

of nuclear energy from peaceful uses to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices."

Accepting the fact of technical indistinguishability between processes for nuclear weapons and for peaceful nuclear research, my delegation could not overlook the problem posed by non-nuclear states which are already engaged in the advanced stages of nuclear research for peaceful uses. We had wondered if they were to continue or discontinue their research. We had also asked ourselves as to the long-run implications of either course of action for the treaty's effectiveness and for the welfare of the peoples of those countries. It would now appear that the answer is also found in Article IV of the above-mentioned document "Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with articles I and II of this Treaty."

The treaty, Mr. Chairman, is forward-looking and commendable as a partial embodiment of general aspirations. It would, however, appear that for as long as certain nuclear and potential nuclear states may opt not to be signatories, the treaty might remain ineffectual and unworkable in stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons. As pointed out by many delegations, the treaty places heavy stress on "horizontal" non-proliferation and not enough on "vertical" non-proliferation.

While my delegation is mindful of and would be grateful for the benefits derivable from the signing of the treaty, it is, however, unconvinced of the wisdom of hurrying those countries which have a genuine fear of the use of nuclear weapons against them into signing it. Their apprehensions are neither baseless nor for that matter only imaginary. We are also not absolutely convinced that those who urge the immediate signing of the treaty

would . . .