

ENDC/PV.299

25 May 1967

ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY-NINTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 25 May 1967, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Alhaji SULE KOLO

(Nigeria)

GE.67-9569

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A.F. AZEREDO da SILVEIRA

Mr. C.A. de SOUZA e SILVA

Mr. A. da COSTA GUIMARAES

Mr. L. de ALENCAR ARARIPE

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. CHRISTOV

Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV

Mr. D. KOSTOV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG

U KYAW MIN

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS

Mr. S.F. RAE

Mr. C.J. MARSHALL

Mr. J.R. MORDEN

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. P. WINKLER

Mr. T. LAHODA

Mr. V. VAJNAR

Ethiopia:

Mr. A. ZELLEKE

Mr. B. ASSFAW

India:

Mr. V.C. TRIVEDI

Mr. N. KRISHNAN

Mr. K.P. JAIN

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI

Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI

Mr. E. FRANCO

Mr. F. SORO

Mexico:

Mr. J. CASTANEDA

Miss E. AGUIRRE

Mr. F. CORREA

Nigeria:

Alhaji SULE KOLO

Mr. B.O. TONWE

Poland:

Mr. N. BLUSZTAJN

Mr. J. GOLDBLAT

Mr. E. STANIEWSKI

Romania:

Mr. N. ECOBESCO

Mr. O. IONESCO

Mr. C. GEORGESCU

Mr. A. COROIANU

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL

Mr. A. EDELSTAM

Mr. I. VIRGIN

Mr. R. BOMAN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN

Mr. V.P. SUSLOV

Mr. R.M. TIMERBAEV

Mr. I.M. PALENYKH

United Arab Republic:

Mr. A. OSMAN

Mr. O. SIRRY

Mr. A.A. SALAM

Mr. M. SHAKER

United Kingdom:

Lord CHALFONT

Sir Harold BEELEY

Mr. I.F. PORTER

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

United States of America:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER

Mr. G. BUNN

Mr. C. GLEYSTEN

Mr. C.G. BREAM

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

1. The CHAIRMAN (Nigeria): I declare open the two hundred and ninety-ninth plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.
2. Lord CHALFONT (United Kingdom): I address the Committee this morning with somewhat mixed feelings, of which I must confess at the moment a feeling of sadness is by far the strongest element. I had intended to speak at our meeting on Tuesday and to address myself to some of the difficulties which apparently still lie in the way of an effective non-proliferation treaty. However, as you, Mr. Chairman, and my other colleagues on the Committee now probably know, while the Tuesday meeting was actually in session an announcement was made in London saying that the Prime Minister wished me to leave my work on disarmament and to take charge of the negotiations for Britain's entry into the European Communities. I felt, therefore, that it would be inappropriate for me at that stage to embark on any detailed analysis of our problems and I propose now to leave that very important part of the United Kingdom delegation's contribution to our work here initially to Sir Harold Beeley, who will be temporarily in charge of the delegation, and eventually to the Minister who will take over my responsibilities in the United Kingdom Government for disarmament.
3. First of all let me say once more, just in case there should be any lingering doubt in anyone's mind, that my Government still regards a treaty to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons as a vital and important step in the disarmament process and as a cardinal element of its foreign policy. I hope, therefore that the negotiations in which the two permanent co-Chairmen have been engaged with such patience and such application over the past few months will soon be crowned with success and that we shall have a draft treaty on the table here in Geneva upon which we can all begin the serious business of negotiation.
4. It has become fashionable in certain quarters -- and some people in my own country, I must confess, are not quite blameless in this respect -- to belittle the attempts that are being made here to achieve a non-proliferation treaty. With a fine disregard for everything that has been said in this Committee by those attempting to negotiate the treaty, its critics have said that the treaty is a worthless project which would make no real difference to the problems of disarmament, or that it is a cynical attempt to preserve the monopoly of the existing nuclear-weapon Powers, or that it would interfere with the legitimate development of nuclear

(Lord Chalfont, United Kingdom)

energy for peaceful purposes, or that it would undermine the security of those countries which undertook to reject the nuclear option. Some of those views, and others of course, reflect the legitimate concerns of the non-nuclear Powers, but perhaps I may be allowed the liberty on my last appearance here of expressing myself with rather more than usual force on some of the attempts that have been made to belittle and denigrate the non-proliferation treaty as a step to disarmament.

