

As the negotiations have evolved, countries have become conscious of a range of interests needing to be accommodated: security considerations; legal and competitive rights of the chemical industry; consequences of toxicity and chemical structure; and consequences of political sovereignty and national policies. Within this framework, Canada has tried to maintain the integrity of a convention that would extend the ban on CW in a comprehensive fashion and ensure that it is effectively verified. Canada has also striven inside and outside the CD to persuade other countries to become original signatories to a CW convention when it is concluded.

Canada welcomed the bilateral arrangements concluded by the USA and the USSR in 1989 under which they exchanged information on the size of each other's CW stockpiles and agreed on a program of destruction scheduled to start in 1992. However, the second phase of this agreement has been held up by Soviet internal difficulties and it is unclear what the impact on it will be of recent constitutional developments in Russia. Canada has urged components of the new commonwealth of ex-Soviet states to fulfil existing treaty obligations and to promote CW disarmament. ■

## MTCR Partners Meet in Washington

Canada participated in a meeting of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) partners in Washington from November 4 to 7. The MTCR, which aims to control the international transfer of missile technology, has served as a valuable nuclear non-proliferation measure since its creation in 1987. The Washington meeting focused on two issues: expanding the scope of the MTCR and clarifying membership criteria.

Given the progress in missile technology and the threat of non-nuclear weapons of mass destruction such as biological and chemical weapons, the MTCR partners agreed on the desirability of expanding the scope of the regime to include missiles capable of delivering *all* types of weapons of mass destruction. Since the current MTCR guidelines (a missile capable of delivering a 500 kg payload across a range of 300 km) may be too restrictive, the MTCR partners have undertaken to study the need for a revised set of parameters, while acknowledging the need to permit the legitimate exchange of missile technology for peaceful purposes. ■

Membership in the MTCR has increased from its original seven participants to include 18 countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, the UK and the USA. At the Washington meeting, the partners recognized that the admission of new members could strengthen the effectiveness of the regime in combatting missile proliferation. To that end, the partners established a set of criteria for considering applications by potential new members. Essentially, the criteria seek to determine the applicant's commitment to non-proliferation and its ability to implement an effective export control system.

MTCR partners considered the Washington meeting a success. They reaffirmed their commitment to strengthening and expanding the regime to better address the problem of missile proliferation. For Canada, the MTCR remains an integral part of our non-proliferation program. The partners plan to hold their next meeting in Oslo in the summer of 1992. ■

## ENMOD Review Conference Scheduled

On December 6, the UN General Assembly adopted by consensus a resolution noting that a majority of States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques (known as the ENMOD Convention) wish to convene a conference to review the Convention in September 1992.

The ENMOD Convention, which entered into force in 1978, currently boasts 53 parties, including Canada. The Convention was concluded because of a growing awareness that scientific and technical advances were opening the possibility of modifying the natural environment not only for beneficial purposes (such as increasing rainfall during a drought) but also for hostile actions.

According to the Convention, parties undertake not to engage in, or assist

other states to engage in, military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques that have widespread, long-lasting or severe effects, as the means for injuring any other State Party. "Environmental modification techniques" are defined as techniques for changing — through the deliberate manipulation of natural processes — the dynamics, composition or structure of the Earth, including its biota, lithosphere, hydrosphere and atmosphere, or of outer space. The kind of phenomena covered by this prohibition include, among other things, earthquakes, tsunamis and upsets to the ecological balance of a region, as well as changes in weather patterns, climate patterns, ocean currents, the state of the ozone layer and the state of the ionosphere. ■

An earlier review conference, held in September 1984, confirmed that the obligations under the Convention had been faithfully observed up to that time and that the Convention's provisions remained effective.

In view of the extensive destruction caused by the release of oil into the Persian Gulf and the ignition of oil-fires by Iraqi forces in Kuwait during the Gulf War, the upcoming review conference should prove timely. While no complaint has been lodged pursuant to the Convention by any State Party including Kuwait (which is a party) against Iraq (which has signed but not ratified the Convention), a number of participants in the conference will undoubtedly raise concerns arising from the Kuwaiti experience. ■