

The Disarmament Bulletin

A review of national and international disarmament and arms control activities

CAI
EA 55
031
9 Wibe
1988
DOCS

Paris Conference on Chemical Weapons 1

Banning Chemical Weapons for All Times 3

Beatty Acts on Barton Report 4

University of Calgary Workshop on Verification of a Chemical Weapons Convention .. 5

Prime Minister Mulroney Addresses General Assembly 6

First Committee Meets With Success 9

Negotiations on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe 9

Ambassador Fortier Stresses Hope 10

Selected Recent Department of External Affairs Publications 12

Resolution on Arms Control and Disarmament (ACD) and International Security at UNGA 43 13

Canadian Public Supports Canada's Role in NATO 14

Consultative Group members visit United Nations 15

Bilateral Arms Control and Disarmament Consultations Since September 1988 15

1988 Nobel Peace Prize Award to United Nations Peacekeeping Forces 16

NATO Publishes Statistics on Conventional Forces in Europe 16

European NGOs Hold Verification Workshop . 17

Clark Addresses Security and Cooperation Conference 17

Grants and Contributions from the Disarmament Fund Fiscal Year 1988-89 20

Paris Conference on Chemical Weapons



The Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, speaking at the Paris Conference on Chemical Weapons.

belief that something had to be done — and soon — to ensure that states in future would not think they could resort with impunity to the use of chemical weapons.

A little more than three months, including the Christmas/New Year holiday period, was all the time available to prepare for the Conference, to take whatever action one could bilaterally and in group consultations to ensure that the Conference would avoid potential pitfalls and not end in disarray. The stakes were high indeed: failure of the Paris Conference would likely threaten the ongoing negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and, contrary to the original aim, add further fuel to the notion that chemical weapons were somehow a useful, perhaps even necessary, addition to national arsenals.

To understand what was accomplished at the five-day Paris Conference, it is necessary to understand what was not intended and what fell outside its reach. It is also important to be aware of the peculiar dynamics of multilateral diplomacy which, contrary to what some might have us believe, is not necessarily an exercise in finding the lowest common denominator.

The Paris Conference, although stemming in many respects from the confirmed use of chemical weapons by Iraq in the Gulf War, was not intended to be an international tribunal dwelling on those past actions, however repulsive in themselves. Furthermore, the Conference could not address the structure and process of the United Nations, which many felt should have done more after the first confirmed use of these horrible weapons. Clearly, in only five days it could not seek to strengthen

For five days in January, the media focussed public attention on the first major international event of the year. More than an ordinary "event," it was about a broken treaty, the repugnance of chemical weapons, deep-rooted fears and, not least, hope for the future. Add varying quantities of East-West and North-South tension, regional antagonisms and distrust, and we had the ingredients for the Paris Conference. It is not surprising that at the working level there was some initial apprehension that greeted President Reagan's September proposal for an international conference to reaffirm the 1925 Geneva Protocol which prohibits the use in war of chemical weapons, particularly since early reactions suggested the agenda might be unrealistically broadened. However, there was also a strong, shared

The Disarmament Bulletin is published periodically by the Department of External Affairs. It is intended to be a source of information on arms control and disarmament issues to a broad spectrum of Canadians. If you wish to be placed on our mailing list, or need additional copies, please write to: The Editor, *The Disarmament Bulletin*, Arms Control and Disarmament Division, Dept. of External Affairs, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2.

— ISSN 0715-7134 —
Cette publication existe également en français.

RETOURNER À LA BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU MINISTÈRE
RETURN TO DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARY

through amendment the 1925 Geneva Protocol which prohibits the use in war of chemical weapons; as well there were many very good reasons why attention and effort should not be diverted from the negotiations in Geneva of a total abolition of chemical weapons to attempts to improve upon an instrument which only addresses a part of the problem. So then, what could be "done?"

International attention could be focussed on chemical weapons in a way that had not been done since their use in the First World War and the preparations to defend against their possible use in the Second. More than that, by suggesting that participation at the Conference be at the Foreign Minister level, the organizers could be certain that the highest levels of governments and their supporting staffs would be seized with the horrors of the use of chemical weapons, with the dangers posed by their existence and proliferation, and with the important issues still waiting to be negotiated to a conclusion in the Conference on Disarmament on a convention to abolish chemical weapons. As a political event, the Paris Conference was a very substantial success in that many more people are now informed about at least some aspects of the above-mentioned issues. Surely, many would say it must have "done" more than that, and so it did, although such are not the things to capture headlines.

The Conference concluded with a short but significant Final Declaration — a political statement — to which all 149 participating states agreed. Reaching such a consensus is an achievement in itself. To this, however, must be added the fact that the two main objectives of the Conference were achieved:

— the participating states (most of which were parties to the 1925 Geneva Protocol, but some of which were not) solemnly affirmed their commitments not to use chemical weapons and condemned such use, and, in this regard, they recognized the importance and continuing validity of the 1925 Geneva Protocol; and

— they stressed the necessity and urgency of concluding, at an early date, a Convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of all chemical weapons, and on their destruction, and called upon all states to become a party to it as soon as it is concluded.

In addition to these, there were two other substantive points in the Final Declaration:

— while awaiting the conclusion and entry into force of a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons, it was deemed necessary for each state to exercise restraint and to act responsibly in accordance with the purpose of the Final Declaration; and

— the participating states confirmed their full support for the United Nations as a framework and instrument for exercising vigilance with respect to the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons, mentioning, in particular, their full support for the Secretary-General in carrying out investigations in the event of alleged violations of the Geneva Protocol.

Such a call for restraint and responsible action could be seen to be addressed to states contemplating the acquisition or production of chemical weapons, while not ignoring that the desired end-result to negotiations in Geneva would also be the destruction of existing stockpiles. It also encompasses actions taken by countries such as Canada to ensure that their industry not contribute to any use of chemical weapons. The expression of support for the United Nations and its Secretary-General was more than a simple *pro forma* nod in that direction and was seen by many as intended to provide advance notice of support for stronger timely action.

Often at such gatherings, as important as what is agreed is what is avoided, and this was certainly the case at the Paris Conference. Some participants would have liked to see the agenda broadened to include, for example, the discussion of nuclear weapons in relation to chemical weapons, particular regional concerns, and a condemnation of particular states. These were all subjects on which such a short conference could only find disagreement and

irresolvable dissension. Although many national speeches addressed such matters in the general debate, moderation prevailed in the Committee of the Whole which was tasked with negotiating a consensus Final Declaration. There have been recent examples of international conferences which ended inconclusively due to the inability to maintain focus, and it is to the credit of all concerned that such an outcome was avoided at this Conference. As it is hoped the above discussion demonstrates, the Final Declaration is definitely not the lowest common denominator upon which some might have insisted.

The Final Declaration will undoubtedly become a new and forceful reference point against which progress in the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament will be measured. Looking forward to the conclusion of the negotiations and the opening for signature of a comprehensive prohibition on chemical weapons, the consensus Final Declaration will be a powerful argument in promoting the early accession to and the globality of the convention. Finally, in the tragic event of any future use of chemical weapons, this consensus Final Declaration will be supportive of decisive action by the international community.

These are all important political achievements, and all participating states can derive considerable satisfaction from having contributed in some way to the successful outcome. Certainly, foremost among these would be the French Government and its officials who prepared the way through extensive — some might say exhaustive — consultations beforehand. Nevertheless, there is always the element of the unknown at such gatherings, and these were managed with tremendous skill. The president of the Conference (Mr. Roland Dumas of France) and the president of the Committee of the Whole (Mr. Kalevi Sorsa of Finland) were ably supported in their efforts by competent French officials and support staff. The UNESCO staff too provided sterling support throughout the Conference. The result is that 1989 has gotten off to a good start in the field of multilateral diplomacy, with promising indications in other areas as well. □

Banning Chemical Weapons for All Times

The following are excerpts from the speech given by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, at the Paris Conference on January 8, 1989.

"In April 1915, Canadian soldiers in Flanders were among the first to suffer the terror, pain and death inflicted by chemical weapons. Of those who recovered from exposure to poison gas, many suffered on for their remaining years. At least three generations of Canadians—parents, the victims themselves, and their children—became acutely aware of the cruel and horrible effects of the use of such weapons. It is a tragic part of Canada's national memory.

No wonder nations in the post-war years sought a treaty which would prevent any further use of such terrible weapons in warfare. The 1925 Geneva Protocol is not a perfect document. It represents a political and legal commitment. It is also a moral guideline. The problem with the Protocol is that obligations have not been fulfilled. The Protocol has been violated on more than one occasion: even more distressing is that these violations were not unanimously denounced throughout the world.

In that sense, the world has slipped back from the high purpose of this Protocol. This meeting is designed to reaffirm that purpose and to help create a confidence and a resolve which our negotiators at Geneva can translate into practical progress on a Convention to ban the production and use of chemical weapons. That is a great challenge by itself, and Canada hopes that, at this Conference, we can concentrate our efforts on the business at hand—the issue of chemical weapons.

This Conference is testimony to the international judgment that chemical warfare is repugnant and it must be abolished. The obligations of the 1925 Geneva Protocol must be reaffirmed and upheld. All violations must be condemned. We commend President Reagan for having proposed a conference of this kind and President Mitterrand for his initiative in convening it so quickly.

Canada's goal is to have all nations ban all chemical weapons—to get rid of them everywhere and for ever. We seek a comprehensive ban that prohibits not only the use but the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. That will not happen overnight. It will require a reliable means of verification, which will let us test each other's word and assess each other's practice. Great progress has been made in the negotiation of a global, comprehensive and verifiable ban. That work must be pursued urgently in the Conference on Disarmament and in bilateral discussions. But this extraordinary meeting can take concrete steps toward that goal.

Specifically, we can condemn the use of chemical weapons, and commit ourselves not to use them.

