC/131, 132) were closely related to our work here. The idea of a cut-back as a preliminary step to a cut-off was mentioned in President Johnson's message to this Conference on 21 January of this year (ENDC/120). It was discussed here, both privately and in plenary meetings, during February. I mention this because those announcements show again that our work here continuously contributes to steps taken by governments in pursuit of peace. My delegation will elaborate further on the cut-off at this session, as we will on other proposals in the President's message of 21 January.

A theme which runs through many of these proposals -- a theme which has already been stressed by other delegations here -- is that while we are struggling with the intricate problems of general and complete disarmament we should give priority to reaching agreement on measures which will halt the arms race now. If we do not, our task of achieving general and complete disarmament will become ever more difficult. Many of the measures which have been successful so far follow that philosophy. We now have a test ban treaty (ENDC/100/Rev.1) which limits the development of larger nuclear weapons. We have an Antarctic Treaty which prohibits the spread of weapons to an area of the earth where they are not now present. We have a General Assembly resolution (A/RES/1884 (XVIII); ENDC/117) against the spread of nuclear weapons to outer space. We have announced reductions in the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons -- reductions which should slow down the race for ever larger stockpiles of such material and, we hope, lead to a cut-off in its production.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

Each of these steps limits in some way the production or proliferation of armaments. Each thereby serves our immediate objective of calling a halt to the arms race. We should move much further towards this goal by adopting the cut-off, the freeze, and the measures we have proposed to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to nations not now controlling them. Moreover, our ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament would be brought closer.

During our last session we discussed collateral measures in greater depth than ever before. Many delegations raised questions about a problem which has seemed so many times to make agreements here more difficult. That problem is verification. To assist the Conference in getting out of this difficulty, my delegation intends to discuss verification in more detail at this session. In particular, we will discuss it as it relates to our proposals for collateral measures.

Verification should be sufficient to assure nations that their security is not being jeopardized through clandestine violations by other nations. This must have been what Foreign Minister Gromyko had in mind when he observed:

"Our country does not intend to take anyone at his word Nor do we expect others to take us at our word." (ENDC/PV.2, p.11)

Our Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, elaborated on the same point early in this Conference. He said:

"No government, large or small, could be expected to enter into disarmament arrangements under which their peoples might become victims of the perfidy of others.

"In other affairs, accounting and auditing systems are customarily installed so that the question of confidence need not arise. Confidence grows out of knowledge; suspicion and fear are rooted in ignorance. This has been true since the beginning of time.

"Let me make this point clear: the United States does not ask for inspection for inspection's sake. Inspection is for no purpose other than assurance that commitments are fulfilled." (ibid, pp.22,23)

With that principle in mind, the United States has attempted to design its collateral measures so as to reduce the scope of inspection while providing the necessary assurance of compliance. We fully recognize that many nations have

(Mr. Foster, United States)

facilities which cannot be opened to inspection at this time. Certainly my Government has sensitive facilities of this kind; but that does not mean we cannot find a way to reconcile this need with the need for verification. Indeed, that should be one of our primary tasks.

The formulation of verification proposals requires hard work and careful preparation by all of us. The United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and other agencies of my Government have devoted tens of millions of dollars to research programmes designed to reconcile the need to provide assurance and the need to protect sensitive facilities. Experts from some of our leading industrial and other concerns and specialists within our Government have devoted many hours to that end.

The verification plans which we will elaborate at future meetings are the end product of that effort. Inspection would be confined to those objects -- and only those objects -- which must necessarily be placed under scrutiny to provide assurance that commitments are fulfilled. In the freeze and the cut-off, for example, the production plants to be regularly observed would be limited to those of a particular type. We would also limit the scope of the inspectors' observations within those plants so as to inhibit their receipt of information which might be of military value. In neither the freeze nor the cut-off would there be inspection to verify the levels of retained armaments.

That is also true of the mutual destruction of B-47s and TU-16s. Here the inspectors would look only at the actual destruction of bombers. They would not explore the countryside to find out how many bombers remained on each side after the bombers were destroyed.

Our purpose in describing verification is clear. We believe a detailed analysis of this subject is essential in order to move us forward towards early agreement on meaningful alternatives to the arms race.

The United States is ready to conclude firm agreements in each of the areas I have mentioned. It is also ready to consider any other reasonable proposal. My instructions are to pursue every practical means for halting the arms race and reducing armaments. This would be important, first of all, for peace; but it would also permit us to devote more of our energies and resources to building a greater society for all mankind.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian):

Permit me first of all to convey on behalf of the delegation of the Soviet Union our profound condolences to the delegation of India upon the death of an outstanding statesman of our time, the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru. In our country and throughout the world Jawaharlal Nehru was well known as an indefatigable fighter for the relaxation of international tension, for general and complete disarmament, and for lasting and inviolable peace among the peoples. May the memory of the great national leader of friendly India become an active force conducing to the progress of our work in the Eighteen-Nation Committee and to the achievement of agreement on the central problem of present-day international relations -- the problem of disarmament!

Permit me also to express my thanks to the Chairman and to Mr. Foster for the words of welcome they have addressed to me, and to convey my own greetings to all the new members of the Committee and to all the colleagues who are to take part in our important work.

The six-week recess has come to an end, and the representatives of the States members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee are meeting again in the Palais des Nations in order to continue the disarmament negotiations, the development of which, we may say without any fear of exaggeration, is being followed with strained attention by the whole world.

At the last few meetings of the previous session of the Committee it was pointed out by several delegations, including our own, that although the discussions that had taken place in the disarmament negotiations had been useful to some extent since they enabled us to have a better understanding of our respective positions, nevertheless the work of the Committee had still failed, unfortunately, to yield any practical, tangible results. Indeed, if we compare the disarmament negotiations to the ascent of a high mountain at the top of which the best of all possible rewards awaits us, namely a treaty on general and complete disarmament, we can say that, although the number of meetings of the Committee is already close on two hundred, although the number of speeches made at those meetings has gone beyond a thousand, while the meetings and talks between the delegations have been quite innumerable, nevertheless we are still at the foot-hills of the mountain. This is an objective fact, and it is precisely this fact that determines the state of affairs.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Meanwhile the armaments race, especially the race for nuclear missile armaments which could reduce to ashes every living thing in any part of the world and destroy all the material values created by the labour of many generations, is still going on. Moreover, now in one and now in another area of the world the forces of aggression are becoming more active, creating hotbeds of tension. Consequently the problem of disarmament becomes ever more acute, ever more urgent, with every year that is missed for its solution.

