

that in principle it was ready to sign the NPT. Some weeks later, in mid-June, South Africa declared that it was ready to accede to the Treaty, and signed it in July. In doing so, however, South Africa did not explicitly declare that it was a non-nuclear weapon state. On the other hand, in the aftermath of the Gulf War, it became clear that Iraq had developed facilities for the enrichment of uranium which lay entirely outside the IAEA inspection system, and had also clearly sought to deceive IAEA inspection teams. Amidst growing concerns that the IAEA and other controls against proliferation were inadequate, in August reports circulated that North Korea, which, like Iraq, is a party to the NPT, had acquired sufficient weapons grade enriched uranium to build atomic weapons.

CURRENT CANADIAN POSITION

Canada approached the Review Conference on the basis of its historic support for the NPT as the centrepiece of efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.¹ The Canadian delegation to the Conference played a vigorous part in the discussions, particularly with regard to Main Committees II and III, reflecting Canada's commercial interests and expertise in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In addition, as deputy Chair of the Drafting Committee, Canadian Ambassador Peggy Mason played a key role in the final days of the Conference in the search for a consensus document.

Canada's positions on the principal issues at the Conference were set down in formal statements to the opening plenary session of the Conference, and to the Main Committees. In regard to Articles I and II, Canada expressed confidence that the NWS were complying with their obligation not to transfer nuclear weapons, components or technology to non-possessors, but noted its concern about possible violations, at least in spirit, by non-possessing states. Without naming specific states, Canada noted that:

Statements by any party about the need to develop such weapons, clandestine procurement of nuclear sensitive items, evidence of unsafeguarded nuclear activity can raise concerns about less than full compliance with Article II.... It should be emphasized in the final document that states party should refrain from any word or deed that would raise questions about compliance.²

In regard to the fulfilment of disarmament obligations incurred by the NWS under Article VI, Canada's position was similar to that of other countries in the Western group. Ambassador Mason noted that "since 1985, progress of an unprecedented nature has been made toward halting and reversing the

¹See: Department of External Affairs. "Canada Supports Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty," *News Release*, no. 44, 5 March 1990.

²Statement of Articles I and II to Committee I, 29 August 1990.