CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CCD/PV.691
4 March 1976
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIRST MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva
on Thursday, 4 March 1976, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. M. Růžek (Czechoslovakia)

GE.76-83004

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Argentina:	Mr. V.E. BERASATEGUI
Brazil:	Mr. A. BIER
Bulgaria:	Mr. R. NIKOLOV Mr. B. GRINBERG
Burma:	U THA TUN
Canada:	Mr. W.H. BARTON Mr. J.T. SIMARD
Czechoslovakia:	Mr. M. RUZEK Mr. V. SOJAK
Egypt:	Mr. A.E. KHAIRAT Mr. S.A. ABOU-ALI
Ethiopia:	Mr. W. BERHANU Mr. G. DEMISSIE
German Democratic Republic:	Mr. G. HERDER Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI
Germany, Federal Republic of:	Mr. G.J. SCHLAICH Mr. J. BAUCH Mr. K. HANNESSCHLAGER
Hungary:	Mr. R. TOTH
India:	Mr. B.C. MISHRA Mr. P.R. SOOD Mr. P.K. GUPTA
Iran:	Mr. M. FARTASH Mr. H. AMERI Miss C. TAHMASSEB Mr. D. CHILATY

Italy:	Mr. G. VALDEVIT
	Mr. A. BIZZARINI
Japan:	Mr. M. OGISO
	Mr. A. YATABE
	Mr. T. SAWAI
	Mr. H. OKA
Mexico:	Mr. S. CAMPOS-ICARDO
	Miss A. CABRERA
	Mr. M.A. CACERES
Mongolia:	Mr. M. DUGERSUREN
	Mr. L. ERDENECHULUM
Morocco:	Mr. S.M. RAHHALI
Netherlands:	Mr. C.A. VAN DER KLAAUW
	Mr. A.J. MEERBURG
Nigeria:	Mr. B.A. CLARK
	Mr. G.S. AKUNWAFOR
	Mr. S.T. ADAMU
Pakistan:	Mr. M. YUNUS
	Mr. K. SALEEM
Peru:	Mr. L. CHAVEZ-GODOY
Poland:	Mr. E. WYZNER
	Mr. H. PAC
	Mr. A. CZERKAWSKI
	Mr. T. FIECKO
Romania:	Mr. C. ENE
	Mr. V. TUDOR
	Mr. G. TINCA
	Mr. M. ROSIANU

Sweden:	Mr. G. HAMILTON
	Mr. U. REINIUS
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:	Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN
	Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
	Mr. N.V. PESTEREV
	Mr. I.P. GLAZKOV
	Mr. A.M. VAVILOV
	Mr. E.K. POTIARKIN
United Kingdom:	Mr. M.E. ALLEN
	Mr. J.G. TAYLOR
	Mr. A. WHITE
United States of America:	Mr. J. MARTIN
	Mr. D.P. BLACK
	Mr. W. GRAYSON
	Mr. C. GRIP
	Mr. G. HARLOW
	Mr. D. THOMPSON
Yugoslavia:	Mr. M. LALOVIC
	Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC
Zaïre:	
Special Representative of the Secretary-General:	Mr. RISTO HYVÄRINEN
Alternate Representative of the Secretary-General:	Mr. A. CORRADINI

Communiqué of the meeting

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 691st plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador Miloslav Růžek, representative of Czechoslovakia.

Statements were made by the representatives of Romania and the United States of America, and by the Chairman.

The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 9 March 1976, at 10.30 a.m.

*

* *

Mr. ENE (Romania) (translated from French): I should like, before beginning my statement, Mr. Chairman, to associate myself with the other representatives who have welcomed your participation for the first time in the work of our Committee, as well as that of Ambassador Hyvärinen, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and of our new colleagues, the distinguished representatives of Burma, Japan and Peru. We welcome also the presence of Mr. Corradini as Secretary of our Committee.

In expressing our warmest wishes for success in their work, I should like to assure them of the Romanian delegation's sincere desire to co-operate closely with them, as we are prepared to do with all the other delegations, in seeking to accomplish the tasks of high responsibility which fall to our Committee.