At the same time, the general conviction in the world today is such that in the present conditions, which are characterized by a certain relaxation of international tension and a strengthening of confidence in the relations between States, the search for a solution to the problem of disarmament is more promising than ever before. The conclusion of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, the agreement to refrain from placing in orbit any objects carrying nuclear weapons, the parallel actions taken by the Soviet Union, the United States of America and the United Kingdom in regard to reducing the production of fissionable materials for military purposes -- those three actions taken by the nuclear Powers in the past year alone in the direction of a certain limitation of the nuclear arms race have shown that there is no fatal inevitability of an unbridled competition in producing and improving weapons and the means of warfare, just as there is no fatal inevitability of war itself. Therefore a movement forward in the field of disarmament is possible; therefore it is in the hands of man.

As a matter of fact, a sense of the increased need to find a way towards an agreement on disarmament, and at the same time an awareness of the increased possibilities of crowning such a search with success, were the feelings with which the delegations of the States members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee left Geneva six weeks ago. The participants in the negotiations then agreed to avail themselves of the recess in order once again to weigh up and think over thoroughly their positions on the main problems of a programme of general and complete disarmament and on individual measures for easing international tension and slowing the arms race, to evaluate the point of view of the other side with the utmost objectivity, and to endeavour to explore in that manner realistic ways that would lead to agreement.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Today the Soviet delegation wishes to inform the Committee that we have analysed the course of the negotiations in the Committee from January to April this year. We have reported our conclusions to the Soviet Government, and have been given firm instructions to avail ourselves in the course of future work of every possibility to achieve an agreement on disarmament. Whenever difficulties are encountered in solving any important political problem, the Soviet Government always starts out from the premise that increased efforts must be made to overcome them. Our Government is, of course, guided by this approach also in regard to the negotiations on the disarmament problem -- the most important problem of present-day international relations.

Accordingly, in the days and weeks ahead the Soviet delegation will exert the utmost efforts to facilitate mutual understanding and ensure a movement forward in the main direction of our work -- in the negotiations on general and complete disarmament. We expect the same of our partners in the negotiations. This is the duty of all the members of the Committee, and elementary logic tells us that success can be achieved only if this duty is complied with by all of them. A unilateral solution of the disarmament problem is just as impossible as unilateral disarmament. We should be insincere if we did not say in this connexion that not all our partners in the negotiations in the Eighteen-Nation Committee -- I have in mind in this case the Western Powers -- have so far shown, in our opinion, the necessary desire to achieve an agreement.

The participants in the negotiations are aware of the steps which the Soviet Government has already taken to help to bring closer together the positions on the programme of general and complete disarmament and particularly on the question on which the co-ordination of this programme depends above all -- the question of the elimination of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles. It was this purpose, the purpose of bringing the positions closer together, that we pursued in submitting the proposal that the Soviet Union and the United States of America should retain, until the end of the entire disarmament process, a strictly limited and agreed quantity of intercontinental, anti-missile and ground-to-air missiles with nuclear warheads (ENDC/2/Rev.1/Add.1). Our proposal for a so-called "nuclear umbrella" gives a constructive answer to the fears expressed by the Western Powers regarding the security of States during the process of disarmament if the means of delivery of

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

nuclear weapons were to be eliminated in the very first stage. While we do not share these fears, we are prepared, however, to take into account the fact that the other side has them. And we express our appreciation to all delegations which have voiced at meetings of the Committee their positive attitude towards this flexible position of the Soviet Union on this key question and their understanding of the important significance of our proposal.

At present we are taking yet another step forward to meet the Western Powers. They have repeatedly expressed a desire to proceed to a detailed consideration of specific questions connected with our proposal for a "nuclear umbrella". Bearing that desire in mind, we are prepared to participate immediately in the consideration of such specific questions in an appropriate working body, if the Committee approves, as proposed by the delegation of India before the recess, (ENDC/PV.177, pp.27 et seq.) the proposal for a "nuclear umbrella" as a basis for the solution of the problem of eliminating nuclear weapon delivery vehicles.

We are prepared to participate in the most active manner in businesslike, concrete work also in regard to agreeing on individual measures aimed at easing international tension and slowing the arms race. We are convinced that here too there is a wide field for serious joint work, for a joint search for ways and means of arriving at specific agreements. Our proposals for measures aimed at further reducing international tension and slowing the arms race are known to the members of the Committee from the document which was submitted by the Soviet Government at the very beginning of the work of the Committee in 1964 and circulated as an official document of the Committee (ENDC/123). The Soviet Government proposes that agreement be reached here in the Committee on the elimination of bomber aircraft, on a further reduction of the military budgets of States, on a reduction of the total numbers of their armed forces, on the withdrawal or, in the initial period, a reduction of foreign troops stationed in the territories of other countries and on the liquidation of military bases in such countries, on the establishment of denuclearized zones in various parts of the world, on the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons, on the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the countries of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, on measures to prevent surprise attack, and on the banning of all underground nuclear weapon tests.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

On each of the measures, basing ourselves on the desire to find points of contact rather than to deepen the divergencies, we are prepared to carry on businesslike negotiations in an effort to arrive at a solution of the questions arising that would be acceptable to the other participants. Of course, we are prepared to participate with the same objectiveness and clearness of purpose in considering also those proposals on individual measures for slowing the arms race which have been submitted by other participants in the negotiations and which are really directed towards that aim.