We can reaffirm the Geneva Protocol of 1925, and call on other States to adhere to it.

We can strengthen the capacity of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to investigate allegations of chemical weapons use.

As a party to the 1925 Geneva Protocol, Canada has accepted fully its obligations on chemical weapons use. Our policy is clear:

- Canada does not intend at any time to initiate the use of chemical weapons; and
- Canada does not intend to develop, produce, acquire or stockpile such weapons, unless these weapons are used against the military forces or the civil population of Canada or its allies.

What does this mean?

- First, it means that Canada is applying its obligations under the Protocol to parties and non-parties alike.
- Second, we have adopted a firm policy of non-production to help achieve a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons.
- Third, Canada has already advised other nations of the destruction of the bulk, useable chemical warfare agents which it had stockpiled during the Second World War.

The 1925 Geneva Protocol also prohibits the use of biological methods of warfare. The Protocol was supplemented by the 1972 Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention which prohibits the development, production and stockpiling of biological and toxin weapons and requires their destruction. Canada moved beyond its obligations under the 1925 Geneva Protocol well before the 1972 Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. In 1970 Canada declared that it never has had—and does not possess now—any biological or toxin weapons and does not intend to develop, produce, acquire, stockpile or use such weapons at any time in the future. That remains Canada's policy and practice today.

Only two countries—the United States and the Soviet Union—have admitted that they produce and possess chemical weapons. Other countries which possess chemical weapons should adopt that spirit of openness.

Treaties are not only pieces of paper which, once signed, simply become historical reference points. They require constant attention and care. In this spirit, Canada's Verification Research Programme has sought to develop ways to investigate allegations of the use of chemical weapons. We have made the results of our work available to other nations. In 1987 Canada, along with Norway, proposed an annex to the future Convention on procedures for verification of allegations of use of chemical weapons. As well, we have fully supported the measure taken by the United Nations Secretary-General to investigate past allegations.

The test of any arms control agreement is how well it is respected. The purpose is to increase everyone's security, and that will happen only if we all have confidence that others will honour the rules we honour. There is agreement here on the urgent need for a ban that works. There has been real progress at Geneva in negotiating a Convention. Now it is time to resolve the important outstanding issues.

Verification of a chemical weapons ban will be complex, expensive and

intrusive. The price of a treaty, in human endeavour, in self-limitations on sovereignty and in resources will be substantial. But experience shows that the cost of failing will be far greater.

In the meantime, there is a need for national self-restraint. It is of great concern to my Government that the spread of chemical weapons has continued and that they have again been used. We considered it a necessary and logical consequence of our policy on chemical weapons to ensure that Canadian industry not contribute, even inadvertently, to any use of chemical weapons. We hope others will do the same.

There is no doubt that there is a collective international desire for a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. This is demonstrated each year at the United Nations General Assembly through a consensus resolution which Canada and Poland, among others, sponsor. This issue concerns not only 40 States negotiating a chemical weapons convention in the Conference on Disarmament, but also the world at large.

The Conference on Disarmament certainly derives strength from such a consensus, as it seeks to conclude a treaty of great complexity and unparalleled scope. Clearly, the speed with which today's Conference has been convened and the international response to it are cause for optimism about the future.

Mr. President, the elimination of chemical weapons from the face of the earth is not merely a pragmatic necessity. More than a common sense assessment of our security interests is involved. The issue touches on our sense of ourselves as human beings. We know that, individually and collectively, we are susceptible to insecurities, fears and animosities. This is a reality. Surely, it is the responsibility of governments to seek to limit our capability to inflict abhorrent cruelties and punishments on each other. Chemical weapons use, inevitably involving civilian as well as military victims, only provokes revulsion. Chemical weapons must be banned. We owe our citizens no less. Let us get on with the task." □

Beatty Acts on Barton Report

The Honourable Perrin Beatty, Minister of National Defence, announced January 25, 1989 that he has accepted all 16 recommendations made by William H. Barton in a comprehensive review of research, development and training in chemical and biological (CB) self-defence within the Department of National Defence (DND) and the Canadian Forces.

Beatty also announced that he will be inviting representatives of the Soviet Union to Canada to tour our chemical research facility.

The aim of the Barton report, undertaken in July 1988, was to ensure that the Canadian Government's policy of maintaining only a self-defence capability with regard to CB agents is fully respected and that all CB self-defence activities in Canada are conducted in a professional manner, consistent with environmental and health regulations, and posing no threat whatsoever to public health and safety.

The Barton report concluded that all research, development and training activities in CB defence undertaken by DND are for purposes of self-defence, and that this is the only prudent option open consistent with the international obligations undertaken by the government.

The review gives the CB self-defence programme a clean bill of health, but also lists 16 recommendations to improve the management, control and public understanding of the CB self-defence program.

"I have directed that all these recommendations, without exception, be implemented without delay," Mr. Beatty said. "Indeed, most of them have already been acted upon."

Eight recommendations regarding Defence Research Establishment Suffield, including safety procedures and physical security arrangements, are cur-

rently being implemented and most will be in place by spring. Mr. Beatty has announced this will mean all outdoor testing at Suffield will be subject to the provisions of the new Canadian Environmental Protection Act, and DND will continue to comply with the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process. Full environmental audits will be carried out this summer at the Defence Research Establishments in Suffield and Ottawa.

As well, Mr. Beatty has directed that a large-scale containment facility be constructed at Suffield to further reduce the requirement for outdoor tests using chemical agents.

The Barton report notes that Suffield has, for many years, been a storage site for old chemical agents and that about 18 tons of chemicals are awaiting destruction. A disposal operation which began after World War II has been given new impetus and should take about three years to complete.

Mr. Beatty announced that in the interest of an open disarmament dialogue he will be inviting officials of the Government of the Soviet Union to visit Suffield. The purpose of the visit would be to allow them to view the facilities, observe the chemical agent destruction process Canada has been using and share information on related technical issues.

Canada long ago renounced the possession of chemical weapons and is fully and actively committed to the goal of a global ban on chemical weapons.

"At the Battle of Ypres in 1915, Canadian soldiers were among the first in the world to suffer and die from the use of poison gas in war," said Mr. Beatty. "As a country with forces committed to collective defence as well as international peacekeeping operations, we must ensure that our soldiers and peacekeepers can operate safely and effectively anywhere in the world. We owe them no less." □

University of Calgary Workshop on Verification of a Chemical Weapons Convention

One of the key areas of discussion at the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament concerning a comprehensive chemical weapons treaty is how to verify effectively that parties live up to their obligations under an agreement. As was evident at the special Conference on chemical weapons, held in Paris January 7-11, 1989, recent events have heightened concerns about the proliferation of chemical weapons among states which previously did not possess them as well as about the use of these weapons.

Canada has long supported efforts to ban chemical weapons. We have worked hard in Geneva to contribute constructively to the present negotiations that have as their objective a treaty to completely eliminate these weapons.

In support of our delegation to the Conference on Disarmament, a major focus of Canadian research activities under the auspices of the Verification Research Programme is verification of a chemical weapons ban. Recently, the Strategic Studies Programme of the University of Calgary, with the sponsorship of the Verification Research Programme, hosted a workshop in Banff, Alberta on one approach to this complex question. This workshop drew together a small number of experts from the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States, Holland and Sweden as well as from Canada.

The University of Calgary meeting sought to identify lessons for verifying a chemical weapons ban that might be learned from the experience of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). IAEA safeguards have been in operation for more than 20 years and represent one of the few working examples of an operating multilateral verification system. While IAEA safeguards apply to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, it has been widely believed that the techniques, management and institutional arrangements of Safeguards can provide a valuable model in the context of chemical weapons verification. The pur-



Participants at University of Calgary Workshop on IAEA Safeguards as a Model for Verification of a Chemical Weapons Convention, 21-24 October 1988.

pose of the workshop was to focus in detail on these lessons.

The model provided by the IAEA has been an interest of the Verification Research Programme for some time. In 1985, the Programme funded original research by Dr. James Keeley of the University of Calgary on this question. His report, which was recently published as the first issue of the *Arms Control Verification Occasional Papers*, entitled "International Atomic Energy Agency Safeguards: Observations on Lessons for Verifying a Chemical Weapons Convention" formed a central element of the University of Calgary workshop discussions.

The meeting provided an invaluable forum for experts on chemical weapons negotiations to meet with and draw upon the experience of experts on IAEA safeguards. The discussions were wide-ranging as well as very frank. Political, organizational, administrative and technical dimensions of the subject were explored. In general, it was concluded

that the IAEA can provide significant and valuable insights with respect to chemical weapons verification. However, these lessons are, for the most part, ones of general approach not of detailed application. This finding is dictated by the significant differences that are inherent in the nuclear and chemical industries—for example, size, complexity, and so on—which make the transfer of the specifics of IAEA safeguard procedures to the chemical weapons environment very problematical. The workshop discussions, nevertheless, proved very fruitful and will undoubtedly contribute to further understanding of the complex issues surrounding chemical weapons verification, as well as lead to further research in this area. The Department of External Affairs intends to publish the proceedings of this workshop in the form of an occasional paper which will summarize its findings. These proceedings will also be shared with other countries at the Conference on Disarmament. ■

Prime Minister Mulroney Addresses General Assembly

The following are excerpts from the address by the Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, to the 43rd United Nations General Assembly.

"I believe we are on the brink of a new age where the differences that have divided us are becoming less important than the dangers we must face together. It is a new age where concrete acts which make our world more secure must—and can—be matched by tangible commitments to reduce poverty in the developing world and protect our common environment. ...

The Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Agreement is an historic first step in arms reduction for which we owe a great debt of gratitude to the courage and leadership of President Reagan of the United States and of General Secretary Gorbachev of the Soviet Union. They have built a foundation, and we can now expand upon it.