On the resumption of the Committee's work, the accent must be placed once again on the growing alarm caused by the accelerated arms race and its disastrous consequences. Disarmament, and primarily nuclear disarmament, has become a major international problem, on whose solution world peace, and the possibility of all nations to devote their efforts freely to the cause of progress and prosperity, directly depend. Massive accumulations of arms and the state of insecurity they engender imperil the still hesitant first steps towards détente, the development of new international relations based on trust and international co-operation on a broad front.

Naturally, the international community is increasingly concerned to find urgent solutions to such a pressing problem.

As has already been pointed out, the United Nations General Assembly, at its recent session, had on its agenda no less than nineteen items on disarmament, or nearly one-third of all the substantive problems before this universal body. The number of resolutions adopted on disarmament also created a new record in the history of the United Nations. The scale of these United Nations activities proves beyond doubt that disarmament has become an object of immediate concern to all peoples. It also reflects the upheavals and sweeping changes which are taking place in the world, and the increasingly wide participation of all States, regardless of their size or potential, in discussions on vital international problems.

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

An analysis of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly following the debates on disarmament reveals conclusions which are important for the activity and orientation of our Committee.

First, the absolute priority of nuclear disarmament measures.

Out of the total of twenty-five resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, nineteen are aimed, in one way or another, at halting the development, testing and production of weapons of mass destruction, and prohibiting the development of new techniques, methods or systems of destruction, while bearing constantly in mind the permanent danger of accumulations of nuclear weapons. Ten resolutions -- as the Secretary-General points out in his message -- deal with the establishment of denuclearized zones, the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from or the prohibition of their emplacement in, the territories of other States -- a fact which is significant in itself, reflecting, as it does, the growing concern of the non-nuclear countries to protect themselves from the nuclear danger by their own efforts and with the means at their disposal.

Second, the need to focus our efforts on the achievement of specific objectives.

It is in this sense that we regard fulfilment of the express request formulated in resolution 3470 (XXX) as of special importance for the future of this Committee. Under the terms of that resolution, the Committee is invited to review the work done in the implementation of the purposes and objectives of the Disarmament Decade and in this light to reappraise its task and duties, in order to accelerate the pace of its efforts to negotiate truly effective disarmament and arms limitation agreements.

Third, the need to incorporate disarmament efforts in current action at the international level aimed at overcoming economic disparities and supporting the process of eliminating underdevelopment.

The General Assembly has emphasized that the ever-spiralling arms race is not compatible with the efforts aimed at establishing a new international economic order.

Lastly, the need to approach disarmament within the framework of a multilateral system of negotiations.

In any event, whether the measures in question are general or partial in nature or universal or regional, all States should be regularly informed so that they can evaluate the progress of the negotiations and the implications for their own security as well as for peace in general, and be in a position to advance their interests.

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

We thus have a plan of work carefully defined by the General Assembly.

At its present session, the Committee is called upon to study, with all due responsibility, problems both important and complex which the General Assembly has defined as priority areas. It is the Committee's political and legal duty to take as a basis for its activities the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

It is in that light that the Romanian delegation has on several occasions expressed its view on the need to improve the Committee's activities, the conduct of the negotiations and its methods of work.

We proceed of course from the logical premise that the decisive factor for the achievement of real progress towards disarmament has been and continues to be the desire of States to reach agreements -- their political will to take firm steps in that direction. It also seems natural and equitable to us that the great Powers should have special responsibilities in the field of disarmament and international co-operation.

The attention which my delegation attaches to the improvement of the activities of the Committee on Disarmament does not mean, therefore, that we are making a fetish of the question of the organization of our work. Indeed, we are in favour of all forms of international meetings which discuss and establish concrete measures concerning disarmament. What is essential is not the form but the extent to which that form offers the possibility for fruitful activity with concrete results.

Our views regarding the Committee's role and its methods of work are based on a few facts which seem essential to us: (a) the Committee on Disarmament is the only all-embracing multilateral body specializing in disarmament negotiations; (b) it is the only body which has received a mandate from the United Nations to pursue negotiations on all problems of disarmament; and (c) it provides scope by its raison d'être for a broadly-concerted effort by States.

Constantly aware that the achievement of general disarmament presupposes the participation of all States, and bearing in mind the objective fact that the acceleration of the arms race by the nuclear States creates the danger that, in the absence of practical measures designed to halt the atomic arms race, no one will be able to prevent other countries from producing such weapons, my delegation believes that the commitment of all States to this vast undertaking is absolutely essential for progress in the field of disarmament. The United Nations can offer the most appropriate framework for such a commitment because, since all countries are represented in it, their participation in the debates and in the solution of disarmament problems can thus be ensured.

