

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT

ENDC/PV.394
28 August 1968
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FOURTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 28 August 1968, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. K. CHRISTOV

(Bulgaria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil: Mr. A.F. AZEREDO da SILVEIRA
Mr. A. da COSTA GUIMARAES
Mr. L.F. PALMEIRA LAMPREIA

Bulgaria: Mr. K. CHRISTOV
Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV

Burma: U CHIT MYAING
U KYAW MIN

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

Czechoslovakia: Mr. T. LAHODA
Mr. R. KLEIN
Mr. J. STRUCKA

Ethiopia: Mr. A. ZELLEKE

India: Mr. M.A. HUSAIN
Mr. N. KRISHNAN
Mr. K.P. JAIN

Italy: Mr. R. CARACCILO
Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI
Mr. R. BORSARELLI

Mexico: Mr. H. CARDENAS RODRIGUEZ

Nigeria: Mr. L.A. MALIKI

Poland: Mr. H. JAROSZEK
Mr. K. ZYBYLSKI
Mr. H. STEPOSZ

Romania:

Mr. N. ECOBESCO
Mr. O. IONESCO
Mr. V. TARZIORU

Sweden:

Mr. A. EDELSTAM
Mr. R. BOMAN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN
Mr. R.M. TIMERBAEV
Mr. V.V. SHUSTOV
Mr. M.P. SHELEPIN

United Arab Republic:

Mr. H. KHALLAF
Mr. O. SIRRY
Mr. A.R. ELREEDY
Mr. Y. RIZK

United Kingdom:

Mr. I.F. PORTER
Mr. W.N. HILLIER-FRY
Mr. R.I.T. CROMARTIE

United States of America:

Mr. G. BUNN
Mr. C. GLEYSTEEEN
Mr. C.G. BREAM
Mr. W. GIVAN

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

(Mr. Bunn, United States)

1. The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): I declare open the 394th plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.
2. Mr. BUNN (United States of America): I should like to explain the changes which have been made in the draft final report by the co-Chairmen in order to take into account the views of members of the Committee.
3. The second paragraph under section I has been substantially revised. We have deleted the reference to the General Assembly's expression of appreciation for the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament in elaborating the non-proliferation treaty (ENDC/226*). We have eliminated the expression of the wish of the General Assembly that the treaty have the widest possible adherence. We have taken out the expression of the wish that the provisions of the treaty be implemented as soon as possible.
4. I know that some members of the Committee will regret these omissions; but the language omitted seemed to be the crux of the complaints expressed by the representatives of India, Brazil and Burma (ENDC/PV.393). In view of our past practice with respect to reports of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, we thought it better not to state the differing views of members of the Committee. We therefore did not revise the report in such a way as to have it state that some members expressed one view and some members expressed another.
5. We concluded, however, that no member of the Committee viewed the non-proliferation treaty as unimportant. The report therefore notes the importance of the treaty. In conversations which took place just before this meeting we suggested also the deletion of the following phrase in the second sentence of paragraph 2 under section I of the revised draft: "and the contribution it would make to halting the nuclear arms race and the solution of disarmament problems". We made some other revisions in that sentence. The revised version reads: "Noting the importance of the non-proliferation treaty, and in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII), the Committee devoted most of its attention to the request of the General Assembly that the Committee urgently pursue negotiations on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." We believe that the statements in this paragraph are now non-controversial, and we hope that they can be accepted. It seems to me that they reflect the facts. They generally follow the suggestion which was made yesterday by the representative of Canada (ibid, paras.110 et seq.).

