

There has been much discussion in this Committee of the need for the Treaty to provide for an acceptable balance of mutual obligations between the nuclear and non-nuclear states. In the view of the Canadian delegation, Article IV of the Treaty goes some way towards establishing such a balance, as it expresses an obligation of states with advanced nuclear programmes to assist those in less favoured circumstances. Furthermore, my delegation considers it most important that Article IV guarantees the rights of parties to the Treaty to the unrestricted development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and to the co-operation to that end of other states and international organizations.

Article V of the Treaty deals with a subject which has at times provoked a lively debate in the Committee. I refer, of course, to the use of nuclear explosive devices for peaceful purposes. We support the wording of the present Article V, which, we feel, contains advantages for non-nuclear countries which offset the prohibitions contained in Articles I and II. During our debate, I have many times stated Canada's position on the regulation of peaceful nuclear expositions under a treaty of non-proliferation. For the present, I shall merely repeat what I said at our meeting on February 21, which reflects our desire to see the elaboration of an effective non-proliferation treaty without any loopholes:

"... we support the prohibitive provision in Articles I and II; and the fundamental reason for this is that we believe that military and civil nuclear explosive technologies are indistinguishable. The ability to produce any kind of nuclear explosive device is the same as the ability to produce a nuclear weapon"

Canada considers that the provisions of Article V are particularly advantageous, as they assure states without nuclear weapons that they will be able to secure nuclear explosive services for peaceful purposes when these have been developed by the nuclear powers, but without any charges for research and development. Such arrangements would spare non-nuclear-weapon states the high costs in both financial and human terms and the delays of many years which would be involved in developing nuclear explosive devices with their own resources.

My delegation, among others, has raised questions concerning the provision for bilateral arrangements for peaceful nuclear explosive services. We have welcomed the oral assurances on this point which have been given by the Co-chairmen, particularly that bilateral arrangements would be arrived at and implemented in strict accordance with Articles I and II of the Treaty. As stated by the representative of the United States, any bilateral arrangements would be subject to international observation.

We have noted also statements by the Co-chairmen that it will be necessary, in due course, when more is known about the economic and technical feasibility of employing nuclear explosions for engineering or other developmental purposes, to draw up a convention or international agreement on the modes of carrying out and controlling the arrangements foreseen under the provisions of Article V. The Canadian delegation suggested an outline of what such a convention should contain in its intervention on September 12, 1967.