5. Quite frankly, I regard a good deal of the criticism of the efforts of this Committee to achieve a non-proliferation treaty as deplorably uninformed and on occasions even startlingly childish. It seems to me to be made often by people with a very limited knowledge of the subject and an even more limited imagination. In my view a successful non-proliferation treaty, intelligently devised to make its provisions acceptable to the nuclear and the non-nuclear Powers alike, would be the first sign and symbol of a fundamental transformation of the international scene. Indeed I think it might well be argued that with a non-proliferation treaty the world would have a good chance of becoming a better, a safer and a saner place to live in. Without a non-proliferation treaty it is almost certain to become worse, more irrational and infinitely more dangerous.

6. I do not intend to take up much of the Committee's time this morning, but perhaps before I leave your councils I might be permitted to reflect briefly on some of the ways in which I believe a non-proliferation treaty would affect all our lives.

7. First, there is the simple fact that such a treaty would be a concrete sign of the community of interest between the world's two most powerful military alliances. If those two alliances, forged and formed in a climate of conflict, can now agree that there are dangers and problems in the world that transcend their own differences then we shall have taken the first step on the road to a wider understanding. Of course that is not to suggest for one moment that a non-proliferation treaty is simply a matter of agreement between the United States and its allies on the one hand and the Soviet Union and its allies on the other. Indeed, by its very nature a non-proliferation agreement would have a deep and radical effect on the security and the prestige of those countries which have chosen instead the path of non-alignment. No treaty that was unacceptable to them could possibly last. But it

(Lord Chalfont, United Kingdom)

cannot be said often enough that the greatest danger to the peace of the world remains, for the present at any rate, the possibility of conflict between the two great super-Powers and that no serious or far-reaching measures of disarmament can even be contemplated without agreement between them.

8. For that reason I see the non-proliferation treaty as simply the first but vital element in a broad and comprehensive strategy -- a strategy for arms control, for disarmament and for international security, and for the international control of nuclear energy for the uses of peace. Certainly the treaty will not last, nor will it deserve to last, if it is used simply as a device to preserve the existing order of things, to perpetuate the oligopoly of the nuclear club. If we are to progress, as we should, from a non-proliferation treaty gradually to a more intelligent system of international security than the one we have at present it will be necessary for the nuclear Powers to accept two simple and incontrovertible facts.

9. The first of those facts is that they cannot expect the non-nuclear Powers of the world to deny themselves the option of possessing the most powerful military weapon the world has ever seen unless they, the nuclear Powers, are prepared themselves to engage in serious and specific measures of nuclear disarmament. Many suggestions have already been made which, in my view, contribute to that aim and deserve close and serious attention: the proposals for a freeze in the production of nuclear delivery vehicles (ENDC/120, 165), for a cut-off in the production of fissile material (ENDC/131, 132, 134) and for the dismantling of existing warheads and the transfer of their fissile material to peaceful purposes (ENDC/109). There have been proposals, too, for regional arms control in Central Europe which ought to be looked at with a fresh eye, unclouded by the worn-out assumptions of the cold war.