We can cut strategic weapons. We can limit the spread of nuclear weapons. We can limit nuclear testing, and every step in this direction takes us closer to a comprehensive test ban. We must redouble our efforts to reach a treaty banning chemical weapons.

In this respect, I welcome President Reagan's proposal for an early meeting of the signatories of the Geneva Protocol on the prohibition of chemical weapons. We must also control conventional weapons. Let us not forget that it is in conventional wars that people are still dying today. I encourage this Assembly to provoke and provide even more achievements in the field of disarmament. ...

In Afghanistan, the attempt to impose solutions by invasion and occupation has failed and the Soviet Union is withdrawing its forces. The United Nations remains heavily involved in the search for solutions. In the Gulf, no country has been able to impose its will by force. Representatives of the United Nations, including 500 Canadians, now patrol in peace where hundreds of thousands recently died in combat.

Canada's role in these events is consistent with our tradition of more than four decades of peacekeeping, a role we have always willingly assumed. Canada has participated in every UN peacekeeping force since its foundation and we are proud that this contribution, costly and difficult though it has often been, has assisted in bringing stability to explosive regions of the world.

Today a significant portion of our armed forces are either involved in peacekeeping around the world, or training for further duty in the service of peace. The award today of the Nobel Peace Prize for Peacekeeping is a splendid tribute both to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to those courageous men and women who patrol the world's danger spots in the pursuit of a durable peace.

But not everywhere do we see the progress we would wish. The vicious cycle of repression and violence is unbroken in South Africa. We all know the cause: the massive and institutionalized violation of human rights called apartheid. Internationally, pressure is increasing and is having an impact. The entire world finds apartheid repugnant: the whole world must now join forces to bring it to an end. Canada has taken strong measures on its own to rid our civilization of this unique evil, known as apartheid.

We are under no illusions about the effectiveness of our efforts alone and so we have actively pursued objectives in cooperation with other governments, especially in the Commonwealth and la Francophonie. From the outset, we have applied all the sanctions agreed within the Commonwealth; we will continue to do so. And we will seek to broaden their application, increase their effectiveness and encourage others to join in adopting and applying them.

Consistent with our policy of moving systematically and deliberately to increase pressure on South Africa, our Government announced earlier this week specific new measures to tighten the ban on government contracts with South African companies and a further ban on

high technology, together with initiatives designed to add practical support to peaceful efforts to work against apartheid. Because of threats to major development projects in the Front Line States, we intend to provide assistance, in concert with others, to preserve these development initiatives.

The movement in favour of human dignity is now irreversible. There can be no doubt that fundamental change will come to South Africa. The only questions are when and how and at what cost in human life.

We must make sure the answers are soon, and peacefully—and that a framework is preserved that will give rise to a non-racial democratic South Africa. Only then will the children of Mandela know the gifts that freedom brings.

The problems of the Middle East have preoccupied this Assembly since the creation of the United Nations. Peaceful solutions have proved elusive, and in their absence, violence and extremism have increased. But that is an argument for redoubled effort, not for despair.

There is today growing support for a properly structured international conference based on Israel's right to exist and recognition of the rights of Palestinians. Canada believes that such a conference can provide a path toward dialogue and away from a situation that appears to promise little but further suffering. ...

Who would have predicted a year ago that today Soviet forces would be withdrawing from Afghanistan; that Vietnamese forces would begin withdrawing from Cambodia; that UN peacekeepers would be patrolling the Iran-Iraq border; that negotiations on Angola and on the Western Sahara would be starting to bear fruit; that the Secretary-General would be discussing the independence of Namibia with the South African government.

Those who have doubted both the value of multilateralism and the UN surely must be re-assessing their views today. The Secretary-General's recent report on the work of this organization is a document which should inspire the deliberations of this Assembly.

In this dawning hope for peace, the path we should take is clear. It is toward conciliation and not confrontation between East and West. It is toward cooperation and generosity, not recrimination and rigidity, in North-South relations. It is toward negotiation, not warfare, in regional disputes. It is toward implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted 40 years ago.

We must give hope to those who today find their rights to free expression silenced by gunfire. We must provide sustenance to the flame of liberty in all regions where fundamental rights are being abused. We must reinforce the role of the Security Council in the pursuit of peacemaking and peacekeeping around the world. It can be done, with the help of everyone in this Assembly.

Mr. President, for two generations the arms race, regional disputes and the threat of nuclear annihilation have been a central preoccupation of the United Nations, and so they will remain. But I believe we are at a point in history when we must devote significantly more political energy to problems other than security, problems just as important, but until now accorded a lower priority.

I want to speak specifically about the twin challenges of severe poverty and our endangered environment. I believe we will not have true security until these problems have been successfully resolved.

These issues were high on the agendas of three international summits Canada hosted this past year — la Francophonie, the Commonwealth, and the Economic Summit. At these meetings, I found a growing conviction among national leaders that these problems can be tackled successfully, and before the end of this century. These problems command the same priority in the United Nations.

Poverty undermines security. It compromises equality. It denies hope. Today, it is estimated that at least one billion people live in absolute poverty. They are hungry. They are often sick. They are uneducated. They die young.

At Toronto, the leaders of the major industrialized countries renewed their

commitment to work toward continued growth for the benefit of both industrialized and developing countries.

We are also working toward a trading system which is more open and more beneficial to all nations. It will be strengthened bilaterally, as in the Canada-US Free Trade Agreement, the largest commercial agreement in the history of two-way trade.

It can also be strengthened regionally, as in the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and in Europe, as it approaches 1992. And it must be strengthened through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and multilateral talks such as the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations. Progress in these talks is essential at the GATT mid-term review to be held in Montreal this December.

Increased development assistance, especially to the poorest countries, is another imperative. Canada has just completed a review of its official development assistance (ODA) policy. We have reset our bearings to improve the quality, and increase the quantity of the help we give, to recognize the special role of women in development, and to concentrate on the poorest people in the poorest countries.

That is why Canada has completely written off the ODA debts of a large number of countries. It is surely reasonable that loans given for development purposes should not be allowed to become hindrances to that same development. None of this is altruism. North and South, rich and poor, have an equal stake in a world where wealth must be more equitably shared.

That is why our assistance program is now composed entirely of grants. We have affirmed that Canadian assistance will continue to increase to reach the target of 0.6% of GNP by 1995 and the desired 0.7% target by the year 2000, now less than 12 years away.

Perhaps I could best illustrate the importance we attach to the UN by pointing out that Canada is the fourth largest contributor to the UN system. Most of these contributions are directed at development assistance. But Canadians generally feel more can and should be done.

Africa is a special case. Canada has taken seriously its responsibilities under the UN Program of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development (UNPAAERD). In 1986-87, Canada disbursed a total of almost one billion dollars in Africa, through all channels, multilateral, bilateral and non-governmental.

Nearly half of all our bilateral assistance will be directed to Africa over the next five years. But poverty in Africa and elsewhere, cannot be ended solely through trade and help from developed countries. It will require sound national economic and development strategies. And the governments of the developing countries have a more direct responsibility to their own people to achieve progress.

Mr. President, I said we must devote the energies freed by greater security to two equally pressing problems. One is poverty. The other is the environment.

The world is facing an environmental crisis of unparalleled magnitude. Nature is sending us an urgent message that we ignore at our peril. The signs of this crisis are all around us—shortages of timber, exhausted soil, desertification, depleted fish stocks, seals dying in the North Sea, beluga whales washing ashore in the St. Lawrence River. Some even maintain that we have reached a point where the survival of mankind is at risk.

Prime Minister Brundtland, Chairman of the World Commission on Environment and Development, has said that the threat to our environmental security is 'second only to nuclear war.' Having lessened the likelihood of global nuclear war, we now face invasion by rising seas, polluted air and encroaching deserts.

There is a growing awareness that the environment, the economy, and human health are inextricably linked. At the same time as we in the North suffer the effects of our industrial society's disregard for the environment, the South suffers from the environmental degradation engendered by poverty, by population growth, and by pressure for immediate economic development.

Destruction of the rainforest in Brazil, deforestation in Sub-Saharan Africa, or the pollution of drinking water in the sprawling cities of the developing world are the consequences of people in poverty seeking the means to survive. Without improved development opportunities, we cannot expect them to do other than search for such fuel, shelter and livelihood, as best as they can.

We must help them to protect these precious resources. We require a new era of economic growth, but we need growth that sustains and expands the resource capital of our planet, not growth that poisons the air we breathe and the water we drink.

An Aboriginal elder, speaking to a Canadian Government Commission, said it best: 'we did not inherit the earth—we only hold it in trust for our children.'

Mr. President, in a world where rivers and winds cannot be contained by laws or borders, it is clear that domestic initiatives by themselves are inadequate. Canadians know this.

Our economy as well as our environment is damaged by acid rain. We have taken important internal measures to address the problem. We have urgently pressed our neighbour to follow suit and to conclude a treaty with us that will reduce the environmental damage from this blight by stated amounts within specific time frames.

But acid rain is not limited to one nation or one continent. It is an international problem, and it demands a viable international solution. The greenhouse effect, the deterioration of the ozone layer and the disposal of toxic wastes are cause for concern the world over. I am encouraged by the strong emphasis given to the environment by others in this year's debate. Strengthened international cooperation is essential, and the UN has a key role to play.

As with security issues, important action has been initiated:

— The signature a year ago in Montreal of the protocol on the protection of the ozone layer is a landmark example of what nations working together can accomplish.

I urge all states which have not yet done so to sign and ratify the protocol without delay.

— The increasingly urgent question of global warming and climate change received serious attention at the International Conference on the Changing Atmosphere in Toronto last June.

Our goal should be an International Framework Convention for the Protection of the Atmosphere by 1992.

We applaud the work of the United Nations Environment Program in developing a global convention on the trans-boundary movements of hazardous wastes. We hope it will be ready for signature next year.