(Mr. Bunn, United States)

6. Under section II we have added reference to the Italian working paper (ENDC/234) and to the memorandum of the eight delegations (ENDC/235). Both these documents will be attached to the report as requested by the delegations concerned.
7. Under section III we have also made changes, to reflect the concerns of the delegations of India and Brazil. The desiderata are listed very much as before, but they are desiderata considered by the co-Chairmen rather than by the Committee. We believe that they are also the important matters which other members of the Committee took into account, as the representative of Canada observed yesterday; but the report no longer says so. It says only that the co-Chairmen considered them.
8. We have also stated that the agenda was recommended by the co-Chairmen, and we have given the date when it was adopted by the Committee.
9. We trust that, with those changes, section III of the report can now be adopted without objection.
10. In the first paragraph under section IV-A we have added a sentence stating that several delegations made useful contributions concerning the negotiation of measures on halting the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament. This language on useful contributions was transferred from the test-ban paragraph because some delegations made proposals with respect to other measures as well.
11. In the test-ban paragraph we have given added emphasis to the significance of the discussion by using the language "the Committee gave consideration" (to the question). We have also characterized the comprehensive test ban as an "important matter". These changes were made to reflect the feeling of the delegation of Nigeria (ENDC/PV.393, para.125) and several other delegations that particular emphasis should be given to the comprehensive test ban.
12. I would add that we were unable to agree on language that would take into account the Swedish suggestion concerning the unofficial International Institute for Peace and Conflict Research (SIPRI) conference (ENDC/PV.385, paras.6 et seq.). A reference to the SIPRI report, however, appears under section II.
13. At the end of section IV-A we have expressed the hope that one or more measures within the nuclear category "would become ripe for agreement at an early date". This was done because several delegations asked that the Committee attempt in the future to establish an order of priority within the nuclear category. I do not believe that it would do any good for the Committee to say that a particular measure is of first priority if it is not in fact ripe for agreement. Simply labelling a measure "first priority" is not likely to facilitate our task of reaching agreement if that measure is not yet ripe.

(Mr. Bunn, United States)

14. I turn now to section IV-B. We have accepted the Swedish suggestions concerning the restatement of the proposal made by Mr. Mulley (ENDC/PV.381, para.92) for a chemical weapons study. We have deleted the phrase "conduct a" in the fourth sentence of the first paragraph, as requested by Mr. Husain. We did not add the words "nature and" to that sentence, since many delegations obtained their instructions on the basis of the present formulation and their Foreign Offices might regard such a change in language as significant. Actually I suppose that in any event the experts will have to consider the nature of these weapons before they can consider their effects. But since, as I have said, instructions had been obtained on the basis of the earlier formulation, we did not try to change it at this late date. For similar reasons we did not change "bacteriological" to "biological". I point out that General Assembly resolution 2162 B (XXI) (ENDC/185) uses the word "bacteriological". My delegation agrees, however, that "biological" is technically the more appropriate word. We trust that the experts will not feel constrained by the fact that we chose the word "bacteriological" rather than "biological".

15. Finally, we did accept the Swedish proposal to substitute the phrase "means of warfare" for the word "weapons". My delegation does not regard this as a substantive change, since we had all along meant to include, for example, the delivery systems as well as the chemical and biological agents themselves. We hope other delegations agree.

16. In the next sentence we added the language "at an early date", in response to the Indian suggestion. We did not delete the reference to the Security Council, since we saw no particular reason to deprive the Security Council of the report. Since the Security Council has primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security, it would seem appropriate for it to receive a copy of the report. This does not, of course, mean that it will take any action on the report.

17. In the third paragraph of section IV-B we have modified the reference to regional arms limitations to take into account the Nigerian view. Since seven delegations, including my own, have expressed views on this problem, my delegation believes the revised language is quite factual.

18. Finally, in response to the criticism by the representative of India, we have toned down the reference to general and complete disarmament in section IV-D.

I believe it too is quite factual.

(Mr. Bunn, United States)

19. Since the report which representatives have before them does not contain the change that was made this morning, I should like to repeat it. On page 2, the second sentence of the first full paragraph would read:

"Noting the importance of the non-proliferation treaty, and in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII), the Committee devoted most of its attention to the request of the General Assembly that the Committee urgently pursue negotiations on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament."

20. I hope that with the changes I have indicated the report can now be accepted.

21. Mr. CARACCIOLO (Italy): I have no objection to the changes that have been made; but before approving this report I should like to be able to write them down. I would therefore request that these changes be read out again slowly.