10. But, quite apart from those detailed steps towards nuclear disarmament the principle must be accepted and clearly understood that if a non-proliferation treaty is not followed by serious attempts amongst the nuclear Powers to dismantle some of their own vast nuclear armoury, then the treaty will not last, however precise its language may be. There is in my mind no doubt that, if the non-nuclear Powers are to be asked to sign a binding non-proliferation treaty, it must contain the necessary provisions and machinery to ensure that the nuclear Powers too take their

(Lord Chalfont, United Kingdom)

proper share of the balance of obligation. But equally it is unreasonable for the non-nuclear Powers to insist that nuclear disarmament should come before a non-proliferation treaty. The great Powers -- and I refer here specifically to the United States and the Soviet Union -- are understandably very unlikely to begin to dismantle their own armouries while the possibility of what has been called "horizontal" proliferation still exists; nor, in my view, can it reasonably be expected that concrete specific measures of nuclear disarmament should be included in the operative clauses of a non-proliferation treaty.

11. The second essential element lies in the field of military security. Here again, no country can reasonably be expected to relinquish by international agreement its access to nuclear weapons if it feels that by its doing so the safety of its people will be put at risk. It is, of course, possible to argue in the most subtle and sophisticated terms that the possession of nuclear weapons does not in fact give a country any real security at all. But what matters in this case is not the learned opinions of analysts and strategists, but whether or not people feel safe. If they do not, then no amount of ingenious sophistry will make them feel any safer. If, therefore, any country signing a non-proliferation treaty feels the need for assurances of its security -- and this applies, of course again more specifically to the non-aligned countries -- then it is up to the nuclear Powers which sign the treaty to provide in some form or another, possibly through the existing machinery of the United Nations, the assurances that are called for. Here again I am not concerned today, nor would it be appropriate for me, to examine details of how such security assurances might be formulated. I merely make a point of principle that seems to me to be irresistibly obvious.

12. If, therefore, the non-proliferation treaty is to come into being, if it is to last and if it is to be the keystone in a new system of international security, it must go hand in hand with these two concepts -- the sincere and declared intent of the nuclear Powers to halt and reverse their own armaments race as soon as the further spread of nuclear weapons has been stopped; and, while nuclear weapons still remain a part of the world's power structure, the evolution of an effective means of protection from assault or blackmail for those countries that have undertaken never to make or acquire them.

(Lord Chalfont, United Kingdom)

13. There is, as I suggested, another aspect of the control of nuclear energy which is as important as, and perhaps in the long run even more important than, that of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. It is the need for a rational and comprehensive international system for the management and control of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. This may not of course be a matter to be dealt with directly by a non-proliferation agreement; but there will be much in a non-proliferation agreement, especially in its inspection provisions, which will bear very closely on the problem. Many people have expressed the fear that, even if everyone concerned in a non-proliferation treaty were influenced by the sincerest and best motives, the inhibitions of a non-proliferation agreement would inevitably affect the spread of peaceful nuclear technology. As I have consistently said here -- and I say it again now -- my Government would not support a treaty that interfered with the legitimate development of civil nuclear programmes.

14. But if there is one thing that has become clearer to me than any other in the two-and-a-half years in which I have been engaged with my colleagues here on these negotiations, it is the crying need to develop our existing international machinery for managing the whole business, complicated already and growing more so every day, of the application of nuclear energy to productive and peaceful needs. This applies not only to the vexed question of the exploitation of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes, if indeed that ever becomes an effective engineering technique. Here perhaps I may add that nothing that has been said in this Committee or elsewhere has yet convinced me that there is any real difference, in either military or political terms, between a so-called peaceful nuclear device and a nuclear weapon. A country which possesses an explosive nuclear device has, whether it likes it or not, a military nuclear capability, with all that that means in the context of proliferation.

15. But the problem of how to make the peaceful uses of such devices available to non-nuclear-weapon States is part of a much larger problem. It emerges constantly in the whole question of the free exchange of technological information; the flow of source and fissile material freely but safely about the world; the establishment anywhere in the world of the most advanced and sophisticated reactors and nuclear installations under effective safeguards; in short, the whole problem of ensuring that while we do our best to diminish the awful danger of the nuclear weapon we do

(Lord Chalfont, United Kingdom)

not at the same time place any obstacle in the way of making the enormous, and as yet not fully realized, potential of nuclear energy available to everyone. Of course, the activities of the IAEA are often overlooked in this context -- and I hope that no one here will think that I have overlooked them -- but much still remains to be done to develop the scope of the international control and management of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. This is a matter of desperate concern to those countries especially to which nuclear energy might make the difference between the poverty that afflicts them now and the quality of life that they can see in the more industrially-developed areas of the world.

