

Toronto/Ontario: Metta Spencer
Dr. Brian S. MacDonald

Winnipeg/Manitoba: Valerie Klassen
Prof. Paul Buteux

Saskatoon/Saskatchewan: Ellen Gould
Prof. Red Williams

Victoria/British Columbia: Dr. Michael Walker
Gen. Reg. Lane

Calgary/Alberta: Dr. Trudy Govier
Prof. Cynthia Cannizzo

It should be noted that, in outlining the six arms control and disarmament priorities established by the Government (radical reductions, CTB, NPT, CW, Outer Space and CBMs), Amb. Roche appeared to be telling audiences something most had not previously heard. It also became clear from questions posed that Canadian foreign policy in general is not well known or understood. Canada was frequently accused, for example, of not voting or working for a CTB, despite our clearly enunciated policy, consistent voting record and ongoing work in the CD and in Canada's verification work for a CTB. As well, Canada was frequently urged to undertake work or support specific arms control and disarmament objectives -- many of which in fact, have long formed part of our agenda, eg. work towards a CW convention, outer space, the NPT. It was evident that, even within the ranks of the largest and most well-established NGOs more information is needed to establish a full perspective. During the lengthy question periods, there was a good deal of lively exchange during which a great many facts about Canada's arms control and disarmament policies were clearly laid out in response to often harsh and critical questions.

Such important recent Canadian initiatives as the Verification resolution, which achieved consensus at UNGA 40, or long-standing initiatives such as the resolution calling for the "Prohibition of the Production of Fissionable Material for Weapons Purposes" or CW resolutions were apparently previously unknown and met with both surprise and support. In fact, a detailed exposé of Canada's work on verification not infrequently drew applause. Other policies, however, elicited harsh criticism and jeers.

The themes or issues of concern which emerged should not be taken as either comprehensive or representing the views of all participants in the public forums. Rather, they reflect the most vigorously-articulated concerns voiced