

nationally-conducted nuclear explosions for engineering and other civil purposes. Canada accepts this prohibition as necessary to the fundamental purpose of the Treaty because peaceful and military explosions are technologically indistinguishable. In our view, Article V, offering peaceful nuclear explosive services to all non-nuclear parties at nominal cost, is a reasonable and economical alternative.

During recent discussions, much has been made of the idea that the Treaty should embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations as between the nuclear and non-nuclear states. No one can quarrel with that principle. We think that principle is fairly reflected in the draft treaty. I suggest only that the text before us should be judged in terms of whether a better balance is attainable at the present time, given the basic difficulty of reconciling the positions of the nuclear haves and have-nots.

We are also aware of the argument that the Treaty is an instrument which could perpetuate the monopoly position of the states now possessing nuclear weapons. In a sense it is. That is an inescapable aspect of a non-proliferation treaty. This treaty does demonstrate, however, that the nuclear powers are becoming increasingly aware of the great responsibility that rests upon them and are demonstrating a willingness to respond to the anxious advice tendered by the vast majority of the non-nuclear states to negotiate a cessation of the nuclear arms race.