

[Ottawa,] July 3, 1997

Courriel de
Mark Gwozdecky
à BNATO

SOURCE : DOSSIER 3936-01

E-mail from
Mark Gwozdecky
to BNATO

SOURCE: FILE 3936-01

Madrid Summit: APM Language

Thanks for reference message and your continued perseverance. Grateful if you would return to the charge with the new proposals listed below which we believe should go part of the way to responding to the concerns/dismay of allies vis-à-vis our initial proposal on APMs. You will note that our proposals are stripped down to accommodate obvious concerns among allies for brevity and are even prepared to drop specific reason to Ottawa as venue for signing of treaty.

2. What is not acceptable to us is return to December 1996 language as price for consensus given fact that terrain has changed fundamentally since then. 13 of 16 allies categorically endorsed Ottawa process less than one week ago in Brussels. More than 100 countries are now on board and NATO should recognize, if not express support for, this fact. On this point you should approach Norwegians who can be expected to offer strong support for any tough language we put forward. FYI, Norwegian colleague contacted us today to express dismay at weakness of language proposed by Canada, particularly the reference to the complementary efforts of the conference on disarmament and the "negotiations in Brussels." They are correct in noting that Brussels Conference was not a negotiation. Were we to include reference to Brussels conference, we could well face request from Germans to include reference to Bonn meeting of late April. Better to have language look forward to what lies ahead, i.e, Oslo and Ottawa. For this reason, while we would like to respond to Belgian request for including reference to Brussels Conference, we are prepared to see it drop as reference was both technically incorrect and was in the past.
3. Grateful if you would propose following new Canadian language: "We support a comprehensive ban on anti-personnel mines, and note the negotiations to take place in Oslo in September with the objective of signing such a ban in December."

The above is less than 30 words, contains no reference to Ottawa process or Ottawa. We could even live without the reference to Oslo but would not wish to be the ones to offer this up given strong Norwegian support. While we should not be the ones to suggest it, we could accept adding to the above any or all of the following:

- (a) the UNGA language as contained in first sentence of our original proposal (i.e. we support the vigorous pursuit of an effective legally-binding agreement to ban the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines,
- (b) the language taken from IMS option I, i.e. we urge all states to ratify the second protocol of the convention on inhumane weapons, and/or
- (c) reference to the efforts in a variety of other fora, including the conference on disarmament.

4. We believe the above proposal shows that we have gone considerable distance to accommodate concerns of other allies. Our text is brief and succinct and deals with one of