



be used, etc. Vehicles and aircraft for inspection will be chosen by mutual agreement. Flight planning is the responsibility of the inspecting state which is also responsible for filing the flight plan with the competent air traffic authority of the inspected state. Provision exists for deviation from the approved flight plan under certain conditions and, in cases when the inspected state provides the aircraft, one member of the inspection team may observe data on the navigational equipment of the aircraft and have access to maps and charts used by the flight crew.

Implications for Canada

The direct impact for Canadian Forces stationed in or transferred to Europe under national command would be small because normally, Canadian peacetime military activity is conducted well below agreed thresholds required for notification and observation. Notwithstanding, participation in multinational exercises which could reach notification and observation thresholds will require the Canadian Forces to provide the same detailed information as called for by the Stockholm Document. Therefore, no matter how small or seemingly insignificant the Canadian military activity might be, allied countries on whose territories Canadian troops are exercising will have to be sent the same accurate detail as found in the annual calendars and prior notification in time for them to advise all other participating states if agreed thresholds are met.

An example of the type of information required for the calendar submission includes *inter alia* such information as: the type of military activity and its designation, the general characteristics and purpose, area of activity defined by geographic features and/or geographic coordinates, planned duration and start date, numbers and types of forces engaged and level of command.

The format for the content of prior notification is much more comprehensive and consists of 48 separate pieces of information which are divided into four section headings: general information; information on different types of notifiable military activities; the envisaged area and time frame of the

activity; and other information. It includes *inter alia* details on various equipment numbers, area and nature of the activity as well as firm timings.

Canadian military staffs, therefore, will have to provide this information in time to allied states concerned for them to include Canadian data in the submission of annual calendars and prior notification, if cumulative totals and all other conditions have been met. This will require both forward planning and coordination.

At present observation thresholds, it is unlikely that Canada will have to invite observers to national exercises. It is to be expected, however, that we would be subject to any observer programme for a multinational exercise conducted at or above the agreed threshold which included Canadian participation. Canada also has an obligation in the spirit of the Stockholm Document to respond to invitations to observe notifiable activities of other participating states; therefore all the agreed observation modalities are equally applicable to Canada, both as an observing and observed nation, which will require an allocation of resources to meet this obligation.

Like all other participating states, Canada could be included in a challenge on-site inspection while on the territory of an allied state located in the zone of application. Moreover, like all other participating states, Canada has the right to conduct challenge on-site inspections in accordance with the provisions of the compliance and verification measure. This will require the development of adequate arrangements to ensure that the provision of this measure can be met at short notice with the necessary manpower and equipment.

In summary, notwithstanding that by herself Canada is not likely to trigger any of the agreed thresholds, she will, nevertheless, have to observe all the provisions of the Stockholm Document. This obligation will require the Canadian Forces to provide timely detail for annual calendars and prior notification of certain military activities in the agreed format and to comply with the observation and verification provisions.

'Arms Control and Disarmament and Defence' Theme of Consultative Group Meeting

The following executive summary of the October 2-4 meeting of the Consultative Group on Disarmament and Arms Control Affairs was prepared by the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament as part of a contract with the Department of External Affairs. Copies of the full report prepared by the Centre are available by writing to the Editor.

The Consultative Group meeting was held under the Chairmanship of the Ambassador for Disarmament, Mr. Douglas Roche, whose responsibilities include representing Canada in the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly and the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Canada's Minister of National Defence, the Honourable Perrin Beatty, addressed the opening session of the meeting on October 2. (The full text of his statement follows the executive summary.) Mr. Beatty's address was responded to by a panel that included Professor Albert Legault of Laval University and Ernie Regehr, Research Director of Project Ploughshares. Other speakers at the meeting were Professor Cynthia Cannizzo of the University of Calgary, Professor Douglas Ross of the University of British Columbia and Mr. Robert Reford, President of the United Nations Association in Canada.

The Consultative Group was created in 1979 in response to the recommendation of the First United Nations Special Session on Disarmament (UNSSOD I) in 1978. It meets periodically with the Ambassador for Disarmament and with officials of