

interests of both countries and permit us to enter into the thing that I think we need most to do, that is, a non-proliferation agreement". I make no apology for repeating these statements, for they show, the Canadian Delegation believes, the increased determination of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. to solve this problem, to come together on suitable terms for the provisions of a non-proliferation treaty. They show -- and we have other indications -- that there is a new spirit in the negotiations, a realization that the importance of achieving agreement on this sector of the disarmament problem greatly outweighs some of the considerations which have delayed progress heretofore. The Canadian Delegation applauds that determination. We are heartened to learn that a new series of talks has been initiated to work out terms mutually acceptable to the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. We welcome the prospect of further meetings between the two major powers which, assisted by the discussions in this Committee and in the ENDC, may result in an agreed text acceptable to all states concerned -- the nuclear powers and the states which do not have nuclear weapons alike.

While this year's meetings of the ENDC recorded no spectacular achievements, it is generally conceded that the discussions have been most useful in clarifying the issues that lie before the Committee. This was particularly true of the non-proliferation deliberations. Mr. Goldberg, in his address on October 20, outlined the areas where progress has been made: (1) progress towards understanding that collective nuclear defence arrangements do not and need not lead to proliferation; (2) progress in accepting the need for safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities; (3) progress in understanding the special problem of peaceful nuclear explosions; (4) progress in exploring ways to halt and indeed to reverse, the build-up of nuclear weapons stockpiles and delivery systems. We were encouraged by the generally high level of debate in the ENDC this year, and by the frankness of the exchange and by the helpful and constructive contribution of the non-aligned members of the Committee. In their joint memorandum on non-proliferation, they expressed their concern that an eventual treaty should reflect a balance of obligations and responsibilities as between the nuclear and non-nuclear countries and should lead to wider measures of arms control and general and complete disarmament. I think it fair to say that their point of view has been accepted by the other members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee. While the Canadian Delegation attaches the utmost importance to the early conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty, we regard it as only the first of many measures designed to stem the nuclear-arms race and bring us closer to our objective of general and complete disarmament. We welcome what Mr. Federenko said: "As it works for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Government does not in any way strive to consolidate and perpetuate the so-called nuclear monopoly of the nuclear powers. Such an agreement cannot and must not be regarded as an end in itself; it should be regarded only as a step towards the prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons". And Mr. Goldberg said essentially the same thing.

The Canadian Government stands firmly committed to its long-established policy not to produce nuclear weapons, which has been well within our technical ability for many years. We are also committed to the conclusion of a universal non-proliferation treaty as the most urgent arms-control measure before the international community. There is considerable common ground between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. draft treaties now on the table. We believe they are close enough in object and scope that we can reasonably expect conclusive negotiations