

Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Not only is this treaty the linchpin of the nuclear non-proliferation regime, it is the point on which all arms control and disarmament progress rests. If we allow that agreement to be damaged, we may undermine the entire arms control process. States will be willing to sign agreements limiting conventional or chemical arms only if they

know that parties to those agreements will be inhibited from acquiring nuclear weapons by a strong non-proliferation regime. Commitment to arms control and disarmament must, almost by definition, mean commitment to the NPT.

Canada was an active participant in past Review Conferences and looks forward to working closely with all NPT parties to help ensure the success of the

1990 conference. We believe that its outcome will be of critical importance in setting the stage for the role of the Treaty beyond 1995.

Patience, persistence and realism — the formula that has begun to yield results, must continue to be followed. Only with these ingredients can effective and lasting progress in arms control and disarmament be achieved. □

West Presents Expanded Position at CFE

The following is the position paper provided by the delegations of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States at the closing of the Second Round of the Negotiation on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) in Vienna on July 13, 1989.

Objectives

1. The agreed objectives of this negotiation are:

- the establishment of a secure and stable balance of conventional forces at lower levels;
- the elimination of disparities prejudicial to stability and security;
- the elimination, as a matter of high priority, of the capability for launching surprise attack and for initiating large-scale offensive action.

2. Through the proposals set out below the Delegations of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States seek to establish a situation in which surprise attack and large-scale offensive action are no longer credible options. We pursue this aim on the basis of equal respect for the security interests of all. Our proposals make up a coherent whole and



A CH-136 Kiowa helicopter from Canadian Forces Base Lahr, followed by two Dutch Air Force helicopters, flies past the Hohenzollern castle in southern Germany during a NATO squadron exchange visit.

Canadian Forces Photo by WO Vic Johnson

are intended to be applied simultaneously and in their totality in the area of application, as defined in the mandate.

Rationale

3. The rationale for our proposals is as follows:

- the present concentration of forces in the area from the Atlantic to the Urals is the highest ever known in peacetime and represents the greatest destructive potential ever assembled. Overall levels of forces, particularly those relevant to sur-

prise attack and offensive action such as tanks, artillery and armoured troop carriers, must therefore be radically reduced. It is the substantial disparity in the numbers of these systems, all capable of rapid mobility and high firepower, which most threatens stability in Europe. These systems are also central to the seizing and holding of territory, the prime aim of any aggressor;

- no one country should be permitted to dominate Europe by force of arms: no participant should therefore possess more than a fixed proportion of the total