

These have been some U.S. considerations, but they do not tell the whole story and I should like to go on to outline other issues which involve not only the U.S.A. but also Canada and the rest of the world. The first of these issues to be faced with ABM deployment would be the effect upon any movement toward détente between East and West. Although it has been argued that political developments are not dependent upon changes in nuclear-weapons systems, I should think that, in this case, the deployment of ABMs would signify, if not create, a less propitious environment for fruitful East-West contact.

Secondly, deployment would almost certainly interfere with developments in the arms-control field. In my view, this effect would be particularly evident if deployment were decided upon during the critical period of negotiation of the non-proliferation treaty. Countries which have been insisting on a "balance of obligations" between nuclear and non-nuclear powers would be disillusioned about the intention of the two super-powers seriously to take steps to hold the line on the acquisition of arms. In such circumstances, world-wide acceptance of a non-proliferation treaty would be seriously endangered.

To take another example: concern is felt in many quarters even now about the relation between continued underground nuclear testing and the desire to perfect ABM warheads. In the event of actual ABM deployment, I can visualize that a comprehensive test-ban would be even more difficult to achieve than it appears to be today. These are but two examples of several which could be cited in support of the idea that ABMs would be unhelpful in the movement toward arms control and disarmament.

Finally, there are two ways in which ABMs would be thought to have implications specifically for Canada. In the first place, we should have to assess how a new space-defence system would affect our own security. We share this continent with the U.S.A. and we could not ignore the fact that a substantial change was being introduced into the continental defence picture. Whether our response to deployment in the U.S.A. would be active or passive and, if the former, to what extent, is a problem which would have to be squarely faced. We could not afford -- and should not want -- to ignore such a development. The military and economic problems suggest that, for Canadians, ABM deployment would be an uninviting prospect, in national as well as international terms.

In conclusion, I should like to remind you of the theme of my remarks. It is that, though we adopt a similar broad fundamental approach to many international questions and to arms control and disarmament in particular, there are important differences of emphasis in this approach, as revealed in the way we look at the problem of nuclear proliferation. Being particularly close to the United States, we in Canada like to think we understand something of the point of view of the most powerful nation in the world. Being a non-nuclear middle power, we also like to think of ourselves as a representative of that large community of nations which are not normally privy to the councils of the great powers. As a friend and partner of the United States we do not hesitate to urge on it greater recognition of the view of the non-nuclear states and to make certain important concessions to their position, even if it means some