Mr. President, this powerful momentum must be maintained and strengthened.

Other steps are needed.

Canada is supporting a feasibility study on a World Conservation Bank to work in concert with the World Bank. Canada is asking the World Bank, at its annual meeting in Berlin, to strengthen the integration of environmental concerns into the design and implementation of its projects.

Canada fully supports the holding of an environmental Summit at the Heads of Government level. Canada urges all corporations and international industrial and trade associations to develop, strengthen and vigorously apply environmental codes of conduct.

Obviously, wealthier nations have to offer more assistance and support to help developing countries achieve growth which does not destroy their environment. For that reason the Canadian International Development Agency makes environmental protection one of the criteria for its development projects.

I want to announce today that Canada will establish a Centre which will promote internationally the concept of environmentally sustainable development. This centre will be located in Winnipeg and will work closely with the United Nations Environment Program and other like-minded international institutions and organizations.

Canada strongly supports the call for a UN Conference on sustainable development in 1992.

The global challenges we face are great, but we are proving they can be met and resolved.

Mankind is not destined to destroy itself. War is not inevitable. Poverty can be alleviated. The environment can be preserved. Injustices can be made right.

Mr. President, the UN is not and never will be a perfect institution. But in the last few years the UN has proven that it can make needed reforms and emerge as a stronger and more effective body. We must continue to improve this irreplaceable organization. Our citizens will judge the UN not by its rhetoric but by its actions and its practical successes.

An immunization program that saves children's lives in a developing nation is, in itself, an enduring monument to the profound value of this institution.

Because now as the international political climate improves, the UN can play the role intended in the Charter.

Lester Pearson, a great Canadian statesman who was present at the creation of this Organization, once observed that the United Nations is the 'living symbol of our interdependence, and embodies that emerging sense of international community, going beyond nation and region, which alone can save us in this nuclear age.'

Mr. President, the United Nations reflects the vision of our predecessors and the hope for our children.

The agenda before the United Nations is compelling, and the choices are clear: to manage the irresistible forces of change that swirl around us; to acknowledge the interdependence of our world and of the issues before us; to ensure a more peaceful, more prosperous, more humane world, a world in which the strong nations are just, the rich nations generous -- a world in which all nations have legitimate hope for greater economic and social justice, understanding as we must that there is but one earth for us to preserve for our children." □

First Committee Meets With Success

The First Committee of the UN General Assembly (UNGA), which *inter alia* considers disarmament and international security issues, held its 43rd session October 17 to November 30, 1988. The Committee was chaired by Canada's Ambassador for Disarmament, Douglas Roche. A very positive atmosphere prevailed, which facilitated an unusually productive session. Of the 67 arms control and disarmament resolutions adopted, a record 27 were by consensus.

Mr. Roche visited selected capitals from all five continents in August and September 1988 in preparation for assuming the Chairmanship. Despite some concern expressed at the possible implications for the First Committee of the failure of the UN Special Session on Disarmament (UNSSOD III) in June 1988 to reach agreement on a final document, there were high expectations for a positive and productive First Committee Session. Recent international developments, for example, the establishment of UN peacekeeping forces in Iran/Iraq and Afghanistan and the ratification and implementation of the Intermediate-Range (INF) Treaty, were expected to have favourable implications since, as is frequently the case in multilateral arms control and disarmament forums, the atmosphere tends to be responsive to progress.

The atmosphere was businesslike and cooperative. Of 75 resolutions tabled at UNGA 43, 67 were adopted. The slight increase in number over UNGA 42 reflected the addition of new agenda items, for example, the Dumping of Nuclear and Industrial Wastes in Africa, and the Illegal Transfer of Prohibited Weapons. At the same time, a number of successful mergers of competing resolutions were achieved, including in the areas of verification, outer space, arms transfers, nuclear freeze proposals, and objective information on military matters.

The First Committee also recommended that UN studies be conducted on the role of the UN in verification (based on terms of reference developed by Canada, the Netherlands and France), on nuclear weapons (proposed by

Sweden), on arms transfers (proposed by Colombia), and on scientific and technological developments (proposed by India).

Mr. Roche devoted considerable effort in pursuit of Canada's objective of rationalizing and enhancing the effectiveness of the First Committee. The Committee's agenda was revised to allow for a 25 percent increase in the time available to delegations for consultations. Although further proposals to rationalize the substantive agenda did not receive the consensus required for implementation, they are expected to receive further considerations in the future.

The Canadian Delegation, as in past years, played a very active role. Canada's new Ambassador to the United Nations in New York, Yves Fortier, delivered the main Canadian Statement on October 18 (separate article refers), stressing the importance of patience, persistence and realism as the central ingredients of success in arms control and disarmament. More specifically, Canada again acted as lead sponsor of resolutions on verification (see separate article) and the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. A competing Swedish resolution on verification was subsequently merged with the Canadian. We also played a major role in drafting and co-sponsoring resolutions on the urgent need for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and, with Poland, on chemical weapons. In the international security area, Canada was able to vote in favour of the Soviet resolution calling for a comprehensive approach to strengthening international peace and security in accordance with the UN Charter as a result of several major changes in the text over last year's version, on which Canada abstained.

In his up-beat closing remarks, Mr. Roche indicated that the Committee had helped to improve the international situation and that he would leave the Chair in the knowledge that this process was well underway. □

Negotiations on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe

The Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, announced January 16, 1989 Canada's agreement to participate in the new Negotiation on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. The mandate for this negotiation provides for talks among the 23 states that are members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The talks will be aimed at strengthening security in Europe through the establishment of a stable balance of conventional armed forces at lower levels. Canada was an active participant in the discussions leading to the agreement on this mandate.

Considerable progress has been made in recent years in improving East/West relations, Mr. Clark noted. He expressed the expectation that the new negotiations on conventional forces will focus on those weapons systems which are capable of mounting large-scale offensive operations and of seizing and holding territory, effectively eliminating once and for all the danger of surprise attack in Europe. Europe is today a heavily militarized region, with over five million men and women of the armed forces of two opposing military alliances facing each other.

Mr. Clark noted that the Negotiation on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe is expected to begin in Vienna in March of this year, within the context of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). He emphasized the importance Canada attaches to the negotiation as providing a unique opportunity for furthering the cause of European security. He confirmed that every effort will be made by Canada's delegation to the negotiation to ensure its success. □

Ambassador Fortier Stresses Hope

The following is the text of the address given by the Canadian Ambassador Yves Fortier to the First Committee of the 43rd United Nations General Assembly on October 18, 1988.

"It is noticeable that the statements being made here, and in the General Assembly itself, exhibit a degree of hopefulness such as has not been heard in this forum for several years. The reasons for this are not hard to find. In the relations between the two leading military powers, bellicose posturing has been displaced by sustained, serious negotiations which have already produced important agreements and hold out the promise of more. In the Gulf region, scene of the longest and deadliest war of this half century, the guns have been silenced and the negotiators have begun their work. In Afghanistan, foreign military forces are being withdrawn and the means for national reconstruction are being mobilized. In other regions long victimized by military conflict or foreign occupation, such as Namibia and Kampuchea, new voices of realism are being heard.

A great poet once referred to hope as 'a strange invention' which seems always to be intermingled with our fears—fears that our hopes cannot be realized. And yet without hope we cannot muster the boldness and daring needed to face down our fears and seek to resolve them. The expressions of renewed hope we are hearing are, I trust, an augury of the growing readiness of peoples and their Governments to address the real problems we confront and seize opportunities for their solution.

Hope that is not grounded on hard experience can be dangerously illusory. What has been achieved thus far remains fragile. Conflict continues in some areas and is scarcely held in check in others. Guns silenced are not guns abandoned. Negotiations alone cannot eliminate deep-seated enmities nor quickly meet long-neglected social and economic needs. Our central task



Canadian Permanent Representative and Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Yves Fortier.

must be to consolidate the gains that have been made and to build on them. We must aim to institutionalize peace. We must try to make peace contagious.

Calls for sweeping transformations of international institutions or prescriptions for the quick negotiations of agreements within a calendar of arbitrary deadlines are not the answer. That is the path of false hope and can lead only to disillusionment. On matters of international security, there can be no quick fixes. The central ingredients of success are patience, persistence and realism.

That, in fact, is the recipe that has begun to bring about what we must hope will be a remarkable and lasting transformation in East-West security relations. Careful, painstaking negotiation between the United States of America and the USSR has resulted in the welcome Treaty on the elimination of their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—the first-ever agreement providing for real nuclear arms reductions. Moreover, the negotiating agenda between those two great powers remains encouragingly

crowded: reductions in strategic nuclear arsenals, on which major progress has already been made; the step-by-step limitation of nuclear tests, leading to their eventual elimination; the role of strategic defence in relation to outer space. Canada urges the two countries to persist in those negotiating efforts with a view to concluding, as soon as possible, further verifiable agreements.

Just as important, the members of the two major military alliances, as well as the other countries of Europe, are in unprecedented ways addressing issues relating to the conventional arms balance in Europe. Within the framework of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the 1986 Document of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, with its provisions for advance notifications, observations and international inspections of conventional military activities, is being effectively implemented. Additional confidence-building and security-building measures in Europe are to be negotiated. Further, within the same broad institutional framework, members of the two alliances are on the eve of launching negotiations toward a balance of conventional arms at lower levels in Europe.

None of that progress has occurred quickly or easily. There have been setbacks, and, indeed, many hurdles remain to be overcome. It is the firm view of the Government of Canada, however, that it is only through careful, step-by-step negotiating approaches, such as those that have begun to register significant achievements in the East-West context, that effective and lasting progress in arms control and disarmament can be accomplished.

