

The memorandum of the non-aligned members of the ENDC from which I quoted at the beginning of my remarks expressed the view that an agreement by non-nuclear nations not to make or acquire nuclear weapons should be followed by an agreement by the nuclear powers or action by the nuclear powers to limit and reduce the stocks of nuclear weapons and vehicles, with the purpose of finally eliminating them. This viewpoint was put more forcefully by the representative of the United Arab Republic at the 224th meeting of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, when he said a non-dissemination treaty should not be

"... a mere instrument in which the non-nuclear powers would gladly renounce their rights to acquire nuclear weapons in order just to perpetuate the monopoly or the privileged position of the present five nuclear powers". (ENDC/224, P. 11)

Canada agrees with these views.

On the other hand, we cannot agree with a more extreme suggestion which we have heard expressed -- that is, that the nuclear powers have no right to ask the non-nuclear nations to abstain from developing a nuclear armoury, while they themselves retain nuclear weapons. Because of the increased risk of nuclear war opened up by the further spread of nuclear weapons and the tremendous destructive power which might then be unleashed, agreement by the non-nuclear nations in an international treaty not to make or to acquire nuclear weapons would constitute a positive and constructive step of very great importance to the entire international community, including those nations, such as my own, which have the ability to make nuclear weapons but have chosen not to do so. In the view of the Canadian Government, the acquisition of nuclear weapons by additional countries would not effectively or permanently add to their security and would seriously risk upsetting the balance of power on which world security rests today. The effect of additional military nuclear capability would be to strengthen demands for similar weapons among neighbouring countries who may feel themselves threatened, and thus lead to nuclear proliferation within the area. Thus the result of the acquisition of nuclear weapons by additional countries would be to precipitate another round in the arms race, at fantastic cost to the countries directly concerned and without any permanent increase in the protection available to the country first taking this step. An increase in the number of nuclear powers would certainly inhibit the possibility of effective agreements among existing nuclear powers to reduce nuclear weaponry. It would tend to make nations consider the use of nuclear weapons in warfare to be normal and thus would increase the possibility of a devastating all-out nuclear war between great powers. I might add that the worst possible reason for embarking on a programme of making nuclear weapons would be that the successful explosion of a nuclear weapon confers a special prestige. This is an example of the sin of pride, against which His Holiness Pope Paul VI warned us, in these words:

"It is pride ... which provokes tensions and struggles of prestige, of predominance, of colonialism, of selfishness: it is pride that disrupts brotherhood." (A/PV.1347, Page 26)

Taken in the context of joining the nuclear arms race, it would be pride that would lead a nation to push the world in the direction of an all-destructive nuclear war, instead of trying to take the road that can lead towards safety.