

positive approach to verification procedures contained in the remarks of the Soviet foreign minister earlier this week.

However, given the complexity and characteristics of many modern weapons systems, so-called national technical means may not be adequate for verifying arms-control or disarmament agreements. Consequently, the international community should address itself to verification as one of the most significant factors in disarmament negotiations in the 1980s.

**Canada commits more funds**

In Canada we are allocating increased funds for arms-control and disarmament initiatives. This decision will allow us to take two important steps. First, we are committing resources to enable Canada to become a full participant in the international seismic data exchange, the international verification mechanism which will form part of the provisions of a comprehensive test ban treaty. We believe that the exchange should be fully operational at an early date and in advance of the treaty. Secondly, we will substantially increase research in verification. To develop effective verification procedures, Canada will be devoting more attention to utilizing expertise available inside and outside government.

In the course of this Session, many good proposals will have been put before us, including those in the Report of the Palme Commission, which has made a significant contribution to public awareness and understanding of the issues. I have tried, from a Canadian perspective, to make a number of precise proposals of my own, in the context of a policy of stabilization. These are designed to ensure stability in the arms balance at the lowest possible level by removing destabilizing weapons systems, reducing those systems allowed to remain, and preventing the introduction of new destabilizing systems.

In the process of sifting the proposals before us, I hope that the Special Session will concentrate on what, with goodwill, is achievable. This Assembly has a right to expect sincerity of purpose and a determination to achieve concrete results on the part of all participants. A particularly heavy responsibility rests with the two super-powers. They must give their undivided attention to negotiations to reduce their arsenals of nuclear weapons and should not deviate from that central objective by imposing political preconditions.

This implies that the super-powers agree to communicate, to talk to each other, and to recognize the unquestionable common interest which unites them in a fundamental way; that is, the need to avoid a catastrophe which would destroy them both.

When the security of the world and the fate of the human race are at stake, all governments have a duty to raise their voices on behalf of the societies they represent. Above all, they have a duty to bring to an end our collective impotence in the face of nuclear peril.