The representative of the United States read out the proposed changes in the draft report.

22. Mr. PORTER (United Kingdom): My delegation can accept the report before us. I should just like to say a brief word about the format. There has been criticism of the present format on the ground that it constitutes a departure from the dry, uninformative statements which we have had in the past. We in this delegation welcome that development. As was pointed out yesterday by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic, there have been achievements of substance as well as of procedure during the six weeks available to the Committee, and we should not minimize those achievements.

23. The new format of the report also seems to us to present a challenge to the Committee; for, if we are to make proper use of it in future reports, there will have to be clear achievements which can be justifiably recorded. My delegation will devote all its efforts to that end.

24. I should also like to express appreciation of the work of the co-Chairmen, who have been at pains to incorporate so many of the suggestions put to them, formally and informally, by delegations around this table.

25. Mr. HUSAIN (India): First and foremost I should like to express the deep appreciation and thanks of my delegation to Mr. Bunn and Mr. Roshchin for the consideration they have given to the views I expressed yesterday. I should like to extend double thanks and gratitude for the informal discussion we had before this meeting, to consider further the various aspects of the draft, particularly in relation to the second paragraph on page 2. The changes agreed upon have been read out by Mr. Bunn.
26. As I said, my delegation is anxious that we should conclude our deliberations today so that we can proceed with the other Conference tomorrow. While some of the changes made in different parts of the draft report, as they have been explained by Mr. Bunn, meet us only part of the way and not the whole way; nevertheless the effort that has been made is appreciated.
27. The only point of explanation, as it were, that I should like to make about the redraft of the second paragraph on page 2 of the revised draft report is in relation to the words "Noting the importance of the non-proliferation treaty ...". As I said yesterday, as members of the Committee are fully aware, India attaches the greatest importance to a non-proliferation treaty and has always advocated the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. There is, however, a difference of view with regard to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. I would not wish at this time to go into a discussion of our concept of a non-proliferation treaty or of the treaty which was approved in New York. We were unable to subscribe to that treaty, and we had to abstain from the vote on the resolution commending it.
28. Hence my understanding of the words "Noting the importance of the non-proliferation treaty ..." would be in the sense I have just explained. In order to save the time of the Committee I would not wish a dissent to be incorporated in the body of the report itself, for the reasons Mr. Bunn has mentioned. But the record will indicate our view of a non-proliferation treaty.
29. The only other comment I wish to make is in relation to the first paragraph on page 8, under the heading "Non-Nuclear Measures", where there is a recommendation that the Secretary-General should appoint a group of experts to study the effects of the possible use of chemical and bacteriological means of warfare. We suggested the

(Mr. Husain, India)

addition of the words "nature and" before the word "effects"; but Mr. Bunn has explained why it has not been possible to add those words. We should have liked them to be added. However, since this report is going to the General Assembly, it will be for the members who are interested and who have expressed views on the matter to pursue the question in the General Assembly itself. We have not wished to hold up the work of the Committee, especially since some delegations do not have instructions on this point.

30. In that sense the draft is now acceptable to us.

31. Mr. AZEREDO da SILVEIRA (Brazil): I also should like to thank the co-Chairmen for the consideration they have given to the observations of my delegation. The report is now acceptable to us, as I have said to them. We have refrained from making any criticism of the non-proliferation treaty because we thought it would not be timely to do so, and we did not intend to do so anyway. We believe that when we say that the Committee notes the importance of the non-proliferation treaty, that is a factual statement, in the sense that the treaty is important in itself, whether one agrees with it or not; it is an important treaty whether one is ready to sign it or not. That is the interpretation of my delegation, in the sense that we are not expressing the view that we should be forced to take a position. We are accepting the fact -- and it is a very real fact -- that the non-proliferation treaty is an important act.

32. I agree also with the United Kingdom representative that the new kind of report which we are making is really a challenge to this Committee. I only hope that the Committee will be able to meet that challenge in future without many difficulties.

33. The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): Since no one else wishes to speak, and if there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the revised draft report, with the last-minute changes that have been made.

The draft report was adopted.