16. Therefore, for the reasons I have outlined this morning, it seems to me incomprehensible that anyone facing the challenge and the possibilities that would flow from a successful non-proliferation treaty, and the dangers that will confront us if we fail, can seriously suggest that a non-proliferation treaty is either, on the one hand, a worthless piece of paper or, on the other hand, some sinister conspiracy of the nuclear Powers. It is for that reason that it is, as I said at the beginning, with very mixed feelings that I leave these negotiations at such a vital and exciting stage. It is for that reason also that I express the sincere hope that the tabling of a draft treaty will not much longer be delayed.

17. Before I end, perhaps I might be allowed the indulgence of the Committee for a few brief moments to make one or two personal comments. Since I first began to take part in these discussions two-and-a-half years ago I have been increasingly impressed by the patience, the skill and the wisdom of the delegations that sit around this table. Some of the faces around the table today are faces familiar from the whole time that I have been here, others are new. I hope that I shall not be accused of being unduly discriminatory if I express my thanks and my admiration specifically to the two permanent co-Chairmen -- first of all to my old and valued friend, Ambassador Foster, to whom I have turned so often during the last two-and-a-half years for guidance and support, and to a newer friend, Ambassador Roshchin, whose skill, courtesy and flexibility in negotiation I have constantly admired even if I have not always found myself able to agree entirely with all his views.

18. Of the rest of my colleagues I shall, I hope with your indulgence, single out two of the founder members of this Committee, Mr. Burns and Mrs. Myrdal, whose contributions to the search for disarmament need no testimonials from me -- their efforts are known

(Lord Chalfont, United Kingdom)

and admired wherever people have a regard for order and peace in the world. When I say founder members, of course, I mean founder members as heads of their delegations. I know that another friend, Ambassador Cavalletti, and again a newer friend, Ambassador Blusztajn, were, in fact here at the first meeting of this Committee, but not as the heads of their delegations. Again, I think I need say no more about the contributions which they have made over the years to the discussions in Geneva and in New York.

19. I should like to say also how much I have admired the way in which the Secretariat, under the untiring direction of Mr. Protitch and Mr. Epstein, has kept our affairs running, not only with smoothness and dispatch but also with an obvious deep commitment to the cause that we all serve. I hope it is not stretching the bounds of common practice here too far to say how grateful I personally have been for the unfailing kindness, courtesy and helpfulness of everyone connected with the Palais des Nations with whom I have come into contact during my visits here.

20. Finally, a short and very sincere word of appreciation for those people who are always heard at every meeting in our deliberations but very seldom seen, except through a glass rather darkly. I refer, of course, to the interpreters without whom there could be very little communication between us. I know how hard they work and I know, indeed that they have had great difficulties in the past with some members of this Committee. Indeed, I know it because I was one of these, and I was taken to task very soon after my arrival here for speaking much too fast for any human translator to cope with. I can only hope that, in the last two-and-a-half years, I have improved to their satisfaction.

21. May I once again Mr. Chairman wish you and your colleagues success in the months that lie ahead, especially in the patient and imaginative attempts that are being made here to bring the nuclear weapon under control and to release the miracle of nuclear energy for the benefit of mankind and not for its destruction?

22. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): In introducing his customarily brilliant speech today, Lord Chalfont has expressed his own sadness at leaving our Committee. I must say that this is in many ways a sad occasion for the Members of this Committee. We are about to lose the services of one of our devoted colleagues. The deliberations of this Committee will be the poorer because he will have gone.

