

ing that there should be an international agency developed which would put its knowhow, its technology, at the disposal of countries who would want to explode nuclear bombs for peaceful purposes, for engineering, or moving mountains and so on. But it is fraught with dangers, the technology isn't advanced and the dangers of fallout and pollution are great and so on. We are nowhere near the point where that might be done and I believe that is also the position of the Indian Government. I repeat, my impression of their position is that they don't want to close that avenue and that is why they haven't signed the NPT. But there is no expressed desire on their part to explode such a device nor I believe the technological ability to do so.

**Q. Mrs. Gandhi in one statement last year did leave this option open that India may go ahead to explode an underground nuclear device. The possibility that India may do this—does this give you any misgivings about the continuing transfer of Canadian nuclear technology and make you think there should be tighter controls on this aspect of Canadian aid to India?**

**P.M:** Yes, that is a very difficult question which we did deal with. And as I had occasion to explain in Pakistan where I was answering this type of question a few days ago, we have no evidence that the Indian Government is doing anything which would lead to that—in the sense that, as of now, there is no use of plutonium from the Canadian type reactors at all. Now what will happen in the future, of course I can't speak for the Indian Government, but in reply to your question, we have stated to the Indian Government that we must find some way of respecting our obligations towards India, because we have signed some bilateral agreements with this country before the Non-Proliferation Treaty was signed and at the same time respect our obligations towards the NPT, and it is this that is the problem for discussion now. We think that it is possible to reconcile them and we have discussed together as governments ways in which our officials should reconcile them and both Mrs. Gandhi and myself this morning expressed optimism that it would be possible, in other words, that the safeguards system would be applied by the NPT agency. There may be a supplementary question here.

**Q. As of now, the existing agreements on this point of your aid program, they are under review?**

**P.M:** No. What is clear in our bilateral agreement with India and what is accepted as clear by India is our atomic energy program must be strictly for peaceful use. This is understood between us. But the type of safeguards which we negotiated back in 1962 and 1966, before signing the NPT, don't go quite as far as the NPT safeguards do, and it's in order to bridge this gap that we are discussing now. But there is no disagreement on peaceful use, as I said in answer to the previous question, even by leaving that hypothesis open. It is still a hypothesis for peaceful use. India in no way has said, nor does it seem to intend to want to have an atomic bomb for war purposes. So there is agreement on the principle of peaceful use, but the fact that the two treaties came into being at different dates does cause a problem of reconciliation at which we are working.

**Q. Do you find any desire from the side of Pakistan to settle the dispute with India?**

**P.M:** Yes, of course I don't speak for the President as well as he can speak for himself. But as an interlocutor of his, I did hear him distinctly express the desire that both your countries would find ways to settle this dispute. I heard him regret the percentage of his own budget which is devoted to military purposes and his hope that in days and years to come, the need for defence between the two countries would not be as great. So there is obviously the desire on his part.

**Q. Mr. Prime Minister, to return for a moment to the question of arms sales to South Africa, can I ask you whether in your discussions with Mr. Heath last night did he strike you as being possibly more flexible than he was when you were talking to him in Ottawa? Do you have any impression whether Britain will be receptive to an accommodation in Singapore?**

**P.M:** Well, you know the rule I like to apply to others, and which I hope they apply to me is not to speak for other governments. So, with regret, I would prefer not to speak for Mr. Heath in the full knowledge that he can do it for himself. I did in my discussions repeat the Canadian point of view.

**Q. Honourable Prime Minister, Pakistan and China, our neighbour countries, are always aggressive towards India. Suppose if there is any military aggression against India, what would be the role of Canada at that time?**