We should like to draw particular attention to the need for all the participants in the negotiations to increase their efforts to achieve an agreement on the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons. In the practical situation which is taking shape in the world today, especially if one takes into consideration the rapid rate of scientific and technological progress, it can be asserted quite definitely that an agreement on the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons must be concluded without delay. Such an agreement would have an enormous stabilizing effect. It would avert many dangers and could become the turning-point towards a practical solution of the whole problem of disarmament.

It is well known that at present there is in fact only one real obstacle to a positive solution of the problem of the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons. That obstacle is the plan to create a NATO multilateral nuclear force, within which access to nuclear weapons and to participation in the control, possession and disposal of such weapons would be granted to several NATO States which at present do not possess nuclear weapons, and in the first place to Western Germany - the only European State which demands a revision of the frontiers established as a result of the Second World War. If the elimination of that obstacle could be brought about by joint efforts, it would be immediately possible for the Committee to work out and agree on a draft treaty on the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons.

The nineteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations will convene in a few months' time. We should like to hope that, by concentrating our efforts on the main problems of the negotiations, by taking as our guide the desire to achieve mutually-acceptable solutions, by showing good will and exerting still greater efforts, the participants in the negotiations in the Eighteen-Nation Committee

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

will be able to report to the General Assembly of the United Nations -- the highest forum of States in the world -- at least the first agreements on disarmament.

Speaking on 12 May 1964 at a meeting in Abu Zabal, in the United Arab Republic, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, said:

"We stand for peace among the peoples and for general disarmament, and we shall not relax our efforts, the aim of which is that the people of various countries should come to the reasonable conclusion that an end must be put to the production of arms and other means of destruction. We should like the efforts of all States to be directed towards peaceful purposes and, in particular, towards the production of such "arms", such "munitions", as would serve, not to destroy people, but to prolong their lives and strengthen their health."

We, the Soviet people, are profoundly convinced that, however great the difficulties may be, success in the disarmament negotiations can be achieved. It pertains not to the realm of fantasy but to the realm of the possible. Let us make it a reality. The Soviet delegation begins the new stage of the negotiations in the Eighteen-Nation Committee with the firm intention of making the maximum useful contribution to these negotiations, being guided by the Soviet Government's firm instructions to do everything possible for the success of these negotiations.

Mr. THOMAS (United Kingdom): First of all I wish to join with you, Mr. Chairman, and other speakers and to convey on behalf of the United Kingdom delegation our profound condolences to the Indian delegation on the recent death of their Prime Minister. As the representative of India said, Pandit Nehru was the chief architect of modern India. He was, of course, also an eminent world figure, and his passing is a sad loss to us all. In Her message to the President of India, Her Majesty the Queen said that Mr. Nehru "will be mourned throughout the Commonwealth and among the peace-loving peoples of the world". Mr. Nehru's successor, Mr. Shastri, has inherited a large and heavy burden, and I should like to take this opportunity of extending, through the Indian delegation, our respectful and warmest good wishes to him.

(Mr. Thomas, United Kingdom)

May I also ask the Ethiopian delegation to be good enough to convey to Ambassador Agede our deep sympathy and sincere good wishes for a prompt and complete recovery from the shocking attack he suffered last week?

I should now also like, if I may, to extend a warm welcome to our new colleagues in this Committee, in particular to you, Mr. Chairman, as the representative of Brazil, to Ambassador Gomez Robledo as the representative of Mexico, and to Ambassador Timberlake as the deputy representative of the United States. I am sure we shall all gain great benefit from the participation of our new colleagues in the work of this Conference, and I am sure we are all glad to have them with us.

We are also glad to see many old friends and colleagues sitting round this familiar table again. I am particularly glad to welcome back, as you did, Mr. Protitch as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, as well as Mr. Foster and Mr. Zorin who, in addition to their tasks as leaders of their respective delegations, take up once more their important duties as co-Chairmen.

Today the Conference is beginning its seventh session. Our last session, as has been mentioned already, ended on an encouraging note with the announcements that the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom had taken steps to reduce the production of fissile material for weapon purposes. The Conference must now seize this favourable opportunity to make further progress in the hope that new agreements can be negotiated in the not too distant future.

My delegation still firmly believes that such progress will be facilitated if, at the outset of this new session, the Committee gives serious consideration to ways and means of improving its procedure on the lines that we and other delegations, including many of the non-aligned delegations, have suggested in the past. If I may say so, I was glad to hear you say, Mr. Chairman, in your speech today that we should leave generalities and get down to details and, if necessary, technical discussions on precise points. I am very glad to welcome and support that view. I was also glad to hear the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Zorin, say that his delegation too is ready for businesslike negotiations. Perhaps I should say that I do not think it is helpful to insist, as he appeared to do in one part of his speech, on pre-conditions before one gets down to negotiations -- pre-conditions such as agreeing first of all on principles. But I certainly welcome that part of his speech in which he said that his delegation is prepared, in those matters that he mentioned, to get down to businesslike negotiations now.

(Mr. Thomas, United Kingdom)

Perhaps I might put forward some suggestions which I think might be useful and, I hope, are constructive. So far as general and complete disarmament is concerned, the Committee has held lengthy discussions during previous sessions on items 5(b) and (c) of our agreed agenda (ENDC/52): that is, the reduction of nuclear delivery vehicles and conventional disarmament in stage I. During our last session we examined in some detail the Soviet Government's revised proposals for the reduction of nuclear delivery vehicles (ENDC/2/Rev.1/Add.1), which were referred to by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Zorin, today. Although these represented some advance on earlier Soviet proposals, I need hardly remind the Committee that serious difficulties still remain and that the gap between the positions of both sides is still wide. The Committee may therefore agree that we should soon move on to the remaining items on our disarmament agenda. We might perhaps set ourselves the target of completing our examination of the items on this agenda before the next session of the United Nations General Assembly.

At previous sessions the Committee also spent a certain amount of time on item 5(d) -- that is, nuclear disarmament -- and last summer we started but did not complete our discussions on item 5(e), which concerns bases. It would therefore seem appropriate to pick up the thread at this point. The Western position on bases is, of course, well known, but we are quite prepared to renew discussions on this issue.

