

almost certain that no clandestine testing could be carried out. We would hope that the USSR will also agree to cooperate in examining such procedures which, in combination with others, might make it possible to break the deadlock in the underground test prohibition problem, and permit the successful culmination of the efforts which have been under way since the Moscow Treaty was signed. We have also studied with much interest other proposals made by Sweden, Mexico, Brazil and the UAR in an effort to bridge the gap between the positions of the two major powers on this issue. We hope these suggestions will be carefully considered by those principally concerned.

Another proposal which, though not new, commends itself to Canada is to halt the production of fissile material for military purposes, popularly known as the "cut-off". Several nations besides the USA (which has elaborated proposals in this regard) appreciate that a verified halt in the production of fissile material for use in weapons would reverse the dangerous continual increase in the nuclear potential of nuclear powers. It would be, therefore, an anti-proliferatory measure mainly affecting nuclear powers, and would constitute a "balancing obligation" to the obligations nations without nuclear weapons would incur by signing a non-proliferation treaty. In our view, the cessation of fissile material production should be seriously studied. It combines the quality of not endangering existing national security with the positive values to which I have just referred.

This brings me to the question of general and complete disarmament which has not occupied very much of the time of the Eighteen Nation Committee in this year's discussions, although it was not neglected entirely in the ENDC. We have always recognized that a disarmed and peaceful world is our final goal. But the same difficulties have always faced us when discussions of the USA and USSR draft treaties have been undertaken. I think most of those in this Committee who have studied the matter at all know the positions of the two sides. It has been clear for a long time that the crux of the problem lies in the opposed conceptions of how nuclear armaments are to be reduced and then eliminated. It is also clear that little progress can be expected on this central problem until greater mutual confidence exists, so that the nations concerned can feel any nuclear weapons reduction would not imperil the balance of our present security arrangements. It seems to the Canadian delegation that we must look for some new, more hopeful means of initiating a process which will lead eventually, through increasing confidence on both sides, to general and complete disarmament. We favour the step-by-step approach because it seems