

the realization of the purposes set out in the preamble, as well as of the provisions of the Treaty, be considered by the review conference to be called five years after the entry into force of the Treaty. Moreover, various delegations expressed strong wishes to see provisions now contained in the preamble brought into the body of the Treaty. This applied particularly to the question of further measures of disarmament to be undertaken by the nuclear-weapon powers.

### **Canadian Views**

In successive interventions, the Canadian representative expressed the views of the Canadian authorities on the various amendments and additions proposed by members of the Committee. The Canadian reaction was generally critical of the Nigerian, U.A.R., Romanian and Brazilian proposals, on the grounds that they were unnecessary or would weaken the Treaty or were concerned with matters which were inappropriate for inclusion in it. On the other hand, we saw much merit in the Mexican addenda, particularly in the proposed new article on further measures of disarmament. Commenting on the Brazilian suggestion that nuclear explosive devices for peaceful uses not be excluded by the NPT, General Burns voiced strong opposition to what he considered a path for nuclear proliferation. Indeed, the Canadian view is that there is no technological difference between nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices and that the latter could eventually be used as weapons. Therefore, acquisition or development of such devices should be prohibited by the Treaty. However, in order that non-nuclear-weapon states participate in the benefits of peaceful applications of nuclear explosions, the Canadian representative proposed that such explosions be the subject of a separate agreement parallel to the NPT and outlined the essential elements of such an agreement. The Canadian stand on peaceful nuclear explosions came under strong criticism from the Brazilian delegate, who maintained his Government's position.

The various amendments mentioned above and Article III on International Control were the subject of numerous and long negotiating sessions between the Co-chairmen. Although substantial progress is understood to have been achieved, negotiations were still going on at the time of the December recess, and the Co-chairmen had not yet made known to the other members of the Committee the extent to which they could agree to revise their text in order to take into account the comments and proposed amendments.

### **Comprehensive Test Ban**

An interesting exchange of thoughts took place during the summer on the subject of a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. "Comprehensive" means that underground nuclear tests, not covered by the Moscow Treaty of 1963, would also be banned. Beginning the debate on this question, the Swedish delegate, Mrs. Myrdal, expressed her conviction that the control issue was no longer a valid reason to hold up agreement on this subject and that meaningful