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

It therefore seems to us very important to relate the Committee's activities to the problems defined as priority areas by the General Assembly and to establish a clear and rational view of its method of work so that it can retain its mission.

The institutional forms and procedures utilized by the Committee are not and cannot be unalterable. We must always base ourselves on efficiency criteria dictated by the scope and urgency of the tasks before us and, of course, take account of new political conditions in which the Committee is working.

It is in the light of the preceding considerations that we view the activities of the Committee at its present session.

The Romanian delegation considers that the Committee must of necessity deal with all disarmament problems.

On some subjects, of course, the discussion is relatively advanced, but this cannot and must not prevent the Committee from dealing with other problems -- from attending to all disarmament problems, in accordance with its mandate.

As we should remind ourselves from time to time, our agenda is quite comprehensive. It calls for the negotiation of effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament, measures of a non-nuclear nature, other collateral measures and general and complete disarmament, and the Committee's work should consequently be in accordance with it. The resolutions of the recent session of the United Nations General Assembly to which we have referred deal with the same range of problems and will obviously enrich the agenda.

At the thirtieth session of the United Nations General Assembly, the Romanian Government submitted an official document entitled "The position of Romania on the problems of disarmament, and particularly nuclear disarmament, and the establishment of lasting world peace" (A/C.1/1066, 30 October 1975). While expressing itself in favour of concentrating efforts on getting the disarmament negotiations moving, the Romanian Government proposed a series of measures which might help to achieve that goal. They are measures whose inclusion in the active negotiations in the Committee has constantly been requested by Romania, and my delegation renews that request once again.

The measures proposed by the Romanian Government are as follows: the freezing and reduction of military budgets; the banning, gradual reduction and, in the future, liquidation of nuclear weapons; the establishment of nuclear-free zones of peace and co-operation; disarmament and military disengagement measures, both partial and at the regional level; resumption of the negotiations on the treaty on general and

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

complete disarmament; the enhancement of the United Nations role in the field of disarmament; the prohibition of war propaganda; and the mobilization of all forces in human society for the achievement of disarmament.

When, in December 1975, it surveyed the record of the Government's external activities, the National Grand Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Romania, as a parliamentary body, confirmed the above guidelines for action on disarmament and gave the Government full authority to work for their implementation in full co-operation with all other Governments.

It is in accordance with these guidelines that my delegation intends to act at the present session of the Committee on Disarmament.

In my Government's view, a main objective of the negotiations must be to outlaw nuclear weapons, halt their production and liquidate those which already exist.

The measures envisaged within the framework of the nuclear disarmament priority relate to: (a) a formal undertaking by all States to refrain from the use of nuclear weapons; (b) the banning of the introduction of new nuclear weapons in the territory of other States; (c) the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territory of other States; (d) the cessation of the development, testing and production of nuclear weapons and the means for their delivery; (e) the cessation of the production of fissionable material for military purposes, the use of existing material for peaceful purposes and the transfer of a quota to be used, by all States, within the context of broad international co-operation; (f) the reduction and complete liquidation of all existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons and means of their delivery; (g) the total banning of nuclear weapons.

All these measures should be implemented under appropriate control, with the participation both of States possessing nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and of States which do not possess such weapons. The control must be strict and effective and must be carried out in such a way as to afford real guarantees that the measures provided for in agreements are actually being implemented.

Thus, while we are in favour of continuing or beginning negotiations relating to matters such as the prohibition of production of chemical weapons and their destruction, the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques and the prohibition of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, we will always bear in mind the fact that any agreement relating to such matters must be considered as one stage in a programme whose primary objective would be the prohibition and liquidation of all weapons of mass destruction and, in particular, nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Ene, Romania)

The main criterion to be used in judging the value of any disarmament agreement must, in our opinion, be the extent to which it relates to the substance of the armaments question and its effect on the arms race.

It would be an error for the Committee to state that it would be satisfied with the conclusion of any kind of agreement because it would thus be fostering the illusion that it is possible to live in peace and security while new stockpiles of destructive weapons are accumulating at a staggering pace in all parts of the world.