It is cause for special satisfaction to the Government of Canada that there appears a reawakening within the international community to the effective and practical role the United Nations can play in promoting peace, security and disarmament. Its usefulness, for example, in facilitating the settlement of regional conflicts and in investigating alleged breaches of international treaties has been recently demonstrated. The timely award of the Nobel Peace Prize

to the United Nations peacekeeping forces is symbolic of that new awareness. Canadians took special pride in the award, since over 80,000 citizens of our country have served in United Nations peacekeeping contingents, 78 of whom have given their lives in the course of their peacekeeping duties. As Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, has recently observed, Canada's participation in every peacekeeping action thus far would not have been possible without the unwavering support of the Canadian people to the ideas and the aims of the United Nations Charter.

Canada's commitment to the principles and objectives of the organization, therefore, cannot be in doubt. Successive Canadian Governments, without exception, have advocated strengthening of the United Nations system and its effective use by its membership. We are very gratified indeed that others seem to be rediscovering the capability of the United Nations to play a significant and constructive role. I would like to note particularly the assistance the USSR provided to Canada in carrying out its peacekeeping tasks in Iran and Iraq, that represents one of several welcome new developments in the Soviet Union's approach to the United Nations.

It is precisely of the firmness of Canada's support for the United Nations system and our belief in its central role in building peace and enhancing security that we have always examined carefully and in a positive spirit any proposal for the strengthening of United Nations machinery or for improvements in its procedures and methods. We will continue to do so. However, that same concern for the viability of the United Nations has also prompted us to be cautious about proposals for major restructuring of existing machinery or for the elaboration of supplementary or parallel institutions.

In the Canadian view, the United Nations Charter remains valid in its totality and is not in need of rewriting. Neither do we see any need for a major overhaul of our institutional structures. We are similarly doubtful about the utility or even the wisdom of selecting from among the principles on which United

Nations institutions are now based with a view to bringing about major reorientations in our structures or procedures. What is needed is a sustained political will and determination to put to the best possible use the machinery that is already at our disposal. That applies, *a fortiori*, in the areas of peace, security and arms control.

It must be conceded that in the area of disarmament the recent record of the United Nations, and of the First Committee specifically, has been, at best, mixed. True, there have been some notable achievements. The elaboration by the United Nations Disarmament Commission of agreed sets of principles relating to confidence-building measures and to verification are solid examples. But, on the whole, our record has not been one about which we can boast. The Third Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament did not reach consensus on a concluding final document. Within the First Committee, recent years have witnessed a proliferation of resolutions and a general dispersal of effort.

It might be said that the situation is not one to be deplored but one that simply illustrates the function of this forum as a political seismograph giving voice to and reflecting accurately the diversity and contention that undeniably exist within the international community on the sensitive, difficult issues touching on peace, security and arms control and disarmament. That, of course, is a legitimate and necessary function of this forum. No participant here should ever feel inhibited from expressing governmental views and interests with directness and emphasis.

Nevertheless, it is not our sole function here to register national positions. If we are to have any real influence, if we are to contribute to the reconciliation of divergent views and the setting of priorities for concerted international effort, we must also seek out common ground. In practical terms, that means we must try to reduce the number of our draft resolutions. We must seek consensus on as many draft resolutions as possible. We must be discriminate and realistic about urging particular actions and undertakings of other forums. Only

in that way can we realistically expect to have some influence on deliberations and negotiations elsewhere, such as at the Conference on Disarmament.

I have outlined the broad perspective from which Canada is approaching our deliberations in this Committee this year. Now I would like to remark briefly on the particular subjects and issues to which Canada's delegation will be giving priority attention.

It is now virtually universally accepted that effective verification is an essential element of the arms control and disarmament process. This consensus has been concretely registered in the set of verification principles which were agreed upon in the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) at its past two sessions. Canada hopes and expects that the General Assembly will give its unqualified endorsement to those verification principles at the current session. The Canadian Government also firmly believes that the United Nations can have a significant and positive role in promoting and facilitating effective verification. We have, therefore, examined closely and in a positive spirit various proposals that have been made for a United Nations role in verification. We have consulted closely with the Governments which have put forward such proposals. Our central concern is to ensure that the United Nations can acquire an appropriate role in verification which will strengthen the arms control and disarmament process by facilitating the conclusion and implementation of agreements and will enhance the authority and credibility of the United Nations system. It is our carefully considered view that, pursuant to this objective, an expert study under the authority of the Secretary-General would be the wisest next step. In close cooperation with several other delegations, Canada will be sponsoring a resolution calling for such a study, as well as endorsing the verification principles agreed at the UNDC.

There is at this juncture a perhaps unprecedented global awareness of the abhorrent nature of chemical weapons. The main reason for this is not to be welcomed—the deplorable repeated use of chemical weapons in the Gulf war, as

investigated and reported by the Secretary-General. Canada, like many other nations, has welcomed President Reagan's call for and President Mitterrand's offer to host a conference to reverse the erosion of the 1925 Geneva Protocol banning the use of chemical weapons. What these events underline is the urgency of concluding as soon as possible a comprehensive, verifiable global ban on chemical weapons, as it is being negotiated at the Conference on Disarmament.

For many, including the Canadian Government, the progress in these negotiations must seem frustratingly slow. But in our judgment, this is not because of a lack of serious effort and intent on the part of participants in the negotiations. Rather, it reflects the genuinely difficult technical and legal issues involved, particularly in relation to various aspects of the verification provisions of the treaty under negotiation. The Canadian delegation, in close cooperation with the delegation of Poland, will work to ensure that this Committee again registers by consensus its view on the urgency of concluding the negotiations toward a global, verifiable chemical weapons ban.

The conclusion of a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing has long been, and remains, a fundamental Canadian objective. The progress being made in this area by the United States and the USSR is welcome and should be energetically pursued. With other delegations, we will again be sponsoring a draft resolution urging steps toward the earliest attainment of this objective.

The Canadian delegation will also be giving special attention to other issues which we regard as of priority concern. One of these is the prevention of an arms race in outer space. This has been under active discussion at the Conference on Disarmament since 1985. Canada has made major contributions to those discussions, which we believe have contributed usefully to clarification of the issues involved. We will continue to do so. Clearly, the negotiations between the USA and the USSR in this area are of crucial importance and should be supported. Continued strict compliance with existing relevant

treaties, including the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, remains critically important. Equally clearly, this is a subject area of legitimate multilateral concern, and decisions on whether additional legal measures may be required are of broad international interest.

For more than three decades, the international arms control and disarmament agenda has been dominated by issues related to nuclear weapons. This dominant concern was clearly recorded in the Final Document of the First Special Session Devoted to Disarmament. This preoccupation was not misplaced and there must be no slackening of efforts to reduce reliance on nuclear arms.

However, tens of millions have been slaughtered by the use of conventional weapons. Moreover, technological advances are resulting in quantum leaps in both the destructive capabilities of non-nuclear weapons and the costs of their development and production. It is especially tragic that countries which can ill afford the diversion of resources from pressing social and economic needs feel compelled to resort to large-scale acquisition of such weaponry. The Canadian delegation is, therefore, eager to engage with other delegations in constructive and dispassionate dialogue on how best to bring the conventional arms race, in both its quantitative and qualitative dimensions, under more effective control. At the heart of such a project is how to reduce the sense of insecurity which leads States to rely increasingly on arms as a basis for security and, equally, how to bring arms-related technological developments under more effective policy direction.

I began my statement with some brief reflections on the ambivalent nature of hope in human affairs. Hope, while subject to deception, is a necessary precondition for any kind of human achievement. Our sense of the present situation is that there is a bit more hope in the air than we have recently been accustomed to. We must build on this and we must build carefully. Peace must become embedded in our institutions and our habits. The United Nations must be the premier forum for this collective endeavour. Let us use it well." □

Selected Recent Department of External Affairs Publications

1. News Release No. 202

"Disarmament and International Security: Douglas Roche Elected Chairman of UN Committee." September 20, 1988.

2. News Release No. 208

"USA Initiative to Strengthen International Prohibition Against Chemical Weapons Use." September 26, 1988.

3. News Release No. 214

"Clark Gives Canada's Reaction to the 1988 Peace Nobel Prize Award to United Nations Peacekeeping Forces." September 29, 1988.

4. Address by the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, Prime Minister of Canada, before the UN General Assembly. New York, September 29, 1988.

5. "Sovereignty in an Interdependent World." Notes for Remarks by the Right Honourable Joe Clark, Secretary of State for External Affairs, at Carleton University, Ottawa, October 18, 1988.

6. News Release No. 227

Appointment to the Board of Directors of the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security." October 21, 1988.

7. News Release No. 241 (Government of Canada)

"Publication by Member Countries of the North Atlantic Alliance of the Document 'Conventional Forces in Europe: The Facts'." November 25, 1988.

8. News Release No. 001

"Joe Clark Leads Canadian Delegation to Paris Conference on Chemical Weapons." January 3, 1989.

