

meet in Vienna in late January 1987 to discuss formulation of a mandate for the proposed "conventional stability" negotiations. Subsequently, in the summer of 1987, Western representatives tabled one draft mandate for the confidence- and security-building measures negotiations at the Vienna CSCE Follow-Up Meeting, and another for the "stability" talks at a session of the weekly "breakfast meetings" of the Warsaw Pact and NATO nations. The HLTF, as the coordinating body for NATO's conventional arms control policy, has continued its work in Brussels to develop and to refine the Western position while the East-West discussions on the mandates for the two distinct negotiations continue in Vienna.

While no prediction can be made with certainty, it now appears to be reasonably assured that the mandates for these new negotiations are likely to be agreed upon, and that the actual negotiations will be started in the months ahead. Much, of course, will depend on the timetable of the CSCE Follow-Up Meeting, which is also discussing other aspects of the East-West relationship. If the new negotiations proceed as expected, the transition into a new era for conventional arms control will have been marked; in these negotiations is the potential to chart the nature of the European security relationship for the remainder of this century and well into the next. As this article has, however, indicated, immense problems must be overcome, and it is unlikely that quick or easy solutions will be found.

In addressing the stability of the conventional balance in Europe, the negotiations will inevitably focus primarily on ground forces, for it is essentially the land forces of the Warsaw Pact (the Soviet Army in particular) which pose the most serious threat to NATO. The elimination of disparities and stabilization of this balance will require considerable effort; it is not simply a question of reducing forces. As was indicated earlier, force-to-force and force-to-space relationships, geography and reinforcement rates are but some of the issues that must be examined and resolved.

Throughout this process it will be necessary for all of the NATO allies to maintain the integrity of their forces. Canada's pledge in the recent White Paper to consolidate the ground force commitment and provide a division in

the critical Central Region will contribute positively to NATO's aims of enhancing stability. The physical presence of Canadian troops in Europe also affords Canada an active part in the arms control negotiation process.

Development of Chemical Weapons Ban Intricate and Vexing

The Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament (CCACD) organized an important Conference on Implementing a Global Chemical Weapons Convention from October 7 to 9, 1987, in Ottawa. The conference provided a timely opportunity for academics and researchers, representatives of industry and labour, as well as officials and diplomats, to come together to assess progress to date in the chemical weapons negotiations, to discuss important outstanding issues which remain to be addressed, and to consider the road ahead.

The following are excerpts from the address by Mr. James Taylor, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs.

"I am honoured to be present here this evening among such a distinguished gathering of experts from many countries. I am pleased, on behalf of Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, to welcome you to our capital and wish you well in your deliberations.

I would also like to take the opportunity to commend the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences for having jointly taken such a timely initiative by convening this conference. I express, for us all, a special word of thanks to John Lamb and his staff at the Centre, in particular Miss Jan Glyde, for their tireless work in putting the administrative arrangements into place so smoothly. The Canadian Government welcomes and encourages meetings such as this one and the Department of External Affairs is pleased to have been able to assist in its realization.

The arms control and disarmament process is one of vexing complication and intricacy. Headlong technological developments proceed without let-up, heedless and independent of the painstaking efforts of official negotiators and their political leaders. The existing body of international law provides an all-too-tenuous foundation upon which the international community must build — shoring up those portions which seem in danger of crumbling, adding to and adapting existing parts of the legal structure and sometimes carrying out extensive renovations in response to new and previously unforeseen needs. All of this must be achieved in a politically charged context. This cannot be otherwise since the matters with which you deal touch directly on the security interests of states and are legitimately the object of sustained attention and concern on the part of political leaders and the publics to whom they are responsible.

In these circumstances, if their collective efforts are to be successful and efficacious, governments cannot rely on their own resources. The erudition and expertise of scientific and legal specialists must be brought to bear in the negotiating process itself. Just as important, especially in those societies in which public debate is an essential part of the policy formulation process, adequate understanding of the issues and problems involved, both by experts and wider publics, can be achieved only through free and frequent discourse across national boundaries. Your meeting is an example of this necessary process.

It is pertinent to recall on this occasion that chemical weapons (CW) have a special place in the Canadian collective memory, since Canadian troops in