The work and conclusions of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons clearly stress the fact that, despite all the agreements and conventions concluded thus far, the nuclear arms race has continued without restraint.

In the absence of concrete results in halting the arms race and in view of the insecurity caused by the existence of nuclear weapons, the non-nuclear-weapon States are fully justified in demanding definite guarantees that they will never in any circumstances be the victims of the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons.

During that Conference, it was proposed that the nuclear Powers parties to the Treaty should undertake such a commitment in an additional protocol to the Treaty. The question of the granting of guarantees to the non-nuclear-weapon States was also the subject of discussions at the last two sessions of the General Assembly. It will again be the subject of discussions at the next session of the General Assembly under the item entitled "Implementation of the conclusions of the First Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and establishment of a Preparatory Committee for the Second Conference".

There is no doubt that the Committee is in duty bound to regard this problem as one of its priority concerns.

These are some of the observations my delegation wished to make at this early stage in the Committee's work. In view of the urgency and complexity of the problems before it, the Committee will certainly be put to the test this year.

The consideration of such problems may prove to be very important for the Committee's future, and even for its continued existence, by showing how it responds to the mission for which it was established.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): In my statement on 17 February I identified and briefly commented on four broad issues that have been raised regarding the draft convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques which was submitted to the Committee by the Soviet Union and the United States (CCD/471, 472). Today I wish to discuss those issues in more depth and to state the position of my Government on each of them.

Before doing so, however, I would like to emphasize once again the importance the United States attaches to the work of the CCD in the field of environmental warfare. We are firmly convinced that it is in the interest of all nations to deal promptly and conscientiously with the dangers of the use of environmental modification techniques for hostile purposes, before such techniques could enter the arsenals of States. The draft before the Committee is the product of long and thorough consideration on the part of its co-sponsors, during which all aspects of the problem were given serious and detailed examination. Now, we recognize that every formulation in the draft may not be perfect. Nothing in life ever is. We strongly believe however, that the draft provides an effective and workable means for dealing with the problem of environmental warfare. It has the full support of my Government, and in our view merits the support of other Committee members as well. We accordingly hope it will be possible for the Committee to report a widely acceptable text to the General Assembly next fall, and so to add a major new agreement to the important body of disarmament law that the CCD has to its credit.

The first of the issues I wish to discuss today concerns the definition or specification of the activities that would be prohibited by the convention. The basic prohibition is set forth in article I of the draft, whereby the parties undertake "not to engage in military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques having widespread, long-lasting, or severe effects as the means of destruction, damage, or injury to another State Party".

In thus defining the scope of the prohibition the draft takes into account both the need to provide effective protection against the dangers to which the convention is addressed, and the need to ensure that the prohibition will be implemented faithfully and will not give rise to friction and controversy over trivial issues. With respect to the latter point it is important to bear in mind that the difficulties of determining compliance increase as the scale of a particular banned activity is reduced. Attempting to prohibit techniques having only minor effects would pose problems of

(Mr. Martin, United States)

implementation and add to the risk of unprovable claims of violation. By focusing on techniques having "widespread, long-lasting or severe effects", the draft avoids these problems and at the same time effectively eliminates the danger of the hostile use of environmental modification techniques that could significantly affect another State party.

In this connexion, I wish to offer a clarification that has not figured in our earlier discussions. In the view of my Government, some environmental modification techniques must be regarded as invariably having widespread, long-lasting, or severe effects within the meaning of article I, and the hostile use of such techniques would therefore be prohibited altogether. Such effects would include, for example, the generation of earthquakes or tsunamis, climate modification, or the steering or intensification of hurricanes. Some other activities, such as precipitation modification, would be prohibited if their hostile use resulted in widespread, long-lasting, or severe effects. Precipitation modification causing floods or droughts would thus be within the scope of the convention and would be prohibited.

The term "environmental modification techniques" in article I is defined in article II as referring "to any technique 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". This definition is intended, among other things, to make clear that the draft convention is concerned with the manipulation of natural forces in such a way as to cause an intended environmental effect. It follows, therefore, that the convention is not concerned with effects on the environment that are incidental to the use of other weapons or techniques of warfare.