All the above publications are available free of charge from the Editor. □

Resolutions on Arms Control and Disarmament (ACD) and International Security at UNGA 43

RESOLUTION NUMBER AND LEAD SPONSOR (* = Co-sponsored by Canada)	RESOLUTION Supported by Canada	VOTE (Yes/No/Abstain)
43/23 (Brazil)	Zone of Peace and Cooperation in the South Atlantic	144-1-7
43/62 (Mexico)	Treaty of Tlatelolco	149-0-5
43/64 (Australia)*	Urgent need for a comprehensive test ban treaty	146-2-6
43/65 (Egypt)	Nuclear-weapon-free zone in Middle East	CONSENSUS
43/66 (Pakistan)	Nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia	116-3-34
43/67 (Sweden)	Conventional weapons deemed excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects	CONSENSUS
43/69 (Pakistan)	Assure non-nuclear-weapon states against use or threat of use of nuclear weapons	152-0-3
43/70 (Sri Lanka)	Prevention of an arms race in Outer Space	154-1-0
43/71 (Tanzania)	Denuclearization of Africa (a) Implementation of the Declaration	151-0-4
43/72 (Byelorussia)	Prohibition of development of new types of weapons of mass destruction	152-0-2
43/73 (Romania)	Reduction of Military Budgets	CONSENSUS
43/74A (Australia)*	1925 Geneva Protocol and Chemical Weapons Convention	CONSENSUS
43/74B (Austria)*	Second Review Conference of the Convention on Biological and Toxin Weapons	CONSENSUS
43/74C (Poland)*	Chemical and bacteriological weapons	CONSENSUS
43/75A (Zimbabwe)	Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations	141-0-12
43/75B (Zimbabwe)	Relationship between disarmament and development	CONSENSUS
43/75C (UK)	Stockpiling of radiological weapons	CONSENSUS
43/75D (Denmark)	Conventional disarmament	CONSENSUS
43/75E (China)	Nuclear disarmament	CONSENSUS
43/75F (China)	Conventional disarmament	CONSENSUS
43/75G (UK)*	Objective information on military matters	130-0-10
43/75(I) (Colombia)*	International arms transfers	110-1-38
43/75K (Canada)*	Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes	144-1-7
43/75L (Sweden)	Naval armaments	152-1-1
43/75M (Norway)*	Seabed Treaty	CONSENSUS
43/75N (Sweden)	Comprehensive UN Study on Nuclear Weapons	141-1-9
43/75(O) (UK)*	Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations	103-0-46
43/75P (France)*	Confidence and security-building and conventional disarmament	CONSENSUS
43/75Q (Nigeria)	Dumping of radioactive wastes for hostile purposes	129-1-10
43/75R (Cameroon)*	Review of role of UN in field of disarmament	CONSENSUS
43/75S (Peru)	Conventional disarmament on regional scale	125-0-23
43/76D (Tanzania)	UN Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa	CONSENSUS
43/76F (Nigeria)	UN programme of fellowships on disarmament	CONSENSUS
43/76G (Nepal)	UN Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia	CONSENSUS
43/76H (Peru)	UN Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Latin America	CONSENSUS
43/77B (Yugoslavia)	Third UN Special Session on Disarmament	152-0-2
43/78A (Bahamas)*	Report on Disarmament Commission	CONSENSUS
43/78D (Mexico)	Climatic effects of nuclear war	145-0-9
43/78G (Mongolia)	Disarmament Week	CONSENSUS
43/78H (FRG)*	Guidelines for confidence-building measures	CONSENSUS
43/78(I) (Netherlands)*	Report of the Conference on Disarmament	96-0-53
43/78J (Romania)	Economic and social consequences of the arms race	143-1-9
43/78K (Mexico)	Comprehensive programme of disarmament	CONSENSUS
43/78L (Nigeria)	1990s as Third Disarmament Decade	CONSENSUS
43/79 (Sri Lanka)	Indian Ocean Zone of Peace	CONSENSUS
43/81A (USA)*	Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements	CONSENSUS
43/81B (Sweden)*	Study of Role of UN in Verification	150-1-0
43/82 (UK)*	Non-Proliferation Treaty IV	137-0-11
43/83 (Trinidad)	Liability for illegal transfer of weapons	CONSENSUS
43/85 (Malta)	Strengthening of security/cooperation in Mediterranean	CONSENSUS
43/86 (Cameroon)	Strengthening of regional and international peace and security	CONSENSUS
43/90 (USSR)	Comprehensive system of international peace and security	97-3-45
NOTE: In addition to the above, the following Decision was adopted:		
43/422 (Czechoslovakia)	Contribution of the UN Specialized Agencies	CONSENSUS

RESOLUTION NUMBER AND LEAD SPONSOR (* = Co-sponsored by Canada)	RESOLUTION	VOTE (Yes/No/Abstain)
Opposed by Canada — 5		
43/68 (Bulgaria)	Strengthening of security of non-nuclear-weapon states against use - or threat of use of nuclear weapons	117-17-16
43/76B (Mexico)	Freeze on nuclear weapons	135-12-3
43/76E (India)	Convention on prohibition of use of nuclear weapons	133-17-4
43/78B (GDR)	Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war	126-17-6
43/78E (Argentina)	Cessation of nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament	135-13-5
Canada Abstained — 17		
43/22 (Costa Rica)	Right of Peoples to Peace	118-0-29
43/63A (Mexico)	Cessation of all nuclear test explosions	136-4-13
43/63B (Mexico)	Cessation of all nuclear test explosions	127-3-21
43/71 (Tanzania)	Denuclearization of Africa (b) Nuclear capability of South Africa	138-4-12
43/75H (Ukraine)	Implementation of UNGA resolutions on disarmament	131-2-20
43/75J (Iraq)	Stockpiling of radiological weapons	116-2-29
43/75T (Tanzania)	Dumping of nuclear and industrial wastes in Africa	141-0-13
43/76A (Cyprus)	Disarmament and International Security	129-1-21
43/76C (Mexico)	World Disarmament Campaign	144-0-10
43/77A (India)	Impact of scientific and technological developments	129-7-14
43/78C (Czechoslovakia)	International cooperation for disarmament	136-1-13
43/78F (Argentina)	Prevention of nuclear war	136-3-14
43/78M (Yugoslavia)	Report of the Conference on Disarmament	136-3-14
43/80 (Jordan)	Israeli nuclear armament	99-2-51
43/87 (GDR)	Need for results-oriented political dialogue	127-1-24
43/88 (Poland)	Tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace	128-0-24
43/89 (Yugoslavia)	Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of Security	128-1-22

Canadian Public Supports Canada's Role in NATO

A recent public opinion poll released by the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security has produced some interesting results. Highlights of the survey include:

— Canadians, like their compatriots in Britain and West Germany who were asked some of the identical questions, no longer see the Soviet Union as the greatest threat to world peace: most point to the arms race, the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and non-European regional conflicts.

— 80% of those surveyed reject the idea of reducing Canada's role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; only one-third of those surveyed, however, believe in a central tenet of NATO strategy, that the Alliance should use

nuclear weapons first if it begins to lose a conventional war in Europe.

— Asked what the best reason for increasing defence forces would be almost three-quarters of those surveyed gave doing a better job guarding our own territory and sovereignty as the best justification. A quarter of those surveyed offered increased influence in NATO or helping defend Western countries as best reasons.

— 40% of those surveyed think Canada should spend more on defence; a third of those who want to spend more agree that taxes should be raised to pay for it.

— 55% of those surveyed approve or strongly approve of the government's proposed plan to purchase nuclear-powered submarines.

The national public opinion survey was commissioned and funded by the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security (CIIPS) and designed by Don Munton and Institute staff. Comprising 51 questions in all, the survey was carried out June through July 1988 by the Longwoods Research Group with a national sample selected randomly to be representative of Canadian households and chosen from a panel of 30,000 households maintained by Market Facts Ltd. A total of 1,005 people responded to the questionnaire which was conducted by mail in both English and French. The response rate was 63%. (The margin of error with samples of this size is approximately +/- 3%, 95 times out of 100. Of the 1,005 respondents to the 1988 survey, 563 were also respondents to the 1987 survey.) ■

Consultative Group members visit United Nations

Ten members of the Consultative Group on Arms Control and Disarmament Affairs participated in an Orientation Programme at the First Committee of the General Assembly from November 6-12, 1988. This is the third year in which the Department of External Affairs has undertaken this programme. Its aim is to enable committed and interested members of the Consultative Group to be more fully involved and informed about the multi-faceted work for arms control and disarmament undertaken by Canada in the United Nations, and in particular the First Committee, which deals with security and international affairs.

The purpose of the programme was, therefore, twofold: first, to assist in the education and dissemination of information among those involved directly in the programme and indirectly to the organizations/communities with which the participants are associated; and second, to enhance and strengthen the Consultative Group on Arms Control and Disarmament Affairs.

The participants were briefed on the arms control and disarmament activities of the Permanent Mission of Canada and on First Committee operating procedures. They met separately with UN representatives of Romania, the USSR, the USA, the Netherlands and Singapore and with various UN Secretariat officials. Participants also attended a number of First Committee meetings, in order to see first-hand how business is conducted in that forum. The group was present to hear interventions and to observe the voting process. There were also opportunities to attend sessions of the General Assembly and to meet non-governmental representatives.

During the course of the week, a number of participants were struck by the lengthy and complex processes of the First Committee, and by the significant role which Canada appeared to play in arms control and disarmament. □



Members of the Consultative Group on a trip to New York. From left to right: Dr. Doug Ross, Mr. John Benesh, Ms. Carol Dixon, Ms. Shannon Selin, Mr. Nick Parker, Ms. Annie Bourret, Mr. Paul Bennett (Department of External Affairs), Ms. Leyla Raphaël, Ambassador Douglas Roche, Ms. Trudy Govier, Ms. Janis Alton and Dr. Paul Buteux.

Bilateral Arms Control and Disarmament Consultations Since September 1988

In accordance with the arms control and disarmament objectives of the Canadian Government as outlined in Prime Minister Mulroney's address to the Consultative Group on Arms Control and Disarmament Affairs on October 31, 1985, Canada conducts annual and ad hoc consultations with a variety of nations at the senior officials level. The following is a list of recent consultations:

DATE	COUNTRY	LOCATION
September 21, 1988	United States of America	Washington
November 14, 1988	Czechoslovakia	Prague
November 17-18, 1988	Federal Republic of Germany	Bonn
January 21, 1989	Japan	Tokyo
January 24-25, 1989	People's Republic of China	Peking

1988 Nobel Peace Prize Award to United Nations Peacekeeping Forces

The Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, issued the following statement after the announcement of the 1988 Nobel Peace Prize.

