

CD are primarily related to verification issues and include the degree of intrusiveness of challenge inspections and the composition of the Executive Committee. In July, the US presented a new proposal for challenge inspections. Rather than moving any closer to the British idea of managed access, the new US position provided for even less intrusive inspection than its own previous position. The new US proposal generated a regrouping of positions by other delegations.

The Persian Gulf crisis, as well as earlier events, had prompted efforts by a number of states to tighten controls on exports of chemical weapons material and technology. In December, the US approved a list of fifty chemical precursors that would be subject to controls when exported to countries where there was a proliferation concern. This list was adopted by the Australia Group, an informal group of twenty states which have sought to strengthen controls on the export of chemical weapons.

CURRENT CANADIAN POSITION

Canada has signed and ratified both the Geneva Protocol and the Biological Weapons Convention and has a long tradition of supporting efforts to limit chemical and biological weapons. It has participated in the negotiations at the United Nations since they began, and over the years, the government has made a large number of important submissions to the negotiations. Canada's special interest has been in the area of verification. In 1985, it produced a *Handbook for the Investigation of Allegations of the Use of Chemical and Biological Weapons*. (For further information see *The Guide 1990* and *The Guide 1989*.)

In 1988, in response to concerns raised by Canadians about research on nerve gas being undertaken at Canadian Forces Base Suffield in Alberta, the Government asked Mr. William Barton to carry out a study of the activities at Suffield. Mr. Barton's report, released in December 1988, concluded that all research, development and training activities undertaken at Suffield were for the purposes of self-defence, that this constituted the most prudent course for Canada, and that it was consistent with the international obligations undertaken by the Canadian Government.⁴ One of the products of the Barton report was the Biological and Chemical Defence Review Committee, made up of members of the scientific community. The Committee issued its first report on 15 August 1991, concluding that Canadian biological and chemical self-defence programmes posed no threat to public or environmental safety.

⁴William H. Barton. *Research, Development and Training in Chemical and Biological Defence within the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces: A Review*, Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 31 December 1988.