

for peaceful purposes do not confer weapons-related benefits". Such an agreement could be reviewed at the end of a fixed trial period to determine whether it might be further extended or be transformed into a permanent agreement including all nuclear-weapon states.

Mr. Jay wondered how it could be argued with any credibility that such an interim halt would threaten the security of the U.S. and Soviet Union when they "already have nuclear weapon arsenals of such enormous magnitude and when their own capacity for destruction so greatly exceeds that of any other nuclear-weapon state".

Non-Proliferation Treaty

"All of us continue to be haunted by the danger that nuclear weapons will spread to more states," the Canadian representative declared. "If more resolute efforts are not made to avert this danger, we shall have frittered away completely whatever chance there still may be of eliminating the threat of nuclear destruction."

Mr. Jay said that the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and its associated system of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards "continue to be the basic instruments of the non-proliferation system and the most appropriate framework for international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy". He outlined steps taken since the NPT Review Conference of May 1975 to reinforce the NPT but said Canada was "convinced that much that should have been done...has not yet been done".

He reminded the Assembly that the nuclear-weapon states party to the Treaty had undertaken in it to pursue negotiations toward nuclear disarmament. Canada regretted that they "had not done more to fulfil their part of the NPT bargain".

Some 100 countries now adhered to the NPT, observed Mr. Jay. These countries, he said, had "clearly rejected the mistaken notion that either the possession of nuclear weapons or the retention of an option to acquire them is a guarantee of security in some way essential to national sovereignty and the reinforcement of national prestige".

"It is cause for the deepest concern," he said, "that this encouraging

perspective is not yet shared by certain other states advanced in nuclear technology or in the process of acquiring that technology." He appealed to such states to "reassess their reasons for not making a firm commitment to the non-proliferation objective either by adhering to the NPT or in some other equally binding and verifiable way".

Safeguards

Mr. Jay declared that Canada was "determined to ensure that Canadian nuclear assistance would be used solely for peaceful non-explosive purposes" and that Canada would continue to press for the further strengthening and broadening of the scope of nuclear safeguards. "In Canada's view," he said, "safeguards will not be fully effective until they cover all peaceful nuclear activities in all states."

He noted that the IAEA was giving detailed study to the application of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. Canada nonetheless remained to be convinced that there were significant potential benefits in so-called peaceful nuclear explosions and doubted "that any benefits that may exist would outweigh the inherent risks".

"Certainly there can be no question," he said, "that such explosions would have crucial arms-control implications." It had been clearly recognized in previous UN resolutions that it was not possible to develop such devices for peaceful application without at the same time acquiring nuclear-weapons capability. Canada sought international arrangements to govern peaceful nuclear explosions that were fully consistent with the NPT and other international legal instruments.

Nuclear weapon-free zones

Mr. Jay confirmed Canada's support in principle for the idea of a nuclear weapon-free zone. He stressed, however, that the value of a specific nuclear weapon-free zone proposal or arrangement would depend on the support of most countries of the area concerned, including the major military powers of the region, on a clear definition of the geographic area covered, on assurance that any state or group of states would not thereby acquire additional military advantage and on

provisions to ensure that all component countries complied fully with the commitments involved and forswore the independent acquisition of nuclear explosive capability. Supplementary arrangements applicable to states outside such zones must be "realistic and fully consistent with generally recognized principles of international law".

Arms trade

Mr. Jay stressed that "concerted international action is urgently required among both suppliers and recipients to check the growth in the arms trade". This trade, he said, "has reached mammoth proportions and continues to devour vast resources urgently needed for productive economic and social purposes throughout the world".

Canada attached high priority, said Mr. Jay, to the Vienna negotiations for mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe. These negotiations offered "prospect of significant steps in disarmament and the reduction of the danger of confrontation at the regional level" but "progress has been slow and the negotiations are now about to enter their fourth year with little measurable achievement yet in sight".

Environmental warfare

Mr. Jay said Canada was prepared to join in recommending to governments that they sign a draft convention, negotiated in the CCD, to prohibit the military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. Canada did not consider the draft convention to be a faultless document, nor, given the other and more pressing priorities in arms control, to be a major landmark. Canada hoped, however, that it would inhibit whatever plans some states might otherwise make or contemplate for the hostile use of environmental-modification techniques.

Special disarmament session

Canada stands ready to support, said Mr. Jay, a call for a special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament and to participate fully and constructively in it. Such a special session "must be to infuse a new sense of purpose into the quest for peace and security".