"All Canadians will feel pride and pleasure at the decision of the Nobel Committee to award its Peace Prize to the United Nations Peacekeeping Forces.

No country has been more steadfast or supportive in its commitment to UN peacekeeping than Canada, and it is worth remembering that peacekeeping, as we know it today, was begun on a Canadian initiative more than 30 years ago. We have been participants in every UN peacekeeping action since that time, a record unsurpassed by any other UN member.

This would not have been possible without the unwavering support of the



Cpl. Jeff Docksey, Canada's representative to the Nobel Peace Prize presentation, with a Danish peacekeeper and General Vadset of the Norwegian army. They are outside the University of Oslo's auditorium where the prize was presented.

Photo by Norwegian Defence Headquarters Information Sect.

Canadian people to the ideals and aims of the United Nations Charter.

This award will have a special meaning for more than 80,000 Canadian men and women who have served in UN peacekeeping contingents in almost every quarter of the globe in the last three decades.

This work has often been difficult, even dangerous, and 78 Canadians have given their lives in this duty. At this very hour, Canadians continue to patrol the ramparts of peace in several troubled regions, including Iran/Iraq, Cyprus, the Middle East and Afghanistan/Pakistan.

Today's award recognizes the immeasurable value of the contribution of these brave men and women to the cause of peace." □

NATO Publishes Statistics on Conventional Forces in Europe

On November 25, 1988, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, and the Minister of National Defence, the Honourable Perrin Beatty, released for distribution in Canada a collective statistical assessment by the member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) concerning the strengths of the armed forces in Europe belonging to the countries of the North Atlantic Alliance and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The document has also been made public at the Follow-up Meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in Vienna and at NATO headquarters in Brussels.

Entitled "Conventional Forces in Europe: The Facts," this assessment clearly points to an imbalance in conventional weapons systems in Europe, which gives the East a capability for surprise attack and large-scale offensive action. It was this imbalance which was highlighted by the Heads of State and Government of



Prime Minister Mulroney and the Honourable Perrin Beatty at a recent NATO meeting.

the members of the North Atlantic Council in Brussels in March 1988 and which makes all the more urgent the initiation of new negotiations on conventional arms control within the framework of the CSCE.

It is hoped that this contribution to military transparency on the part of the

members of the North Atlantic Alliance will prompt the countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization similarly to provide figures for their forces. Such a gesture would be a positive move and could facilitate the early stages of new negotiations, in which Canada intends to participate actively. □

European NGOs Hold Verification Workshop

Under the aegis of the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF), a number of European Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) hosted a unique workshop on Verification in London, England from November 30 to December 2, 1988. Titled "Workshop on Verification of Nuclear and Conventional Arms Reductions," this meeting brought together more than 100 specialists from a dozen European and North American countries. Although technical in their thrust, discussions ranged from an assessment of the experience gained thus far from the implementation of verification provisions of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to problems likely to be addressed in the development of significant conventional arms agreement in Europe. The co-chairmen of the three-day workshop were Dr. Jurgen Altmann of the PRIF and Dr. Tom Kibble of the Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College, London.

Two Canadians were invited by the hosts to make presentations in areas of particular interest to Canada. Colonel B.A. Goetze, a member of the Delegation of Canada to the North Atlantic Council, provided a retrospective view of conventional arms negotiation in Europe based upon his experience in support of a number of previous negotiations. Colonel Goetze recently completed his doctorate in studies relating to arms control in Europe. Mr. F.R. Cleminson of the Department of External Affairs undertook a preliminary assessment of verification methods likely to be evolved as part of a verification model designed to meet the requirements under a new negotiating mandate. That mandate was finally agreed to by the 35 nations of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe at their Follow-Up Meeting which concluded in Vienna on January 19, 1989.

The workshop heard from a large number of arms control specialists representing a variety of views from both East and West. To many who took part in the event, the most significant aspect of the three days was the lack of acrimony during discussions on a broad-

based set of significant issues. To a large degree, this apparent agreement can be said to be a product of the new Soviet policy which, by and large, now parallels the Western approach to arms control negotiations in general and verification in particular. Glasnost notwithstanding, however, it will be at the negotiating table that words will have to be translated into definitive deeds.

The organizers of this workshop can be jointly proud of its results. The meeting succeeded in bringing together

governmental, NGO and private sector representatives from East and West in a common dialogue bereft of the histrionics and preconceptions sometimes associated with such ventures. The published results of the workshop will constitute a significant contribution to a deeper understanding of the issues involved in effective verification. This workshop itself serves as a very positive example of the useful role which NGOs can play in the overall process of arms control and disarmament. ■

Clark Addresses Security and Cooperation Conference

The following are excerpts from a speech by The Right Honourable Joe Clark, Secretary of State for External Affairs, on conclusion of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) Follow-up meeting, Vienna, Austria, January 19, 1989.

"...From the beginning of the Vienna Meeting, Canada raised the fundamental issue of compliance with CSCE commitments. Candidly, but factually and fairly, we called attention to shortcomings, because we were convinced that unless there were better compliance, or a demonstrated willingness to improve it, further promises were unlikely to be meaningful. Far from building a climate of confidence, they would have eroded it.

We firmly believed that this Conference should produce real progress on the whole range of issues covered by the Helsinki Final Act. Canada played an active role in all three Baskets in sponsoring and supporting measures that addressed the most serious issues. We pursued these goals patiently, constructively, and at times stubbornly. We were convinced that we would deserve to be judged harshly by future generations if we failed to make the most of the Vienna Meeting. That was a common purpose of the Canadian government and of the non-governmental organizations, here and at home, with whom we were able to work so constructively.

Incrementally, and by hard bargaining, the Vienna Concluding Document took shape. Subjects whose introduction into a CSCE forum would earlier have been denounced as 'confrontational' or 'interference in internal affairs' were considered openly and debated freely. We could begin to see that the opportunity open to us was even greater than we had thought, if we had the will and the patience to exploit it to its fullest extent.

Our efforts have now been rewarded with success. The Vienna Concluding Document is a welcome milestone in East/West relations and in the evolution of Europe. It reflects and builds on recent changes. It makes significant strides in all the areas covered by the Helsinki Final Act. Canada is proud to have played a role in formulating some of its key elements.

When the Vienna Meeting opened, we had just succeeded in the Stockholm Conference in establishing a set of confidence- and security-building measures that carried considerable political and military significance. But what we did not know then was how these measures would work in practice. Since 1986, we have seen gratifying progress in adherence to both the letter and the spirit of Stockholm. We now have the confidence to believe that we can further increase transparency and predictability in military affairs. We wholeheartedly support the establishment of negotiations on confidence- and security-building measures to build upon the work of the Stockholm Conference.

We now also have the confidence to embark on ambitious negotiations touching on conventional armed forces themselves. These negotiations will take place within the framework of the CSCE process, but will be autonomous—a condition we regard as vitally necessary for their efficiency. They will not be easy. Success will depend at all stages on frankness and trust, which in turn depend, in some measure, on developments outside the arms control arena....

I should not leave this subject without referring briefly to a negotiation which will conclude before the commencement of the new negotiation on conventional arms control. The Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions talks were a pioneering attempt to arrive at conventional arms control measures in a crucial area of Europe. Much of what has been learned from the successes and failures during the many years of these talks will prove useful in the new negotiations.

Other specific elements of this Concluding Document are very important to Canada. We have achieved firm commitments that will improve the conditions under which business people and entrepreneurs can perform their central role in economic cooperation. We have sharpened our commitment to promote contacts between business people and potential buyers and end users, and to publish useful, detailed, and up-to-date economic information and statistics. These measures will expand the economic dimension of our cooperation and growing interdependence. The Conference on Economic Cooperation, with business people and experts participating, will be an important first step in this process....

We are encouraged that the importance of environmental protection has been recognized. In addition to specific commitments on air and water pollution, hazardous wastes, nuclear safety and other measures Canada supports, we welcome the essential message of this Document: the environment of Europe and the world is a common trust, in which people themselves have a critical stake and role. Governments must cooperate in its protection, but it is

above all the commitment, dedication and sacrifice of aware and concerned citizens that will ensure ultimate success.

We think the progress on tourism is important. Eliminating minimum exchange requirements makes tourism more attractive, and easing contacts between tourists and the local population (including permitting them to stay in private homes) will offer greater human contact and understanding.

In the section on principles, we have adopted a firm statement on terrorism and have made a breakthrough in acceptance of the principle of third party involvement in the peaceful settlement of disputes.

In the field of human rights and humanitarian cooperation, our achievement at Vienna has been remarkable, especially when one looks back to the days of the Ottawa Meeting of Experts. Some of the accomplishments of special interest to Canada are:

- the commitment to respect the right of all citizens to associate together and participate actively in the promotion and protection of human rights and in monitoring their government's performance. We have undertaken not to discriminate against those who exercise these rights, and to ensure that remedies are available to those who claim that their human rights have been violated. We have recognized the role of non-governmental organizations and individuals in promoting human rights.

- the undertaking to ensure freedom of religion and to allow religious communities to have places of worship, institutional structures and funding, and to participate in public dialogue and to have contacts with believers elsewhere. We have recognized the right of anyone to give and receive religious education in the language of his choice, and to obtain, possess, and use religious publications and materials.

- the commitment to protect the human rights of national minorities, to promote their ethnic, cultural, and linguistic identities and their cultural expression, and to allow contacts with counterparts elsewhere.

- we have committed ourselves to ensuring that no one is subject to arbitrary arrest, detention and exile, to improving the treatment of prisoners, and to protecting individuals from abuses of psychiatric practices.

- we have undertaken to respect the right of people to move within and between countries, including an explicit statement of the right of an individual to leave any country, including one's own, and return to one's own country, subject only to exceptional restrictions.