We hope that we can then move on to the next subject, which is force levels. Here there are serious problems which need detailed consideration by the Conference: for example, that of definition.

The following item on the agenda is military expenditures, one which has already been discussed at the last session but in a different context.

We could perhaps omit the next item -- outer space -- in view of the General Assembly's resolution 1884 (XVIII) of 17 October 1963.

That would bring us to item 5(i) of our agenda, namely peace-keeping, which is clearly one of the vital elements of any treaty on general and complete disarmament and to which the Conference must obviously give most careful consideration.

(Mr. Thomas, United Kingdom)

That would leave three other subjects on the agenda which I hope we can examine in the next few months. These are: measures to reduce the risk of war in stage I of the disarmament process; the question of transition from the first to the second stage; and, finally, measures related to the establishment, organization and functioning of the international disarmament organization.

This represents a full and, I would suggest, practical agenda. Let us therefore push on with it. We support strongly the suggestion by the representative of the United States, Mr. Foster, that the Committee should also take another look at the whole problem of verification, one of the other basic issues in general and complete disarmament. I was glad to hear him say that the United States intends to discuss this topic analytically and in detail. My delegation hopes to be able, at an appropriate time, to put some views to the Conference on this subject.

We are convinced of the importance of our discussions on general and complete disarmament and of continued endeavour to reach agreement here. But we must nevertheless admit that the most fruitful field for concrete agreements in the immediate future seems most likely to be found in our consideration of collateral measures. When I was last here, on 23 April, just before the Committee went into recess, I expressed the hope that we could now turn to detailed consideration of some of the ideas which have been put forward and which seemed to offer most likelihood of agreement. I would reiterate that hope today.

I should also like to say that, in pursuing that objective, it seems to me that it would be of the greatest use to the work of the Conference if we could soon agree on an agenda for our discussions on collateral measures. We have already had an opportunity to hear exposition in some detail of the various proposals put forward at the beginning of the last session. That has been of value; but I have considerable sympathy with those who have suggested that we should now try to introduce more order into our discussions. We recognize, of course, that this is a question for our distinguished co-Chairmen, but it affects all the members of the Committee also. In our view, a somewhat more orderly procedure would be of real benefit to the Committee's work. If we could now examine some of the proposals before us successively in greater depth, we might be able to find which among them is most likely to yield agreement. The proper method to do that seems to us to be by adopting an agenda.

(Mr. Thomas, United Kingdom)

I am sure that all my colleagues would agree that on such an agenda there should figure the proposals set out in President Johnson's message of 21 January (ENDC/120). One of these, of course, is the United States "freeze" proposal. My United States colleague will no doubt be giving the Committee a further exposition of what is involved in that proposal, based on the further examination of it that his Government has been able to make during the recess. But I should like to say that in the view of my delegation the freeze offers a vital step towards our goal. Surely the criticism which has been offered, that it is not a measure of disarmament, dwindles to unimportance when we consider the contribution that the adoption of such a measure would make towards limiting nuclear rivalry. It would help to call a halt to the arms race in its most important sector.

Another proposal which deserves further consideration by the Committee is the one generally called the "bomber bonfire." If we could reach an early agreement on this, it would be a useful beginning in the actual destruction of some weapons. In my remarks during my last visit I put in a plea for considering it in that light and recalled that the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary, Mr. Butler, had said on 25 February:

"Once the first step in destruction of weapons has been taken, we hope that other more substantial ones may follow". (ENDC/PV.169, p.13)

Let us not neglect measures which, while comparatively limited in scope, could be of real benefit.

I should also like, if I may, to remind the Committee of the question of observation posts. On an earlier visit I submitted a paper on this subject (ENDC/130), and I would suggest that the proposals in that paper merit some detailed discussion. I do not wish to enter into discussion of the merits of these proposals today, but would merely reaffirm that we consider the idea of a system of observation posts to have intrinsic value and to deserve more detailed consideration than has yet been given to it.

We should also like to see agreement on other subjects in the field of collateral measures. There is the very important question of an agreement to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons, which was referred to by Mr. Zorin; there is the possibility of further agreements on the cut-back of production of fissile material for weapon purposes; and there is the United States proposal that the transfer of fissile material should take place under effective inter-

(Mr. Thomas, United Kingdom)

national safeguards (ENDC/120; PV.172, pp.14 et seq.) All of these offer the possibility of reaching new agreements, and we consider that in this new session the Committee should give them serious and fruitful consideration.

Much work, therefore, lies before us. I know that we all wish to see maintained the fresh momentum given to our work by the declarations on the cut-back of fissile material which came at the end of the last session. In our forthcoming session our thoughts must already begin to turn towards the autumn session of the United Nations General Assembly. This Committee will have to prepare a report to the General Assembly giving an account of the progress it has made. I share the hope of the Soviet representative that we shall in fact be able to point to new developments and new fields of agreement. I am sure that we shall be able to realize this aim if we all enter into our discussions in a genuine spirit of negotiation. In this we shall be helped also by the valued contribution of our colleagues from the non-aligned countries. Given goodwill and determination, I am confident that this coming session will produce new progress.

Mr. HASSAN (United Arab Republic): It is a painful duty to my delegation to have to mourn, within less than a year after the death of President Kennedy, another great man who dedicated himself to the cause of peace and disarmament. Mourning Mr. Nehru in our Conference is something more than expressing our feelings of sympathy to our Indian colleagues; for Mr. Nehru's philosophy, ideals, policy and actions were closely linked with the aims and objectives of this Conference. Mr. Nehru was among the first statesmen to grasp the validity of the policy of peaceful co-existence and the wisdom of the policy of non-alignment. That is why he took every opportunity to condemn the "cold war" and devoted his efforts to the service of peace and social progress in the world. On many occasions Mr. Nehru's declarations on the question of disarmament were quoted at this Conference in order to guide and orientate our work towards a peaceful world. We shall never forget that Mr. Nehru was the first to call for the banning of all nuclear tests.