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

The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament is completing another stage in its negotiations. The present session of the Committee, to mention its main feature, has been held after agreement was reached on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In their statements members of the Committee pointed out the great importance of the non-proliferation treaty (ENDC/226*) for restricting the nuclear arms race. We can note with satisfaction that the United Nations General Assembly expressed its high appreciation of the contribution made by the Committee to the elaboration of that treaty. Many delegations -- and we fully agree with them on this point -- have emphasized the need for the widest possible adherence to the treaty by States and for its speediest possible entry into force. The non-proliferation treaty must serve as a point of departure for further progress towards the solution of other problems of disarmament, and first of all nuclear disarmament.

35. The discussion that has taken place in the Committee has undoubtedly been useful from the point of view of making clearer the positions of the parties and of elucidating the range of issues on which the Committee should concentrate its attention in the light of the non-proliferation treaty and the recommendations addressed to it by the United Nations General Assembly. We note the active participation of delegations in the exchange of views which has taken place. Various proposals reflecting the points of view of the countries participating in our negotiations on ways of accomplishing the tasks before our Conference were submitted for consideration by the Committee.

36. The Soviet delegation would like to express its appreciation to all the delegations which have pointed out the importance for our negotiations of the memorandum (ENDC/227) of 1 July of the Government of the USSR on some urgent measures for stopping the arms race and for disarmament. The proposals contained in that memorandum are aimed at diminishing the threat of nuclear war and at implementing the provisions of the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The programme of measures for disarmament put forward by the Soviet Union opens up wide possibilities for achieving both nuclear and conventional disarmament.

37. The Soviet delegation regards as a positive contribution the fact that during the present session of the Committee a large number of delegations have advocated the immediate conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

weapons. This measure, the consideration of which was proposed by the Soviet Government as a task of high priority in the struggle against the threat of thermo-nuclear war, is quite justifiably gaining ever wider support. The representatives of socialist countries and also of non-aligned countries such as the United Arab Republic (ENDC/PV.390, para.40), and Ethiopia (ibid., paras. 81 et seq) have spoken in the Committee in favour of concluding a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

38. At the same time some delegations, in particular those of the United Kingdom (ENDC/PV.381, para.70) and Canada (ENDC/PV.392, para.19) expressed the opposite view in the Committee, namely that it would be inappropriate to renounce the use of nuclear weapons. During the discussion the Soviet delegation, as well as a number of other delegations, showed that this position is contrary to the interests of the removal of the threat of nuclear war and to the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. We hope that further discussion of the question of the non-use of nuclear weapons will lead to agreement on this important matter.

39. The present session of the Committee has shown the interest taken by the majority of the members of the Committee in a speedy solution of the question of a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests. The Soviet delegation considers that during further negotiations on disarmament every effort must be made to solve at last the problem of banning underground nuclear-weapon tests and using national means of detection for control over this ban.

40. For reasons which are quite understandable, the members of the Committee have been devoting most of their attention to the solution of the aforementioned problems of restricting the nuclear arms race, as well as of other problems of nuclear disarmament. We agree with the view expressed in the Committee by many delegations that it is necessary to give priority to the solution of problems of nuclear disarmament. The Soviet Union stands for a cardinal resolution of these problems. Wishing to deliver mankind from the danger of nuclear war, the Soviet Government proposed in its memorandum that all nuclear Powers should forthwith enter into negotiations for stopping the manufacture of nuclear weapons, the reduction of stockpiles of these weapons and the subsequent complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons under appropriate international control. The consolidation of peace and security will depend to a large extent on the solving of the problem of removing the threat of nuclear war.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

41. During the present session of the Committee a broad debate has been held on the question of banning chemical and bacteriological weapons. We note that the call for strict observance of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 was the leading idea running through the overwhelming majority of the statements. Following resolution 2162 B (XXI) of the General Assembly (ENDC/185), the representatives of many countries expressed themselves in favour of the early adherence to the Geneva Protocol of the States not yet parties to it. The proposal of the Polish People's Republic (ENDC/PV.385, para.70) for the preparation of a report on the effects of the possible use of chemical and bacteriological means of warfare met with a positive response in the Committee. The Soviet delegation declared its support for this Polish proposal. As the debate held in the Committee shows, the attempts to prove the need to revise the Geneva Protocol on the alleged ground that it has become obsolete failed to meet with support from the majority of the participants in our negotiations.

