

57.

DEA/50271-M-40

*Le secrétaire d'État aux Affaires extérieures
à la délégation au Comité sur le désarmement*

*Secretary of State for External Affairs
to Delegation to Disarmament Committee*

TELEGRAM N-318

Ottawa, December 5, 1962

CONFIDENTIAL. OPIMMEDIATE.

Reference: Your Tel 1897 Dec 4.†

Repeat for Information: NATO Paris, Paris, Washington, London, Permex New York,
Bonn, Rome, CCOS (JS/DSS) (Priority).

By Bag Moscow.

NUCLEAR TESTS CESSATION – CANADIAN PAPER
ON A SUGGESTED BASIS FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Following is a further elaboration of certain points in our paper on above subject in response to questions raised at the Western Four meeting. (Paragraph references are to our paper.)

2. *Paragraph 3(ii)*. In clarifying intent of this paragraph you might reiterate point made in your reference telegram to the effect that it was intended to allow the nuclear powers (particularly the Western nuclear powers) to bring before the Commission any event which they had not identified to their satisfaction as a natural phenomenon, non-nuclear explosion, etc. In effect, this paragraph is designed to protect Western interests by giving them an opportunity to challenge the Soviet Union, in the case of any event they consider doubtful, to demonstrate that it was not a nuclear explosion. Dean's rejoinder to you that data would have to be coordinated from "several different stations which might be situated on different national territories in order to arrive at a conclusion regarding the nature of a given event" is not entirely relevant for two reasons:

(a) in the case of the USA, for example, national experts would already have evidence from more than one station to aid them in making their decision before requesting the Commission to undertake a further investigation; and

(b) in order to place it before the Commission, it would not be necessary to reach a firm conclusion concerning the nature of the event – it would be sufficient that the state concerned should be doubtful about its nature.

3. With respect to general point raised in connection with this paragraph, we have tried to avoid prejudging the question whether or not it would be possible "to decide on scientific grounds alone" which unidentified events would require inspection. Events to be referred to the Commission would be decided by national states themselves; and events which would require an on-site inspection would be, under the terms of the arrangement, those which the Commission decided by majority vote demanded such further investigation. In practice, this system might well provide greater protection against "cheating" than a small quota of on-site inspections agreed in advance, since it would permit the Western nuclear powers to put the onus of the Soviet Union to prove that no violation had occurred in the case of *any* event about which they were doubtful.

4. *Paragraph 3(iii)*. The word "agreed" was inserted in this paragraph only because it was assumed that all procedures and methods under the arrangement would have to be "agreed" among the parties if they were to be put into operation. However, if it appears to weaken the proposal insofar as the requirement for adequate inspection is concerned, it could be deleted.