

the actual experience that I have representing Canada on these issues with other countries. I would also be much less effective, talking to groups and so on, if I did not have a role in the development of policy. So the three aspects of the job complement each other very well.

Because there are such possibilities for progress in arms control and disarmament now, it seems to me critically important that we maximize our opportunities and make as much progress as we can. The three aspects of the job lead to the possibility that this position can be a catalyst for that kind of progress.

Ed: Is arms control and disarmament a new field for you?

PM: My first experience in arms control and disarmament was attending the Stockholm Conference in 1984. This was part of the overall CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe] process working on a range of issues, but specifically on trying to develop confidence-building measures between East and West at a time when there was not much progress on arms control and disarmament questions. At the time I was working with Mr. Clark, who had been asked by the then leader of the official opposition, Mr. Mulroney, to do a sort of shadowing of the Trudeau peace initiative. As part of that, Mr. Clark was sent to the Stockholm Conference and, as his advisor, I found myself suddenly literally plunged into arms control and disarmament issues. When Mr. Clark became Foreign Minister, I had the opportunity to continue working in his office and wanted to continue working on arms control and disarmament questions. So my background and training were certainly not in arms control and disarmament, but I've been working in the area now for five and a half years.

Ed: You're about to head off to the First Committee. What are some of the major issues Canada will be dealing with there?

PM: The First Committee, of course, is not a negotiating forum. It is a place where all of the member countries of the UN can speak on arms control and disarmament questions. The goal is to try to develop some common ground, some consensus, so that more progress can be

made in the actual negotiating forums. Canada will be focusing in particular on a resolution that we co-sponsor with Poland on the proposed global convention banning chemical weapons. It will take into account the progress that's been made bilaterally by the United States and the Soviet Union and also multilaterally in the chemical weapon negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament. There have been a number of conferences — the Paris Conference [in January 1989], for example — trying to inject political will into the negotiating process. The Canberra Conference was recently held in Australia in an attempt to get the chemical industry more involved, because they're a vital part of any successful chemical weapons convention. So the resolution will take note of the progress that's been made, but will also try to seek to ensure that the international community strongly supports the need for such a treaty.

Canada can have greatest impact in conventional negotiations

In general, Canada will be bringing a kind of challenge to the First Committee. A great deal of arms control progress is being made bilaterally between the superpowers and also between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. I think one can fairly say that the multilateral side is not keeping pace. What Canada will try to do — as a great believer in the multilateral process and as a country that has never engaged in UN-bashing but has always sought to make the UN more effective — is encourage the First Committee to meet that challenge and really move the multilateral process forward. Frankly, it's a wonderful position to be in: that there has been sufficient progress bilaterally that multilateral institutions have to catch up.

Ed: If one backs away from the First Committee and looks at the whole range of arms control and disarmament issues and negotiations that Canada is involved in, which do you think are the most important? Where should we be concentrating our energy?

PM: You can have an interesting debate about which are more important in a

global sense: the negotiations between the superpowers to radically reduce nuclear weapons or the conventional arms reduction talks between the members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. But I think when you get to the other question, which is where should Canada be concentrating, clearly the conventional negotiation is where we can have the greatest impact because, quite simply, we are a part of that negotiation. Canada has been a leader in developing the verification package, which is essential to the overall agreement, and it's also been a leader in bringing along all of the various countries on the NATO side to agree to that package. Canada has to, and is, playing an important role there. It's harder on the strategic side because we're not a party to the negotiation. We have to confine ourselves to influencing the superpowers to adopt positions that are in our best interests, so that means bilateral representations and so on. From the public's point of view it's difficult, because bilateral consultations, in order to be effective, are generally confidential. We're not standing on the street corner shouting.

Ed: Do you plan to become personally involved with some of these issues?

PM: I've already been in Geneva for a preparatory meeting for the NPT [Non-Proliferation Treaty] Review Conference. After the First Committee is over, I hope to have the opportunity to visit Vienna, where the two conventional negotiations are going on, and to engage in some other consultations as well. That should give me a better sense of where I can have the most impact. At this stage there's a lot to deal with, so I still don't have a final sense of where the most productive focus will be. I think that the two conventional negotiations and the NPT have clearly got to be important areas of concentration.

Ed: How about on the public liaison side of your job? Do you have anything in particular planned?

PM: One of the first things I did as Ambassador for Disarmament was hold a meeting of the Steering Committee of the Consultative Group on Disarmament and Arms Control Affairs. The purpose was partly to get acquainted, but also to plan for the next meeting of the full Consulta-