(Mr. Foster, United States of America)

23. Lord Chalfont is a soldier who gave up a military career for another more public one, journalism. He distinguished himself in both careers. He then entered the world of politics and has become the eloquent spokesman for his country on disarmament. He has been as successful in his latest career as in the others, and this Committee's progress in the last two-and-a-half years has been due in no small measure to the attention and capabilities which our distinguished British colleague has brought to our deliberations.

24. We are all here as servants of our Governments, assigned to carry out their instructions, but we all have a larger duty as well. It is a duty to all mankind; a duty to bring about a peaceful disarmed world. Lord Chalfont was unusually successful in emphasizing these two duties. We are particularly sorry that he is leaving us at a time when the efforts in which he has participated seem at last to be approaching fruition. Lord Chalfont has now been called to other duties and charged with leading the efforts of his country in its momentous decision to seek admission to a wider economic grouping. It is a fundamental step which his country is taking, and it is a recognition of his past achievements that he has been chosen as its leader in that task.

25. As he leaves to take up his new assignment, I am confident that all of us wish him success and godspeed.

26. Mr. BURNS (Canada): Before beginning my prepared statement I should like to welcome, as other speakers who have preceded me have done, Mr. Castañeda, the distinguished representative of Mexico who has joined us. We are looking forward very much indeed to collaborating with him. The Mexican delegation has always played a very important part in our deliberations here and we are sure that, under Mr. Castañeda's direction, it will continue to do so.

27. The Canadian delegation listened attentively to the statements made at our 297th and 298th meetings. Like many other delegations, we had hoped that on resumption of our meetings after the rather long recess we should have on the table before us a draft of a non-proliferation treaty. As we know, our co-Chairmen have been working long and diligently to find language on which both can agree and which will accord as far as possible with the consensus of views expressed by all delegations represented at this Conference, as well as the views of other important

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

countries not represented here. By "important" countries I mean countries which have the potential to produce a nuclear weapon -- countries to which, therefore, the question of non-proliferation is of particular concern. We were disappointed that all points of difference had not been overcome in the prolonged negotiations which have been going on since the last United Nations General Assembly, but we were encouraged when the representative of the United States of America said, at our meeting on 18 May: "The co-Chairmen's work is therefore not yet done. But my hope is that we can present our recommendations on what we have accomplished to the Committee in the near future." (ENDC/PV.297, para. 37)

28. We were encouraged also by the statement bearing on that point made at the same meeting by the representative of the Soviet Union. Looking back on the proceedings of this Committee since 1962 I think I must say that usually when the Canadian delegation has commented on statements by the representatives of the Soviet Union it has been to disagree, more or less, with the viewpoints or proposals they have presented. Today, however, I am happy to say that we find ourselves largely in agreement with what Mr. Roshchin had to say at our 297th meeting in regard to various points which must be covered in an effective non-proliferation treaty. I mean, of course, that the Canadian delegation found itself in agreement in principle because, as we do not have any text before us, we cannot make a final statement of the Canadian Government's position in regard to the various aspects of the treaty.

29. After outlining the general principles on which the treaty should be formulated, and quoting particularly some of the terms embodied in United Nations General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX) (ENDC/161), the representative of the Soviet Union said:

"It is important to note in that connexion that the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons is a universal one. The proliferation of nuclear weapons constitutes a threat to the great Powers. They face an increased risk of being dragged into a nuclear war as a result of conflicts in one or another part of the world. The proliferation of nuclear weapons equally constitutes a threat to small countries. For them, as for all countries in the world, a nuclear war would be truly catastrophic."

"... The conclusion of an international treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons would undoubtedly help to ensure the security of all States, nuclear and non-nuclear". (ENDC/PV.297, paras. 11 and 13)

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

30...I think it would be difficult to express better the paramount reason why all of us here, and other nations with a nuclear weapon potential, should put aside narrow nationalistic conceptions fitted more to the nineteenth century than to the nuclear age, and instead deploy all our efforts to agree on an effective international instrument to check the spread of the menace which nuclear armaments hold for every nation, and every people.