- we have agreed to a range of measures to remove bureaucratic obstacles to family reunification and travel, to publish laws and allow appeals, to respect the wishes of applicants regarding how long they wish to travel and where they want to go, to remove restrictions on the movement of people, to eliminate the punishment of individuals who wish to travel simply because a relative may have breached exit control regulations, to implement tight, clear-cut time limits for decisions on travel, and to resolve outstanding cases within a very short time after the conclusion of the Vienna Meeting.

- we have acknowledged the qualitative difference between the right to leave and practical commitments regarding entry policy.

- we have taken a large step toward preventing State action against an individual wishing to exercise his right to leave through the arbitrary imposition of restrictions based on national security grounds. The Vienna Concluding Document also ensures that long-term refuseniks will have the time since they were last involved in national security work retroactively credited against any limit during which any restriction will be applied.

- we have undertaken to respect the privacy and integrity of postal and telephone communications, to allow people to listen to radio from outside the country, and to receive, publish and disseminate information more freely. Scholars and teachers will be able to have more direct contacts and access to research materials.

— we have taken important new steps to protect the rights and improve the working conditions of journalists, and provide for the freer flow of information and greater access to culture.

Built on this solid achievement in human rights and Basket III, and providing a mechanism for its protection and enforcement, is the Conference on the Human Dimension. We welcome the agreement of all participating States to respond to requests for information and to consult bilaterally on specific cases and situations. We look forward to the meetings in Paris, Copenhagen and Moscow where we can pursue the issues of compliance and of new measures to enhance our achievements, as well as to deal with unresolved cases and situations. This Conference and the ongoing mechanism will keep human rights, human contacts, and related humanitarian issues central to the CSCE process, ensuring that they become a permanent part of the European political landscape....

Two things should be clearly understood. First, by accepting the Moscow meeting, Canada has not signified that problems of human rights and human contacts in the Soviet Union no longer exist. On the contrary, much remains to be done. Indeed, the USSR has undertaken to continue its work over the next two years of making Soviet society more open, democratic, and governed by the rule of law. Reforms are to be securely institutionalized. We welcome these promised undertakings, and will look forward to their fulfilment.

The second point I want to emphasize is that, having discussed this matter with the Soviet Union, having examined all the facts and assessed its performance against criteria we know to be important to the Canadian people, we consented to the Moscow meeting not just as a compromise or as a political gesture. Our consent should be seen as an expression of hope, based on recent improvements, and of confidence that the future will bring even more.

We trust that when our delegations, and the hundreds of groups, individuals, and journalists that traditionally assemble for CSCE meetings, gather in Moscow in 1991, they will find an open and tolerant environment for frank exchange.

There are many, many more provisions on human rights and humanitarian cooperation in the Vienna Concluding Document which take account of the differing interests of our peoples. Canada considers all of them important. Together, they are a great achievement. In most cases they are clear and unequivocal. We recognize that there is still room for improvement, but what is in this document will, if fully implemented by all participating States, lead to great changes in the lives of millions of people, and will have a real impact on European confidence and security. Let me illustrate by one example from our own experience.

On December 7, many communities in Armenia were struck by a devastating earthquake that killed outright some 25,000 people and injured thousands more. At one time, the Government of the Soviet Union and some other participating countries faced with a similar disaster might have said there was no problem, no help was needed. But this time it did not. From all over the world, offers of help came forward spontaneously, inspired by a natural human feeling of sympathy. The Canadian Government responded to the need for assistance....

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anything could better demonstrate what we have been saying for many years—that the ties between people, that grow naturally from common experience and humanity, are one of the keys to a peaceful world. When people know the truth, when they can have contact with each other, they will reach out across barriers, they will forge links far stronger than governments can ever build. When people are barred from travelling, from visiting with families, from having ordinary contacts, from worshipping freely, from speaking a language or practising a culture, their frustrations breed fear, resentment and instability. When arbitrarily imposed and artificial barriers are removed and people, ideas, and information can move without restraint, when freedom becomes a reality, then there will be no limit to the possibilities that will open before us.

Some participating States have learned that lesson in the past two years. But we must also remind ourselves where

these changes have fallen short of expectations and commitments and of what remains to be done. Candor and openness have done much to achieve the success we now enjoy. This is not the moment to abandon them.

In some countries, individuals are still being punished for exercising their right to know and act upon their rights, for criticizing their governments, and for conducting allegedly subversive activity. Indeed, one participating State has, at the very moment of the adoption of this forward-looking Concluding Document, trampled, in Prague, on both its old and its new commitments by taking violent action against groups engaged in the peaceful exercise of their human rights under the Helsinki Final Act and the Vienna Concluding Document.

Another participating State has, in the face of CSCE tradition and procedures, declared that, notwithstanding its action in giving consensus to the whole Concluding Document, it assumed no commitment to implement those provisions which it considered to be 'inadequate.' By taking this approach, the Government of Romania seems to be attempting to treat the Vienna Concluding Document as a menu from which it would choose those items it would abide by and those it would ignore. This is clearly an untenable interpretation. Our CSCE commitments, arrived at by consensus, are indivisible. My Government, therefore, considers that all participating States must comply with all aspects of this document, to which we have all given consensus.

The Governments of these participating States must in coming years decide whether they want to move forward in renewal and reform, or cling to policies and methods that are not only distasteful, but now demonstrably outmoded and counterproductive. Canada will continue to encourage change, to criticize shortcomings, to urge the breaking down of barriers. We have no desire to impose our system or beliefs on anyone, but we are convinced that Europe can be a stable and secure place only when all its people can enjoy freedom and personal dignity, and feel safe from the arbitrary exercise against them of the force of the state...." □

Grants and Contributions from the Disarmament Fund Fiscal Year 1988-89

CONTRIBUTIONS

1. <i>Canadian University Press</i> — peace and security room at annual conference	\$1,805.00
2. <i>University of Manitoba</i> — Political Studies Students' Conference	\$4,500.00
3. <i>Centre for International Studies</i> — University of Toronto, Conference	\$5,000.00
4. <i>Peace Education Centre</i> — Vancouver Youth Forum	\$5,000.00
5. <i>Dr. Matthew Speier</i> — attend International Teachers for Peace Congress in Bonn	\$1,300.00
6. <i>Dr. Peggy Falkenheim</i> — attend Conference on Peace and Security in the Asia-Pacific Region, Mongolia	\$2,000.00
7. <i>Voice of Women</i> — attend UNSSOD III	\$1,000.00
8. <i>Group of 78</i> — participation at UNSSOD III preparatory committee	\$1,200.00
9. <i>J.A. Boutilier</i> — attendance at ISIS Conference, Malaysia	\$1,800.00
10. <i>Canadian Federation of University Women</i> — Women, Leadership & Sustainable Development Conference	\$2,000.00
11. <i>Science for Peace</i> — University College Lectures in Peace Studies	\$2,500.00
12. <i>Project Ploughshares Calgary</i> — Outreach Program	\$1,000.00
13. <i>United Nations Association in Canada</i> — Disarmament Week Project	\$10,000.00
14. <i>Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament</i> — Air Defence Initiative project	\$13,000.00
15. <i>Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament</i> — Forward Maritime Strategy project	\$8,000.00
16. <i>University of Lethbridge</i> — Beyond the INF Treaty Conference	\$4,000.00
17. <i>Association des Politologues Étudiants de l'Université Laval</i> — Conference: changes in USSR	\$2,000.00
18. <i>Hans Sinn</i> — Attend Conference in Nicaragua	\$1,400.00
19. <i>University of Calgary</i> — Barry Cooper — Media Analysis	\$5,000.00
20. <i>Groupe de Recherche sur la Paix</i> — bibliography and filmography	\$20,000.00
21. <i>Dr. Peggy Falkenheim</i> — Attend Pugwash Meeting, Beijing	\$1,350.00
22. <i>Pembina Institute for Appropriate Development</i> — Canadian Peace Educators Directory	\$11,200.00
23. <i>North American Model United Nations</i> — travel and equipment costs for NAMUN Conference	\$5,000.00
24. <i>Conférence mondiale des religions pour la paix/Canada</i> — transportation costs	\$2,500.00
25. <i>True North Strong & Free Inquiry Society</i> — The Arctic Choices for Peace and Security	\$10,000.00
26. <i>Maxime Faille</i> — air and train fare to attend the International School on Disarmament and Research on Conflicts	\$680.00
27. <i>University of Manitoba</i> — Glasnost, Perestroika and International Security	\$3,500.00
TOTAL OF CONTRIBUTIONS	\$126,735.00

GRANTS

1. <i>Peacefund Canada</i> — UNSSOD III participation	\$2,000.00
2. <i>North American Model United Nations</i>	\$1,500.00
3. <i>Albert Legault</i> — translation of book	\$7,000.00
4. <i>Beyond War</i> — Western Canada speaking tour of Alexander Nikitin and Craig Barnes	\$5,680.00
5. <i>NGO Committee on Disarmament, Inc.</i> — publication of five issues for UNSSOD III	\$3,000.00
6. <i>Brock University</i> — Sanity, Science and Global Responsibility Conference	\$5,400.00
7. <i>Radio Centre Ville St-Louis Inc.</i> — programs on peace and disarmament	\$4,600.00
8. <i>Kornel Buczek</i> — seismic verification	\$4,000.00
9. <i>Niagara Peace Movement</i> — Disarmament Booth	\$1,800.00
10. <i>World Disarmament Campaign</i>	\$25,000.00
a) Disarmament Yearbook	\$25,000.00
b) UNIDIR	\$12,500.00
11. <i>Albert Legault</i> — 43 ans d'espoir: le Canada et le désarmement 1945-1988	\$4,000.00
12. <i>Committee on Peace Studies, McMaster University</i> "Non-Violence in Violent Contexts" Conference	\$4,000.00
TOTAL OF GRANTS	\$101,480.00
TOTAL OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND GRANTS	\$228,215.00