If the death of such a leader is a great loss for his country and the world at large, it is the non-aligned countries at this Conference in particular which most feel they have lost something of themselves and that they have been deprived of a great spiritual force. Peace was the ideal of Mr. Nehru, and thus we should pay tribute to his memory by redoubling our efforts for a world without arms, a world without war.

(Mr. Hassan, United Arab Republic)

Turning now to our current work, my delegation would like to welcome the resumption of the Conference after a six-week recess, which we hope was fully utilized by both sides to think over their positions in order to bring their points of view closer. It seems to my delegation that we are reconvening in a more favourable atmosphere and that the spirit of détente is continually expanding. The most recent encouraging signs, of course, are the two great Powers' agreements for a co-ordinated satellite weather-forecasting project and the exchange of space biological and medical information which were signed last week during United Nations meetings on the peaceful uses of outer space. I hope that this will be a first step towards general international co-operation in this field.

I do not intend at this stage of our work to embark upon a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the problem of disarmament; I will limit myself to a few observations of a procedural and preliminary character, to which I hope the Committee and the two co-Chairmen will give serious consideration in charting the course of our deliberations during this session. We should like to believe that we are starting a promising new stage in our deliberations, a stage where both parties will be in a position to present new contributions as a result of the complete exposition of all relevant aspects of the proposals of both parties.

In this connexion there are two important points which I should like to raise relating to the organization of our work. The first concerns the necessity of achieving a more disciplined discussion of the various collateral measures already presented to the Conference in order to create a more propitious opportunity for enlarging areas of possible understanding. Thus our Committee would be enabled to concentrate and to engage in a thorough exchange of views on some of the collateral measures which offer larger possibilities for agreement, so that we could report positive and concrete agreement to the next General Assembly session. The second point relates to the usefulness of setting immediately a tentative schedule for our work during the five-month period preceding the next General Assembly session. Such a course of action would be for the good of our work and would prevent transformation of a mere procedural point into an undesirable political issue.

(Mr. Hassan, United Arab Republic)

We mention these points at this early stage, together with the advisability of resorting to more informal discussions, which have proved to be fruitful in the past, in the hope that they will be carefully considered by the two co-Chairmen; and we should appreciate it if we could be told by them that the method of work of this Committee is no longer an obstacle.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to extend to you a cordial welcome and to greet all representatives and delegations, including our new colleagues, and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. I should also like to welcome our two co-Chairmen, who have not been with us for some time: I refer to Mr. Zorin, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, and Mr. Foster, the leader of the United States delegation.

Mr. LIND (Sweden): First, I wish to express to the delegation of India the profound sympathy of the Swedish delegation at the grievous loss suffered by India and its people on the death of its great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. His work as a statesman was of tremendous importance in the struggle for peace throughout the world. Therefore his death is a loss to us all and is deeply felt, not least here in this Conference, the aims of which he always did so much to promote.

Let me now associate myself both with the welcome which has been addressed to you, Mr. Chairman, and to other representatives taking part in this Conference for the first time, and with the welcome back to this Conference of those representatives who have returned here after an absence. I wish particularly to say how pleased we are that Mr. Zorin and Mr. Foster have resumed their functions as co-Chairmen.

At the time of the reconvening of the Committee in January this year it was noted with great general satisfaction that the Conference was resuming its work in auspicious circumstances created by the successful completion of the partial test ban treaty and the ensuing favourable atmosphere so manifest during the eighteenth session of the General Assembly. Like many others, my delegation was aware of the importance of taking advantage of that favourable atmosphere as well as of keeping up the momentum by endeavouring to make further progress. When, after three months' work, we decided to recess, we were unfortunately unable to conclude that our endeavours had led to any agreement on any disarmament measure. However, during the first part of that session several proposals and ideas were presented and discussed, all of which certainly deserve serious consideration, and which, either singly or in combination, appeared to afford possibilities for agreed solutions, given a genuine

(Mr. Lind, Sweden)

will to negotiate. In this respect the decision by the nuclear Powers to reduce their production of fissionable material for military purposes was most encouraging. The decision to set aside a period of six weeks for reflection and study provided an opportunity for evaluation of positions and for preparing the ground for progress in our continued work towards disarmament.

At the resumption of our negotiations today in an international climate that remains favourable, it is our hope that our work this year during the previous meetings and the ensuing recess will prove to have increased the prospects for moving forward and that it will be possible to reach substantial results and make real progress on which to report to the General Assembly. Having listened attentively to the statements made here this afternoon, I hope it is right to conclude that added strength has been given to those expectations.

The main reason why I have asked for the floor this afternoon is that my delegation has deemed it appropriate at the very beginning of our resumed session to raise a matter of procedure relating to the organization of the work of our Committee. We should like to put for the consideration of the Committee, and in the first place for the consideration of our co-Chairmen, the idea of adopting a time schedule for the Conference; and here I am making a point of procedure which corresponds to that made earlier by my colleague and friend from the United Arab Republic. In making this recommendation we do not have in mind merely a time-table for the coming session. Our proposal is rather of a general and long-range nature. It is based on two assumptions which I think can be generally accepted as being correct and realistic. The first assumption is that we are all firmly determined to pursue with energy and in a spirit of good-will our search for an agreement on general and complete disarmament. The second assumption is that to achieve this objective will necessarily require some time.

More precisely, our proposal is that the Committee should accept as a general rule -- a guiding model, as it were -- to have regular annual sessions consisting of sessions here of a duration in principle of approximately three months with intervening recess periods. Applied to a normal year -- by which I mean a year in which the United Nations General Assembly convenes regularly in the middle of September -- this principle of three-month periods would mean that the Committee would begin its session in the middle of January and go on to the middle of April.

(Mr. Lind, Sweden)

It could then take a recess of one month or so and reconvene for another three-month period, which would last until the middle of August.

