

desirable clarity.

Alternative B:

Until late in the fourth Experts Group meeting, it looked like the Danish/Cuban/ Australian proposal (Alternative A) would be the one used to extend the scope of the treaty. At the last moment, however, India presented what is now listed as Alternative B. The Indians were concerned that the wording in Alternative A was not sufficiently strong to protect the freedom from interference in internal affairs. In their alternative draft, reference to the Geneva Convention is included and the right of freedom from interference in internal affairs is spelled out in a more detailed way.

The extent of the detail in the Indian draft is worrying. In clause 5, for example, the proposal says that nothing in the treaty can be used "as a justification for intervening, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the armed conflict or in the internal or external affairs" of state-parties. We fear that this language could be used to abrogate our wish of applying the treaty to internal conflicts.

The challenge at the CCW Review Conference will therefore be to preserve the essence of the Danish/Cuban/Australian proposal which achieves the goals we seek, while doing so in such a way as to assuage the fears of India. Of course, the possibility always exists that the Indian language is primarily intended to provide a useful bargaining chip in the debate over such issues as verification.

CANADIAN POSITION:

Canada favours as strong a reference as possible to the extension of the CCW to internal conflicts. At the same time, we recognize that this issue presents considerable difficulties to many NAM countries. It will also have to be dealt with in the context of its relationship to our other priority for the RevCon: verification.

POSITIONS OF OTHER PLAYERS/GROUPS:

As noted in the Background section. All of our Western Partners favour Alternative A.

LIKELY AREAS OF COMPROMISE:

We believe that the ultimate outcome of the debate will be language which recognizes the principle involved, but is rather hazy with respect to specific obligations. This would be acceptable if it placed the item on the Agenda of future Review Conferences in such a way that it could be returned to and further developed. Ideally, we would also like to see it along with a strong verification provision, though this may be difficult.