31. Then the representative of the USSR mentioned that the nations which do not possess nuclear arms, and which will be invited to renounce possession of them, are naturally concerned that a non-proliferation treaty should not in any way hinder them in the development of nuclear technology, and from participating in the benefits of nuclear energy. He observed, in this connexion:

"... Our point of view in that regard is that the solution of the non-proliferation problem is one of the most important conditions that would ensure for the non-nuclear countries the most rapid and successful development of their peaceful atomic industry.

"Renunciation by the non-nuclear countries of military ways of using atomic energy would enable them to concentrate all their scientific, technical and material resources on the peaceful utilization of the achievements of nuclear physics, which would undoubtedly widen their potentialities in the field. Indeed, it is well known what huge efforts and material resources are required for the development of nuclear weapons. The great material expenditures and the diversion of the efforts and energy of scientists from peaceful to military problems would all hinder the peaceful development of atomic energy".

(ibid., paras. 15 and 16)

The Canadian delegation can agree whole-heartedly with that statement. We think that when the report which is being produced by the Secretary-General on the effects of nuclear weapons finally appears, that viewpoint will be reinforced by the conclusions of the experts.

32. The next point the representative of the Soviet Union made was in connexion with the use of nuclear explosive devices for peaceful purposes. He said: "It cannot be denied that any device for the carrying out of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes in no way differs in principle from devices having a military purpose".

(ibid., para. 20)

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

33. The Canadian delegation holds a similar view which it has expressed several times, most recently in the statement of the Hon. Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs, read to this Committee on 28 February (ENDC/PV.289, para. 48). To put this point succinctly, in the form made famous by Gertrude Stein, "A nuclear explosion is a nuclear explosion is a nuclear weapon."

34. We hope, however, that there will be a clause in the treaty to ensure the right of States other than nuclear Powers to participate in the benefits of the use of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes, which will be mainly large engineering projects. Such a clause should express a commitment of the nuclear Powers to make available the results of their expertise to nations not possessing nuclear weapons. The details could be worked out in a separate agreement, as suggested by the Soviet representative when he said in his statement on 18 May:

"In this connexion we bear in mind that the question of the procedure and conditions governing the carrying out of nuclear explosions is a particular question which can be settled only on the basis of a separate international agreement". (ENDC/PV., para. 21)

35. The Canadian delegation also finds itself in agreement with the views expressed in a subsequent passage of the USSR representative's statement which deals with the point -- of great concern to all nations not possessing nuclear weapons -- that a non-proliferation treaty is: "... not ... an end in itself or ... a single, isolated measure, but ... a link in a chain of other disarmament measures designed to eliminate the threat of nuclear war". (ibid., para. 25)

36. Mr. Roshchin followed that by saying:

"It is important, in particular, that the treaty should state the intention of the States parties to the treaty to bring about the cessation of the nuclear arms race as quickly as possible, calling upon all States to co-operate in achieving this aim". (ibid., para. 27)

37. The representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States of America have also made statements expressing the same general view, and I should like to quote them.

38. On 23 February of this year Lord Chalfont said:

"This is not to suggest that a non-proliferation treaty can ignore the responsibilities of the nuclear Powers in this respect. Its drafting must clearly reflect their intention to move rapidly towards agreement on measures to halt and reverse what has been expressively called 'vertical proliferation';

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

and its terms must provide the means of redress for the non-nuclear Powers if the nuclear States are unreasonably slow in translating their intentions into action." (ENDC/PV.288, para. 10)

39. In the same statement Lord Chalfont said also: "A treaty will not last if further measures of arms control and of real disarmament do not follow within a reasonable period." (ibid., para. 26)

40. On 21 February Mr. Foster, the representative of the United States of America, read a message from President Johnson (ENDC/187), containing the following passage:

"Agreement on a treaty to stop the spread of nuclear weapons will be an historic turning point in the long effort to bring the atom to heel. It will, I am confident, permit further co-operative steps to reduce nuclear armaments. Plain sanity calls for a halt to the competition in nuclear arms." (ENDC/PV.287, para. 24)

41. There is one prediction about this treaty which, in the Canadian view, can be made with assurance; it is that if there is no progress towards real disarmament an agreement on non-proliferation will not endure for more than relatively few years. This, we believe, is the reality of the situation, and it is not in our view highly important exactly how the obligations in respect to further measures of disarmament are formulated in the treaty which is drafted.