Ideally, the Committee would submit progress reports to the General Assembly before its April recess. After the second part of its session it should submit its final, comprehensive report to the General Assembly, which could thus be received by the Secretary-General by 1 September. Applied to this session, the suggested principle of three-month periods would mean that the session that has just started would continue until about 10 September.

Having said that, I want to make it perfectly clear that we by no means want the Committee to be bound by any strict or rigid time schedule. It will, of course, always be for the Committee to decide on the length of its sessions, and any decision we may take on a time schedule should never preclude the Committee from modifying such a schedule. It goes without saying, for instance, that a period of fruitful negotiations here should not be interrupted by adherence to a set deadline. It is our belief, however, that the adoption of a time schedule as a guide would serve the purpose of facilitating our work and making it more effective. It would help governments in processing the disarmament problems and in assigning representatives and staff to the disarmament negotiations. For the Secretary-General a time schedule, even if it were rather rough and approximate, ought to mean better possibilities for organizing the pattern of United Nations conferences in a rational and economic way.

For this Committee and its co-Chairmen, finally, it would seem to be an advantage to be able to organize the work and the meetings on the basis of a general plan of the type now suggested. The adoption of a time schedule from the outset would allow us to concentrate on the substantive part of our work. Moreover, it would be easier to deal with the question whether or not to go into recess, which, as experience has taught us, always comes up for discussion; and a decision on a recess will, I submit, be more easily reached and less open to misinterpretation or speculation by all those outside watching our proceedings.

Those are the reasons which have led us in the Swedish delegation to recommend that the Committee decide to establish a time schedule based in principle on recurring sessions of about three months, interrupted by recess periods. This year we have in fact followed that pattern, having had a first

(Mr. Lind, Sweden)

session of three months followed by a recess period of six weeks. In our view it should be possible to apply this pattern also to the session beginning today. If we were to decide to recess on 10 September or thereabouts -- say, not later than 29 September -- this would give us a target date for the completion of our important task, to be able to report to the General Assembly on the fulfilment of the mandate given to this Committee.

Now, it is true that, as the Assembly this year is not likely to meet until the beginning of November, we shall have more time at our disposal than in previous years. It may therefore be possible to have a longer session. There might also be other reasons for continuing the session beyond the date that I have just suggested. We should, however, be grateful if the co-Chairmen and the Committee would already now consider our recommendation for a time schedule, both as a general principle and as applied to the present session.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): My delegation does not at present wish to make a detailed statement on the substance of the problems at issue. It wishes to reflect on all the very important speeches made today, and will state its position at a later meeting.

I asked for the floor in order to associate myself in heartfelt grief with the condolences tendered to our Indian colleague on the loss of his country's great leader, Prime Minister Nehru. I express these condolences in the spirit of profound friendship which links the Indian and Italian peoples, and in the knowledge that Mr. Nehru's death is a loss not merely for India but for all mankind. I hope that the teachings and example which Mr. Nehru has bequeathed to us will serve as encouragement and guidance in our labours.

I should also like to greet all the friends whom I am meeting again around this table and those who have come to join us. I wish first and foremost to greet you, Mr. Chairman; you are representing Brazil at this Conference for the first time and have delivered today a high-minded and pertinent speech. You have touched on essential and urgent problems, and in particular on the ban on underground nuclear tests. That is a problem of great concern to the Italian delegation. Our view on it is very similar to yours, and I hope that on that basis our work can assume a realistic and concrete form. I am sure that your participation in our labours, as well as that of Mr. Gomez Robledo, the new representative of Mexico, whom I

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

also wish to welcome, will strengthen and develop the collaboration in this Conference of the non-aligned countries, and particularly of our Latin-American friends. As you know, we consider that collaboration essential to the success of our work.

I should also like to welcome those representatives who, after a lengthy absence, have returned to this Conference: Mr. Naszkowski, Mr. Pechota, and Mr. Zorin, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union. I especially wish to greet Mr. Zorin, with whom I have had contacts for a long time past at this Conference and whose intelligence and ability I have learned to appreciate. Our opinions have often differed in the past, but I trust that they have come closer together and that our collaboration here will be very fruitful. I listened with great attention to his speech today; it deserves careful study. Mr. Zorin repeated the various Soviet proposals and also alluded to certain criticisms of the Western position with which we are already familiar and which we consider ill-founded.

However, I do wish to dwell, not on this negative side of Mr. Zorin's speech, but on its positive side. His moderate tone, and his important assertion that agreements can be concluded and that disarmament is possible, inspire confidence. I continue to hope that, during this session more than in the past, the Soviet delegation will show a spirit of conciliation and understanding. That is the spirit which animates the Italian and other Western delegations, as was proved yet again today by the speeches of the United States and United Kingdom delegations.

I am sanguine about the success of the session which begins today and which is to prepare a report for the General Assembly of the United Nations. This session has begun in an encouraging manner. We have heard very important and very practical speeches. Mr. Hassan and Mr. Lind have made highly interesting proposals on our Committee's procedure. These were certainly formulated in order to make this Committee's work more fruitful, and I therefore hope that they will be seriously considered by the Committee and by the two co-Chairmen.

On the substance of the problems, the speeches of Mr. Foster and Mr. Thomas clearly outlined a far-reaching, concrete and realistic working programme. I shall make a detailed comment on it at a subsequent meeting and indicate the priorities. However, I should like to say here and now that a halt and reversal of

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

the arms race in certain sectors, as a first step towards general and complete disarmament, and the restoration of confidence through improved mutual knowledge and limited and effective reciprocal controls, are objectives for which the Italian delegation has always striven during previous sessions of this Conference. My delegation is firmly resolved to continue its efforts in a spirit of faith and determination, realizing the desire for peace of all the peoples of the world and the need to make fresh progress as soon as possible towards general disarmament.

The Italian Parliament recently ratified the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests. It did so unanimously. Every speaker, whatever his party, who took part in the discussions in the Italian Chamber stressed the great importance of that agreement and the prospects which it opens up for disarmament and peace. These speeches confirmed yet again, in the most solemn manner, Italy's determination to make an active contribution to this Committee's task. Mr. Saragat, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy, said at the conclusion of the debate on the ratification of the Moscow Treaty: "This treaty opens the way to a relaxation of tension which should make it possible to overcome antagonisms".

