

primary responsibility in this regard is acknowledged to rest with the Security Council. But if the Security Council is unable, for any reason, to act in such a situation, the General Assembly should not be prevented from recommending appropriate action to safeguard the peace. For all governments have, in the last resort, a common interest in taking measures to halt the spread of local conflicts before the major powers are confronted with the alternatives of retreat or world chaos.

*Third*, there should be an acceptance of the principle of shared responsibility in financing peace-keeping operations in all cases where the permanent members of the Security Council agree to their being undertaken. In those cases, the General Assembly would apportion the expenses, taking due account of the principle of capacity to pay. If a permanent member were to object to an operation, some modification of the principle of shared responsibility might have to be accepted.

*Fourth*, there is a need for continuing efforts to improve the technical capacity of the United Nations to act in situations of emergency. This has its counterpart in suitable arrangements being made by member states to co-operate with the United Nations before such situations arise.

Canada, for its part, will continue to do all it can to strengthen the peace-keeping capacities of the United Nations. We shall do so by working towards a settlement of the wider political issues in the Special Committee. We shall also do so by improving, where possible, the practical arrangements which must be made in any event if the United Nations is to continue to respond to requests for the provision of international forces to preserve or restore peace around the world.

We can be sure that some mechanism, whether it be nation states acting on their own, regional groupings or alliances, or the United Nations itself, will continue in the years ahead to be required to do this job. If it is to be well done, we need the broadest possible consensus of world opinion and the United Nations is the best place for us to find that consensus.

#### NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

Peace keeping is one dimension of the problem of maintaining peace and security in the world today. Disarmament is another.

For the first time in human history, we have achieved something close to absolute military power. We have come to assume that the destructive power we wield will deter us from ever using it. That, at any rate, is the assumption that lies at the root of the conception of "nuclear deterrence". But this is not a state of things we can look upon with any degree of complacency.

In the first place, we are faced with the prospect of a diffusion of nuclear capability. Secondly, it is surely paradoxical that, in a century which has seen man achieve greater control over his environment than any preceding century, we should not be able to build a better and more peaceful world order except under the compulsion of the law of fear.

These considerations underline the need for early progress in the field of disarmament.

...I suggest that the principal problem in the field of disarmament before us today is now to limit the further spread of nuclear weapons. And, when I speak of the spread of nuclear weapons, I mean an increase in the number of states possessing independent military nuclear capabilities.

So far, we have pursued this objective in two main directions. First, we have acted to safeguard the transfer of nuclear materials and equipment from one country to another in order to ensure that they are used only for peaceful purposes. The atom, of course, is capable of a wide range of peaceful uses of which the supply of energy is only one. We must anticipate that, as time goes by, the atom will become an increasingly important agent in the scientific and technological revolution we are witnessing all around us. There is no sense in inhibiting that development. Indeed, there is every reason for encouraging it.

But we cannot ignore the fact that the atom can be used for war as well as for peace. As the peaceful uses of the atom become more widely diffused, more and more nations are inevitably being placed in a position of having the potential capacity to produce nuclear weapons of their own. This situation is coming about without these countries necessarily wishing to acquire a military nuclear capacity. It is coming about without any conscious determination on their part.

It is, nevertheless, a situation of which we have had to take account. And we have taken account of it by attaching safeguards, wherever possible, to transactions in nuclear materials and equipment. Such safeguards are now a feature of most bilateral agreements covering peaceful co-operation in nuclear matters. At the same time, a system of international safeguards has been evolved by the International Atomic Energy Agency to apply to transactions conducted through it as well as to transactions specifically placed under its supervision for safeguards purposes by member states....

But the use of safeguards is not universal in application. It seems to me, therefore, that we must direct our efforts towards closing this gap by making safeguards applicable on as comprehensive a basis as possible to nuclear materials and equipment entering into international commerce. To the extent that this can be done through the International Atomic Energy Agency, I am sure that international confidence in the system will be enhanced.

#### AIM OF COMPREHENSIVE AGREEMENT

The partial test-ban treaty concluded two years ago is another step we have taken towards halting the spread of nuclear weapons. Its extension, accompanied by acceptable arrangements for verification, to include underground testing would help to consolidate progress in that direction. Recent advances in the technique of seismic recording and analysis encourage me to believe that the technical capability to distinguish at long distance between earthquake signals and those of an underground explosion

(Continued on P. 5)