42. The consideration in the Committee of the question of the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, as posed in the Soviet memorandum was in our opinion useful. The debate has shown that the delegations taking part in the negotiations are giving great attention to this problem. We note with satisfaction that many countries share the view of the Soviet Union, which advocates the exclusion of the sea-bed and the ocean floor from the sphere of any military activity. This is a solution which would fully correspond to the aim of preventing an arms race on the sea-bed, and to the interests of the peaceful exploitation of this promising environment rich in resources useful to man. Basing ourselves on this premise, we have expressed our disagreement with the position taken by the United States, which proposes that we confine ourselves to renouncing solely the placing on the sea-bed of weapons of mass destruction. We must in the future elaborate appropriate measures for establishing in proper form such a regime as would ensure the utilization of the sea-bed beyond the limits of the present territorial waters solely for peaceful purposes.

43. During the present session the Committee has, after some interval, resumed consideration of the problem of general and complete disarmament, the solution of

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

which is the ultimate objective of our negotiations. We regard as positive the fact that many delegations have resolutely stressed the need to give new impetus to the work of the Committee towards that end. In the opinion of the Soviet Union, it is essential to make every effort to achieve concrete results in solving the problem of general and complete disarmament and thus to deliver mankind forever from the threat of war.

44. The shortness of the present session of the Committee has made it impossible for us to give thorough consideration to all the proposals put forward by various delegations in the course of our negotiations. We think, however, that the study and consideration of the arguments put forward here should be continued in order to find subsequently a constructive solution of the problems that would be conducive to the cessation of the arms race and to disarmament.

45. Undoubtedly we must put to the credit of the present session of the Committee the achievement of agreement on the agenda for our negotiations, which enables us to endeavour to accomplish the important tasks confronting the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in a more purposeful and consistent way. The adopted agenda, which gave priority to the concrete questions of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, is based on the requirements of the treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and of the United Nations General Assembly resolutions. The adoption of the agenda is an important decision of the Committee which will facilitate progress in its future work.

46. We cannot of course overlook the fact that in the course of further negotiations on disarmament we shall still encounter not inconsiderable difficulties connected with certain differences between the parties in their approach to this or that specific problem. That makes it all the more incumbent on all of us to work more strenuously in order to arrive at mutually-acceptable agreements on urgent questions of disarmament.

47. The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, which has acquired during its existence considerable experience in conducting negotiations on disarmament is in our view in a position to accomplish the important tasks with which it is entrusted. In emphasizing the Committee's contribution to the elaboration of the non-proliferation treaty, many delegations have pointed during the present session to its increasingly important role in the solution of problems of disarmament. We share this view.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

48. We should also like to stress in our statement today our satisfaction that the Committee has approved the report to the General Assembly concerning the activities of the Committee and setting out the substance of the work which it has done during the brief session of the past six weeks.

49. Since the Eighteen-Nation Committee is suspending its work, we deem it necessary to state that the Soviet delegation intends to avail itself of this interval to study very thoroughly and to think over the considerations put forward by delegations on various aspects of disarmament in order to get ready for the examination in the Committee of measures which would contribute to a speedy solution of the problems confronting us, in the first place in the field of nuclear disarmament. We call upon other members of the Committee to exert efforts directed to that end in order to achieve progress in the cause of disarmament during the subsequent negotiations on disarmament both in the Eighteen-Nation Committee and elsewhere, and thus to extend the success achieved in elaborating the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which we hope will enjoy the widest possible adherence and will soon enter into force.

50. In conclusion, the Soviet delegation would like to thank Mr. Protitch, the Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General, his Deputy, Mr. Epstein, and all the staff of the Secretariat, including the interpreters, for their very efficient co-operation and for the highly-skilled services which they have rendered to the Committee in the course of the negotiations on disarmament.