At the beginning of this session my delegation expresses the hope that the Committee will in its subsequent labours strengthen and develop the spirit of the Moscow Treaty and translate it into concrete and constructive deeds, full of promise for the peace of all peoples.

Mr. PECHOTA (Czechoslovakia) (translation from Russian): On behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation I wish to associate myself with the profound condolences which have been expressed here upon the death of an outstanding statesman and foremost fighter for the freedom and independence of his people, the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and to request the delegation of India to transmit our condolences to the Government and people of India. The memory of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who devoted so many efforts to the cause of peace and mutual understanding among nations and contributed with all the weight of his authority to the progress of the idea of disarmament, will live for ever in the hearts of all peace-loving people.

(Mr. Pechota, Czechoslovakia)

Allow me, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation to thank you and other colleagues who have spoken today for your words of welcome, to express my satisfaction at the appeal with which you opened today's meeting, and to assure you and our other colleagues of the steadfast desire of the Czechoslovak delegation to achieve progress in the work of our Committee. We should like to add the voice of the Czechoslovak delegation to the voices of the preceding speakers who have welcomed here in our midst the co-Chairmen of our Conference: the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Zorin, and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency of the United States, Mr. Foster, as well as all our colleagues who are taking part in our work for the first time, and those representatives who are attending the Conference once again after the recess.

Now I should like to make, on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, a few comments in connexion with the resumption of our negotiations. As we know, the Eighteen-Nation Committee is meeting in this chamber for the seventh time. The number of meetings held by the Committee since the beginning of its work is approaching two hundred. Nevertheless, it has to be noted that we can hardly boast of any substantial results from the work of the Committee.

In this connexion I wish to stress that such an assessment is by no means a manifestation of extreme pessimism. In our opinion, it is an entirely realistic view based upon an objective assessment of the actual situation. We admit -- and I am glad to state this -- that our Committee has played a certain positive role as a forum in which the points of view of the member States have been clarified on a number of problems under discussion. In this context our Committee has contributed to some extent to the achievement of agreement on the individual measures which have been carried out in the past year and in the present and have led to a certain relaxation of international tension. We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that agreement on those measures, including the most recent one -- I refer to the decision of the Governments of the Soviet Union, the United States of America and the United Kingdom to reduce the production of fissionable materials for military purposes -- was reached outside this Committee.

(Mr. Pechota, Czechoslovakia)

It is hardly possible to deny that the Eighteen-Nation Committee is still in debt to the peoples of the world in regard to fulfilling the specific tasks assigned to it. This applies above all to the main and most important task: the preparation of a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament. Here we must frankly confess that in regard to fulfilling that task we have in fact achieved no progress whatsoever. Nor have any tangible results been achieved in the field of measures to ease international tension and slow the arms race.

It seems to us that such a state of affairs is hardly in keeping with the aims and tasks of the Committee or with the existing possibilities. It should be stressed that the responsibility for such an unsatisfactory situation does not lie with the delegations of the socialist countries. Those delegations -- and in the first place the delegation of the Soviet Union -- throughout the work carried out up to the present have striven unremittingly to overcome the accumulated obstacles and to open up before the Committee new prospects of moving forward.

This applies in the first place to the position of the socialist countries on the question of general and complete disarmament. It is well known that the Government of the Soviet Union has agreed to a number of substantial amendments to its original draft treaty, having taken into consideration the remarks of the Western Powers. It has thus confirmed its endeavour to create an acceptable basis for agreement. The most significant step in this direction was the proposal for the retention of a so-called nuclear umbrella until the end of the process of general and complete disarmament (ENDC/2/Rev.1/Add.1). The adoption of this proposal would open a way towards the solution of a crucial problem of general and complete disarmament: the problem of eliminating nuclear weapon delivery vehicles and the nuclear weapons themselves, and would thus create the most favourable pre-conditions for the achievement of general agreement.

This is proved by the wide support with which this Soviet proposal has met not only in our Committee but also on the part of public opinion in all countries. In this connexion I should like to recall with satisfaction the important statement made by the delegation of India on 24 March 1964, in which it was proposed that the principle of a nuclear umbrella should be accepted as a basis and starting point for further negotiations on this question. The delegation of India rightly pointed

(Mr. Pechota, Czechoslovakia)

out that such acceptance could well break the circumscribing circle in which the negotiations on general and complete disarmament find themselves (ENDC/PV.177, p.28). In our opinion, if the Committee were to act in accordance with this appeal, real prospects of achieving agreement would be created.

We should like to express the hope that the Governments of the Western Powers have availed themselves of the recess in the work of the Committee to review their positions, and that in the course of further negotiations it will be possible to bring about a change for the better on this fundamental question. We believe that progress in regard to this question is likely to be assisted and facilitated to a great extent by the additional proposal made by the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Zorin, in his statement today (supra, p. 17).

Likewise in regard to measures aimed at easing international tension and slowing the arms race, the delegations of the socialist countries have made untiring efforts to find an acceptable basis for agreement. This fact was confirmed once again in January this year when the Government of the Soviet Union submitted to the Committee for consideration a memorandum (ENDC/123) containing a number of effective measures the implementation of which would help considerably to relax international tension, to strengthen mutual confidence between States, and to slow the arms race. The individual measures proposed have been explained in sufficient detail during the previous negotiations, and I should therefore merely like to dwell briefly on a few of them.

