

related resolutions and voted in favour of more than 40 of the resolutions adopted.

The Canadian delegation was pleased with the First Committee's work at UNGA 44. The improving international political climate contributed to a business-like and constructive atmosphere. This resulted in movement toward overcoming differences of opinion or approach that have for years hindered progress on many crucial disarmament issues.

However, much remains to be done to invigorate the UN's consideration of dis-

Canada pleased with progress, but much remains to be done to invigorate UN disarmament discussions

armament questions, so that discussions and negotiations at the global multi-lateral level can catch up to the current rapid pace of talks between the superpowers and in the NATO-WTO context. Profound differences remain on many disarmament issues on the UN agenda, and these will only be resolved through patient and serious discussions accompanied by flexibility and realism on the part of all countries.

Canada looks forward to building on the positive atmosphere of UNGA 44's First Committee at the 1990 session. Progress on disarmament matters is, by nature, a complex and slow process. The Canadian government is convinced, however, that there currently exists the potential for the UN to make an unprecedented contribution in the area of disarmament. Canada will continue to do its best to ensure that this potential is lived up to. ■

Recent Statements on Arms Control and Disarmament

On Arctic Arms Control

The Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, Prime Minister: "In Moscow, I...raised with Mr. Gorbachev the Arctic arms control proposals he had set forth in his Murmansk speech several years ago. I pointed out to him that Mr. Clark had responded to those proposals on several occasions but that we were quite prepared to discuss with the Soviets any refinements they might have to make to their original ideas. I pointed out, as well, that I continued to believe that current ongoing arms control negotiations between the two superpowers and the two alliances had proven successful and were the best avenues for making progress on these issues. He understands fully our position and agreed that further review of this issue should be pursued by the Secretary of State for External Affairs [Mr. Clark] and [Soviet Foreign Minister] Mr. Shevardnadze." *[Statement to the House of Commons on his visit to the USSR, November 27, 1989]*

On NATO

The Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, Prime Minister: "We are entering a new and important era of relationships between East and West. We should be sensitive to all opportunities for change. We should not reject ideas out of hand simply because they have not been tried before or they have been tried and found wanting.... [Mr. Gorbachev said to me] that the most imprudent thing that could be done at this time, given the enormity of the changes in Eastern Europe, would be changes in the structures of the alliances, because at this particular time any such changes could be destabilizing with regard to the efforts that he and others are trying to bring about.... The progress we have made so far, and it has been remarkable in the last number

of years, has been brought about in large measure because of the leadership of President Gorbachev on the one side, but [also because of] the solidarity of NATO on the other. We propose to keep that."

[Question Period, House of Commons, December 6, 1989]

On NATO and CFE

The Right Honourable Joe Clark, Secretary of State for External Affairs: "[The money that Canada spends to keep troops in Europe] in part [is] an investment that yielded the agreement on one nuclear arms treaty and could yield agreement on other nuclear arms treaties. It could yield an agreement on the reduction of conventional forces in Europe... [O]ur participation in NATO is based very strongly on the view that the solidarity [of NATO] is not a theory; solidarity is a technique that has worked.

"I personally believe that there will be a change in the nature of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and that it will begin to put more focus on some of the political activities that have always been part of its mandate, but have taken second place. Regarding troops specifically, we are not anticipating any movement back of troops. This round of CFE negotiations in fact would not affect our troop levels. We have made it clear that we are prepared to be in Europe as long as our allies want us to be there. It may be that if we get into other rounds of conventional force discussions...that may reduce the need on both sides for troops. But we won't be looking upon that as an economy measure. Any efforts that we might take in the future...would be as part of alliance decisions and as a result of negotiations."

[Interview with Don Newman on "This Week in Parliament," December 8, 1989] ■