

know that such a view misconstrues the real process of verification.

It has been said many times that verification is a process, just as confidence-building is a process, whereby States Parties can focus attention on compliance matters of concern and work together to address those concerns. That is why my delegation prefers to speak in terms of the creation of a "compliance regime" for the Convention that will encompass not only confidence-building measures but also verification measures — with the latter perhaps focussed on particular situations.

What is the difference in a name? Most importantly, the title of compliance regime conveys very clearly that it is the obligation of States Parties to *demonstrate compliance* with the Convention. In this way, we mean to put the emphasis on cooperative approaches to the resolution of any concerns that may occur.

Such a compliance regime could combine:

- the politically-binding commitments of States Parties on confidence-building measures;
- a provision for fact finding in circumstances when one or more States Parties may desire clarification, and this coupled with a strengthened consultation mechanism; and
- the establishment of institutional/procedural arrangements necessary for effective implementation.

Canada believes that such an integrated approach would constitute a practical and positive contribution to strengthening the international security regime of which we are all a part. My delegation is prepared to cooperate with others in moving forward in each of these areas...

I would like to take a moment to address the important issue of universal adherence to this Convention. Canada welcomes the new States Parties that have joined the vast majority of states in declaring clearly and forcefully that there is no place in this world for biological and toxin weapons. In fact, Canadians find it difficult to understand how it is that some countries still stand outside this circle. Surely these countries cannot be any more secure in knowing that, by standing apart, they

themselves may be promoting suspicions among others. The fact that some of those countries are attending this Review Conference is an encouraging sign, and the warmth of our welcome could only be further enhanced by their becoming full participants as States Parties to the Convention. Some, in fact, have already taken the first step in signing the Convention, and we regard this as more than just a symbolic gesture. We recognize that the very act of signing the Convention carries with it certain obligations under international law.

As the final substantive point of my intervention — but not the least important — I would like to take this opportunity to announce that Canada has recently modified its reservations to the 1925 Geneva Protocol, which prohibits the use in war of chemical weapons and of bacteriological methods of warfare, by removing the reservations insofar as they relate to bacteriological methods of warfare. As long ago as 1970, the Canadian Government unilaterally declared that it would not use biological or toxin weapons at any time in the future. The more recent formal action taken with regard to the 1925 Geneva Protocol is meant simply to ensure that there can be no suggestion of uncertainty anywhere as to the extent of Canada's abhorrence of biological warfare and the means of conducting it.

This is an exciting time in the field of biotechnology and indeed in international affairs. Canada believes that the many triumphs of science can be harnessed and applied where they are most needed for the general good, and the perversions of distrust and hostility defeated. This is, however, not the work of a single moment, a single signature. It requires a continuous application, cooperation among states and scientists, and willingness to move forward in our levels of commitment and vigilance.

Our goal is nothing less than a universal Convention with the strict adherence of all States Parties to its purposes and provisions. It is, I believe, an achievable goal. ■

Forecast

Arms control and disarmament activities involving Canada, October 1991 through January 1992

Ongoing: CSBM Negotiations, Vienna

Ongoing: CFE 1A Negotiation, Vienna

Ongoing: CFE 1 Joint Consultative Group meetings, Vienna

Ongoing: Open Skies negotiations, Vienna

October 14 - late November: UNGA First Committee, New York

November-December: CD inter-sessional meetings, Geneva ■

Biological and Chemical Defence Review Committee Releases Report

The Honourable Marcel Masse, Minister of National Defence, announced on August 15 the release of the Biological and Chemical Defence Review Committee's (BCDRC) first annual report. The Committee concluded that the Department of National Defence/Canadian Forces (DND/CF) biological and chemical self-defence programs, including research, training and facilities, are managed in a professional manner with no threat to public safety or the environment.

The BCDRC was established in May 1990 as a result of the 1989 Barton Report, a comprehensive review of the conduct of biological and chemical defence within the DND/CF. The Committee consists of prominent members of Canada's scientific community. It is chaired by Dr. E.R.W. Neale of Calgary, with Dr. C.E. Holloway of York University and Dr. G.L. Plaa of the University of Montreal as members.

"The BCDRC Report makes a number of practical suggestions concerning defence in a hostile biological and chemical environment," said Mr. Masse. "In particular, it emphasizes that CF personnel must continue to have the highest level of training and equipment to protect themselves against exposure to a variety of nerve agents."