

actually been proposed and why, with the objective of developing a common perspective and verification typology. There has been a virtual revolution in terms of verification technology. Yet, argumentation has remained largely unchanged. On the one hand, information which might have been kept from hand-held cameras in 1960 is now made available, often by mutual agreement through national technical means today. On the other hand, while intrusion has indeed changed, in any practical sense we tend here to be rather historical, and updating is needed.

Prior to the Second World War — the 1922 naval accords and the 1925 Geneva Protocol were examples — arms control and disarmament agreements negotiated under comparatively normal peace-time conditions did not normally make provision for systematic and effective verification of compliance with obligations. In post-Second World War negotiations, however, provision has generally been made for some type of verification. In fact, verification in some form is now normally a part of almost any significant agreement, whether public or private. As members of this Committee, we must recognize therefore, that to insist upon verification in an arms-control agreement is not necessarily to question the good faith of any one of the negotiators entering into an agreement, but rather through the reciprocal nature of the provision, to build confidence and ultimately strengthen mutual trust.

I believe that it will be apparent to you upon reading the conceptual paper that the rationale which has been developed is without bias — that has certainly been our intention. The definition of verification, for example, was selected not from any political document, but rather from the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*. It is a particularly apt definition in that it included "demonstration" as an equal, and in my view preferable, method of verification to "inspection".

Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko warned last autumn that the arms race "is approaching a point beyond which it may become impossible to curb it effectively by means of agreements based on mutual verification". If mutual verification encompasses the principle of reciprocity in its broadest sense, then of course all of us can support his reasoning and his concern. That being said, members of the Committee have the right to believe that it should apply not only to verification means now in use internationally (such as national technical means), but also to all methods of verification, existing and potential. It means that preconceptions of "mutual verification" of the last 20 years must be reassessed, in the light of the necessities today. Should not the requirement for secrecy within national borders and the claim of intrusiveness as an argument against adequate verification be reviewed? Indeed it could be argued that national technical means, a verification method accepted by treaty in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) process, is the most intrusive method in terms of national security assets. I commend to you the discussion on intrusion contained in Canada's conceptual paper being tabled today.

In submitting this latest working paper on verification, Canada continues on a course set 20 years ago, in the then multilateral negotiating body here in Geneva. Canada then took a special interest in the verification provisions of the Sea-Bed Treaty; and today, we apply the same concept of verification to other subjects, recognizing the special requirements of each area.