42. In his statement, from which I have already quoted so much, the representative of the Soviet Union mentioned also the important subject of control, or verification, to ensure that all parties to the treaty conform to their obligations (ENDC/PV.297, paras. 22-24). He quoted with approval the views of the representative of the United Arab Republic on this point, expressed at our 294th meeting on 16 March. The Canadian delegation also finds itself in general agreement with the views then stated by the representative of the United Arab Republic. However, he spoke of the "application of the single system of safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency to all non-nuclear States ..." (ENDC/PV.294, para. 14). We should omit the word "non-nuclear". It is the Canadian view that the international safeguards over peaceful nuclear activities should be accepted by all States and not only by those States which have refrained and will agree to refrain from manufacturing or acquiring nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

43. The representative of the United Arab Republic also said in his statement: "the only inspection system acceptable ... is ... international and not regional ..." (ibid., para. 15). The Canadian delegation could agree to this as the final condition which should be stipulated in formulating the relevant sections of a non-proliferation treaty. However, we must take into consideration the existence of the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM), an established organization for the development of peaceful uses of nuclear energy under effective control. It is regional, true, and its membership is confined to those nations belonging to the European Common Market. Due to its international character and the form of its legal constitution, nations members of it will require a certain time to ensure that obligations they might accept under a non-proliferation treaty do not conflict with their existing EURATOM obligations, and they must have this time to work out the arrangements under which IAEA safeguards could be put into effect over their nuclear installations, in an integrated system or otherwise. The Canadian delegation urges that this problem of the EURATOM countries should be sympathetically considered.

44. Our colleagues around this table may find that the statement which I am concluding is somewhat peculiar in its form. Perhaps some will think that I have chosen an easy way to compose it, merely quoting, generally with full approval, what the representatives of the USSR and others have said. However, I do have a purpose in making my statement in this manner. It is to show how close the viewpoints of the representatives of Western Powers have come to those of the Soviet Union and its allies on the drafting of a non-proliferation treaty. This is in great contrast with the very divergent views we have had to express on certain problems of disarmament in the past. So what does this mean?

45. In the view of my delegation it means that the points of divergence still to be settled are of minor importance compared to the points upon which agreement has been reached. They are of still smaller dimensions when we consider the vast issues of mankind which hang on the completion and implementation of a non-proliferation treaty. We hope, therefore, that our co-Chairmen will be able to suggest to us -- and soon -- an order of business which should enable us all to participate in the elaboration into final and effective form of the draft treaty which we know has been under negotiation for so long.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

46. Before terminating I must say a word of farewell on behalf of the Canadian delegation to Lord Chalfont who, as we have heard in the eloquent tribute paid by the representative of the United States, is leaving our Committee for other duties. We shall miss greatly his lucid and constructive contributions to our discussions in this Committee. His background as a military man for many years I feel, perhaps for personal reasons, to be a very useful one when discussing the reverse process of armament, namely disarmament. We know that Lord Chalfont is taking up new and very important responsibilities on behalf of his Government, and we wish him every success therein, but our final word is that we are sorry he is leaving us -- very sorry indeed.

