

We feel that it may be necessary to give security assurances to non-aligned countries over and above the general terms of the UN Charter. In this way, perhaps, any disadvantages of their accession to a non-proliferation treaty could be offset. Whether these assurances are to be provided within the context of a non-proliferation treaty or in some other way will mostly depend on the views of the countries concerned. We should, therefore, be most interested to hear the views of non-aligned members on the merits of the various alternatives which have been proposed, as well as any other ideas which they themselves may advance.

We believe that, as now revised, Draft Resolution A/C.1/L.368 on the renunciation of actions hampering the conclusion of the agreement on non-proliferation should contribute to establishing a favourable atmosphere for the negotiations which will be taking place here, in Geneva, and elsewhere and help expedite them. It was for this reason we decided to associate ourselves with the resolution as a co-sponsor.

While Canada is committed to a universal non-proliferation treaty, we by no means rule out the regional approach to non-proliferation. We therefore support, and should like to encourage, countries attempting to create nuclear-free zones in areas relatively free from grave international tensions. The efforts of the Latin American and Caribbean countries in this regard deserve particular praise, and we would also wish African countries success in their aspirations to make their continent a de-nuclearized zone.

Most countries, including the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., advocate an end to nuclear testing underground to complete the agreement which was reached in Moscow to prohibit nuclear testing in the atmosphere, outer space and under water. The difficulty, of course, is over verifying that all parties to the treaty shall respect obligations not to carry out underground tests. The position of the U.S.S.R. is that all underground tests anywhere can be detected by national means within national territories. The position of the U.S.A. and its Western allies is that, although considerable improvements have been made in detecting underground tests by seismological and other scientific means, yet a certain number of underground events still cannot be identified as either earthquakes or nuclear explosions. That is to say that if verification of a treaty were limited to seismological means alone, there would still be a possibility of a nation evading its obligations by carrying out clandestine underground tests. The U.S.A. position is that a small number of inspections at sites of unidentified events is necessary in order to be sure that obligations would be adhered to.

As I have indicated, there has been continuing effort to improve techniques for detecting and identifying of underground events. Possibilities of supplementing them are being explored. Canada supports the proposal put forward for this purpose by Sweden, which is that interested countries, primarily those not nuclear powers, should exchange seismic information. The proposed exchanges would take place principally among those countries with a sufficiently advanced seismological science and data-gathering or processing equipment, but results would be available to all. With information coming from many sources, individual countries would be in a better position to assess whether any suspicious underground event was natural or nuclear in origin. We attach importance to the participation of the nuclear powers in the suggested exchange and welcome their expressed interest. If the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., for example,