51. Mr. BURNS (Canada): The Canadian delegation has listened with great interest to the statement which has just been made by the representative of the Soviet Union. It seems to us that it constitutes a review of the work of the Committee from the viewpoint of his delegation. I am happy to state that the Canadian delegation is able to agree with a great deal of what he said. There are of course some points with which we do not agree; but it is not my purpose at present to enter into a discussion of those points.

52. We find ourselves in complete agreement with what he said in the last paragraph of his statement. On behalf of the Canadian delegation I should like to thank Mr. Protitch, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Epstein, the Deputy Special Representative, and the interpreters, the verbatim reporters, the stenographers and all the other members of the Secretariat who enable our work here to be carried out so efficiently.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

53. I should also like to say a word of thanks to the co-Chairmen, who have had to work much harder than the rest of us in trying to formulate, and succeeding in formulating, first an agenda and secondly a report to which we can all subscribe. We hope that their future work in the Committee will be even more successful and lead to agreements of a substantive character.

54. Mr. PORTER (United Kingdom): We too agree with almost all that was said by the representative of the Soviet Union; but I feel that I should make one point.

55. Mr. Roshchin referred to endeavours to prove the need to revise the Geneva Protocol; and, although he did not mention the United Kingdom in connexion with the discussion we have had on chemical and bacteriological weapons, the implication was that we were pressing for a revision of the Geneva Protocol. I should like to read out what Mr. Mulley said when he introduced our working paper (ENDC/231):

"I should stress again, as I did in my speech on 16 July, that our purpose is to supplement and not to supersede the Geneva Protocol of 1925. We consider that that Protocol should remain in force, and we should welcome the ratification of it by all States which have not so far signed and ratified it." (ENDC/PV.387, para. 6)

56. Mr. HUSAIN (India): I have already expressed my great appreciation of the consideration shown by Mr. Roshchin and Mr. Bunn in taking into account the views which have been expressed in the Committee on the finalization of our work, I should now like to join with Mr. Burns in expressing the thanks of the Indian delegation to the Secretariat: Mr. Protitch, Mr. Epstein and the members of their staff for the excellent work which they have done and the great service which they have performed in the successful conclusion of this session.

57. Mr. BUNN (United States of America): I wish to express appreciation of the statements made by other delegations about the work of the co-Chairmen, and, on behalf of my delegation, to thank the members of the Committee for the co-operation that all of them have given us.

(Mr. Bunn, United States)

58. I should also like to join in the expressions of thanks to Mr. Protitch, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and Mr. Epstein, his Deputy, and to extend my thanks to the interpreters, the verbatim reporters, the stenographers and all the other members of the staff who have helped us so much here. We often forget how much we depend on them for the success of our work.

59. The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): If no one else wishes to speak, allow me, as Chairman of this last meeting of the present session, to say a few words now that we are about to conclude our work.

60. I am sure that I am expressing the sentiments of all the members of the Committee when I extend, first of all, our deepest gratitude to our co-Chairmen for the untiring efforts they have made to ensure the successful accomplishment of the task entrusted to the Committee. On behalf of all the delegations, I thank them.

61. I believe that all the members of the Committee would wish to join the co-Chairmen in their expressions of gratitude to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Protitch, his Deputy, Mr. Epstein, and all the members of the Secretariat -- the interpreters and all the other staff -- for the assistance they have given us and the devotion they have shown in carrying out their task of servicing the Conference. I would again thank Mr. Protitch, and I request him to convey the thanks of the Committee to all the members of the Secretariat.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 394th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador K. Christov, representative of Bulgaria.

"Statements were made by the representatives of the United States, Italy, the United Kingdom, India, Brazil, the USSR and Canada, and by the Chairman.

"The Committee adopted its report to the United Nations General Assembly and to the United Nations Disarmament Commission (ENDC/236).

"The next meeting of the Conference will take place at a date agreed on by the co-Chairmen in consultation with all the other members of the Committee."

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.