Considerable attention has been given above all to the proposals for a reduction of military budgets, whether in the form of an agreement to reduce military budgets substantially by 10 to 15 per cent, or in the form of an appeal to governments to follow the example of the Soviet Union and the United States, which announced at the end of 1963 a unilateral reduction of their budgets. As we know, the example of the two great Powers has already been followed by a number of other States, including Czechoslovakia. There is no doubt that a particularly great positive effect, both from the point of view of easing international tension and from the point of view of slowing the arms race, would result from a reduction of military budgets, especially those of the militarily most powerful States, which are spending vast amounts on armaments and possess the greatest military strength. We are convinced that it would be possible to find a more rational use for the

(Mr. Pechota, Czechoslovakia)

resources released as a result of this reduction and to devote them to increasing the well-being of the peoples. We therefore trust that the proposal for reducing military budgets will continue to be the focus of the Committee's attention; and we should like to express the hope that the Western Powers will abandon the negative attitude towards this question which they have taken in the past.

In our opinion, the question of measures to prevent a further spread of nuclear weapons has also become fully ripe for solution. All realistically-minded people in the world realize the serious dangers to which a further spread of nuclear weapons would lead. Such a development would substantially increase the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war. For this reason the question of measures to prevent a further spread of nuclear weapons has been on the agenda of the United Nations for a number of years, and our Committee has in fact been concerned with this subject from the very first days of its establishment. It may be noted that, in words at least, the Governments of all the States represented in the Committee agree that it is necessary to adopt effective measures to prevent such a dangerous development. Unfortunately, however, it must be said that words are not always accompanied by corresponding actions.

In our opinion everyone should agree that measures to prevent a further spread of nuclear weapons must be consistent and not leave any loophole for infraction or circumvention. The extremely dangerous consequences to which a further spread of nuclear weapons would lead give rise to the imperative need to bar all ways, whether directly through bilateral agreements, or indirectly -- that is, on a multilateral basis within military groups, for instance through the creation of a so-called NATO multilateral nuclear force -- for the transfer of nuclear weapons to countries which do not now possess them. That is the firm conviction of the socialist countries, which consistently demand that all measures in this respect should be effective to the utmost. We should like to point out that the plans for the creation of a NATO multilateral nuclear force are becoming the most serious obstacle standing in the way of the adoption of effective measures to prevent a further spread of nuclear weapons. Incidentally, it was not only the delegations of the socialist States that drew attention to this fact at our previous meetings.

(Mr. Pechota, Czechoslovakia)

Therefore we are bound to state that the continuing negotiations of the Western Powers, and the measures that are being prepared for the execution of the plan to create a multilateral nuclear force, the accelerated creation of which is being urged mainly by certain circles in the Federal Republic of Germany which are striving to gain access to nuclear weapons, are contrary to the vital interests of the peoples of all countries and to their desire for the easing of international tension and the strengthening of confidence among nations. Essentially they also frustrate the aims of our negotiations in this regard. Naturally, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, as a State bordering on Western Germany, is directly interested in the adoption of effective measures to prevent the dissemination of nuclear weapons. Moreover, what applies to this question to a greater extent than to all the other problems is the fact that time is working against us and that any delay whatsoever in solving this question could lead to most serious consequences.

The implementation of the Soviet Government's proposal to eliminate bomber aircraft would be an important measure to slow down the arms race and to carry out in practice effective steps in the field of disarmament. Therefore it is quite understandable that the governments of many States, including a number of non-aligned countries, have adopted a positive position in regard to this proposal. In our view it would be possible to arrive at an acceptable agreement that would take into account the different situations in individual States and the importance of bomber aircraft for ensuring their defence capacity and security. The possibility of such an approach, which takes into consideration the specific conditions of individual States, has already been mentioned by the delegation of the Soviet Union at our previous meetings.

In this connexion we should like to point out that the solution of this problem cannot be helped forward by proposals which would merely lead to the destruction of a few obsolete types of bombers while leaving more up-to-date aircraft in the armaments of States and making it possible to improve them and to produce new types. Such a proposal, which does not meet the purposes of disarmament, we consider to be, for instance, the United States proposal in this regard, which is limited to the destruction of only a certain number of American B-47 and Soviet TU-16 bombers (ENDC/PV.176, pp.5 et seq.)

(Mr. Pechota, Czechoslovakia)

Real and effective measures for the relaxation of international tension and the strengthening of confidence between States are also proposed in other paragraphs of the Soviet Government's memorandum of 28 January 1964. For a number of years the socialist countries have proposed the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the States members of NATO and the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty. This is a measure the implementation of which would not come up against any technical or control problems. It would not cause any prejudice to the interests of either side. On the contrary, it would substantially help towards improving not only the relations between the States of the two groups but also the general situation in Europe and in the world. This is doubtless the reason why the proposal for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact has been so widely welcomed throughout the world, and, moreover, in a number of NATO countries. Therefore it would be appropriate if the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom were to inform our Committee of the results of the consultations on this subject which were to be carried out in accordance with the communiqué issued on 25 July 1963 at the conclusion of the Moscow negotiations of the three Great Powers (ENDC/101).

There is no need to stress especially that Czechoslovakia attaches particular importance to the discussion of all measures aimed at reducing tension in the area of Central Europe.

In my statement I have referred to only a few of the measures which are contained in the proposals of the Soviet Union and which provide a realistic and sufficiently wide basis for fruitful negotiations and for the achievement of a mutually-acceptable agreement. The Czechoslovak delegation trusts that these proposals will be the subject of thorough, businesslike discussion in our Committee, and that this will soon lead to the positive results awaited by the peoples of all the countries in the world.

Ato TEFERRA (Ethiopia): First of all I should like to associate myself with you, Mr. Chairman, and with other representatives in their expressions of condolence to the Indian delegation on the loss of the great Indian leader, Prime Minister Nehru. I should like also to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and those other representatives who have expressed their sympathy with Ambassador Agede, who is in an unfortunate situation at this moment. I shall convey your anxiety and concern to him and his family and to my Government.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 188th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador Antonio Correa do Lago, representative of Brazil.

"The Conference observed one minute of silence in tribute to the memory of the late Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru. The representative of India extended his thanks to the Conference.

"Statements were made by the representatives of Brazil, the United States, the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United Arab Republic, Sweden, Italy, Czechoslovakia and Ethiopia.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 11 June 1964, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.