47. The CHAIRMAN (Nigeria): At this juncture I am sure members would all like me, as Chairman today, to express on behalf of the Committee our regret that Lord Chalfont, the leader of the delegation of the United Kingdom, has to leave us for other duties. I am sure that all of us here, whatever our individual views, appreciate the lucid and outstanding contributions which Lord Chalfont has made to our deliberations. Indeed, the appointment of Lord Chalfont to lead the negotiations for British entry to the European Economic Community is an eloquent testimony to the qualities which our own Committee needs to bring our deliberations and our task here to a successful conclusion. In spite of our regrets, I am sure that all here will join me in wishing Lord Chalfont every success with the European Economic Community.

48. May I also take this opportunity to welcome Sir Harold Beeley, who is now to lead the United Kingdom delegation in our Committee? We trust that our co-operation with him will be as fruitful as that which we have had with Lord Chalfont.

49. Mr. AZEREDO da SILVEIRA (Brazil): I wish to express, on behalf of my delegation and myself, our deep regret at learning that Lord Chalfont will no longer sit in this Chamber at the head of the United Kingdom delegation. At the same time, we are aware that the British Government is entrusting to Lord Chalfont's wisdom, imagination, intelligence and skill very important tasks in other areas of extreme significance to his country. We are sure that Lord Chalfont will meet the challenge of his new assignment with the same outstanding ability which has commended him to the admiration and esteem of the members of this Committee. During the months in which I have had the privilege of participating as a fellow representative with

(Mr. Azeredo da Silveira, Brazil)

Lord Chalfont in the deliberations of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. I have come to know and to appreciate both aspects of his engaging personality, as a representative and as a man, even when we have disagreed, as has often happened, when speaking for our countries. He will continue to represent his country in other forums where his services are needed, and I am sure that the friendship and the mutual ties of understanding that we have woven between us here will continue to grow throughout the years. My delegation and I wish Lord Chalfont in his new mission the great success that he deserves. We wish him good luck and godspeed.

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

On behalf of a number of representatives in the Eighteen-Nation Committee, and also in my capacity as co-Chairman and representative of my country, we too should like to express our regret that one of the most active participants in the work of the Committee, Lord Chalfont, is leaving his post as representative of the United Kingdom in the Eighteen-Nation Committee -- a post which he has filled so befittingly over a number of years that have been of the greatest importance for the work of the Committee.

51. Although we have not always -- I should say not always by a long score -- agreed with the position, views and considerations which Lord Chalfont has advanced, set forth, defended and enlarged upon here in the Committee, we cannot fail to pay tribute to the fact that his participation in the work, discussions and contacts within and outside the Committee was always of great interest and importance and represented a valuable contribution to the discussion of those problems which constitute the substance of the task and work of our Committee.

52. We express the hope that in leaving his post as representative of the United Kingdom in the Eighteen-Nation Committee, Lord Chalfont will not lose interest in the problems of disarmament and that his further co-operation in the solution of those problems will not cease after he leaves this post and the post of Minister of State for Disarmament. We wish Lord Chalfont further success in his career, good health and all good fortune.

53. Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): On behalf of my delegation I should like, in my turn, to salute Lord Chalfont, who is leaving this Conference and who has today addressed to us, with his usual eloquence, his farewell speech imbued with so much regard for us all and so much faith in the continuation of the task of this Committee. I should like to tell him how sincerely my delegation regrets his departure, how much its members have appreciated, throughout these years, his great qualities as a statesman and skilful negotiator, as well as the warm, loyal and sincere friendship he has always shown for us. We shall cherish the warmest memory of this period of collaboration with Lord Chalfont in Geneva.

54. Lord Chalfont is now going to devote himself to another task which is very important for his country, for my country and, I would also say, for the development and destiny of Europe, in a context of peace and ever-wider and more confident collaboration among the peoples.

55. No one could be more sincere than the Italian delegation in wishing him every success in his new post. This wish is expressed in the conviction that the negotiation which has just been entrusted to Lord Chalfont could not be in better hands.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 299th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of His Excellency Ambassador Sule Kolo, representative of Nigeria.

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

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 30 May 1967, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 11.35 a.m.