The article II definition goes on to set out examples of effects, or phenomena, that may result from deliberate manipulation of natural processes: earthquakes and tsunamis, an upset in the ecological balance of a region, or changes in weather patterns, in the state of the ozone layer or ionosphere, in climate patterns, or in ocean currents. Now, this list is, of course, only illustrative. In our view, however, it serves a useful purpose by adding substance to the technical definition of environmental modification techniques. It is true that the techniques for producing some of the effects listed are only theoretically possible at present. But it is nonetheless an important objective of the convention, as we see it, to preclude the hostile use of such techniques before they become feasible and hence more difficult to restrain.

(Mr. Martin, United States)

An important part of the statement of prohibition in article I is the reference to the hostile use of environmental modification techniques "as the means of destruction, damage or injury to another State Party." This phrase, like the definition in article II, makes clear that the convention is concerned with the use of environmental modification techniques as weapons. In our view, the "destruction, damage or injury" referred to in article I should be understood in the broad sense of harm to another party -- to its military forces and civilian populations, to cities, industries, agriculture, transportation and communication systems, and to its natural resources and assets.

The question has been asked whether it would not be sufficient and preferable for the convention to prohibit "hostile use" instead of "military or any other hostile use." We would agree that the phrase "military or any other" is not essential to the technical definition of the prohibition in article I. However, the phrase serves the important purpose of emphasizing that the prohibition applies to the conduct of military operations during armed conflict as well as to the hostile use of environmental techniques when no other weapons are being used or when there is no overt armed conflict. We believe the context makes it clear that the prohibition refers only to those military uses that are hostile.

Finally, with regard to articles I and II, I wish to comment on the suggestion that the scope of the prohibition should be broadened to cover the threat of use, as well as the actual hostile use. In our view, attempting to prohibit threat of use could raise difficulties of implementation disproportionate to any potential benefits. It might be quite difficult to determine whether or not a threat had been made, particularly if it were stated or carried out in an ambiguous manner. There would be a risk that unfounded accusations and controversies could weaken the treaty. We would question, moreover, whether any State having undertaken not to engage in the hostile use of environmental modification techniques would threaten to use them, thereby signalling its intention to violate its treaty obligations. It accordingly is not clear to my delegation what additional element of importance would be achieved by including a prohibition on the threat of use. We will, however, be prepared to hear further amplification of this issue.

The second general issue, about which a number of delegations have indicated special concern, relates to the provisions for resolving problems that may arise in connexion with the operation of the convention and for dealing with possible violations. We recognize the importance of this issue. If the convention is to win the support of the international community, parties must have adequate confidence that other parties will observe their obligations.

(Mr. Martin, United States)

The provisions in the draft concerning compliance include two separate and complementary procedures. First, all parties undertake to consult and co-operate in solving any problems which may arise in relation to the objectives of the convention or in the application of its provisions. Thus, parties have not only a right but an obligation to consult one another and to co-operate; this consultation and co-operation may also be undertaken through appropriate international procedures within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter. In our view, this procedure should provide an adequate means forsolving most if not all differences that might arise between parties.

In addition, and independently of the consultation procedure, any party may lodge a complaint with the Security Council of the United Nations if it finds that any other State party is in breach of its obligations under the convention. In addition, all parties undertake to co-operate with any investigation which the Security Council may initiate. These undertakings establish a strong presumption that no party will take action to impede or obstruct such an investigation. We believe that these procedures satisfactorily meet the need of all parties to assure adequate confidence of compliance with the terms of the convention.

The third general issue that has been raised concerns the relationship between the draft environmental warfare convention and the draft protocols under discussion at the Diplomatic Conference on International Humanitarian Law in Armed Conflicts. Several delegations have suggested that the convention should be "harmonized" with those sections of the protocol that deal with protection of the natural environment. We, of course, agree that the convention and protocols should not be inconsistent and we believe the drafts as they stand are not. However, there is a clear distinction between them as to their intended areas of coverage and objectives.

The purpose of the pertinent sections of the Law of War protocols is to protect the natural environment from widespread, long-term <u>and</u> severe damage caused by conventional means of warfare. These provisions must necessarily be somewhat restricted in their applicability since conventional military operations often unavoidably cause serious local damage to the environment. The purpose of the draft convention, on the other hand, is to prohibit the use of new techniques of warfare -- those which utilize the natural forces of the environment to produce widespread, long-lasting <u>or</u> severe effects -- so as to cause damage to another State party, including its population, assets or natural resources. Accordingly, the relevant provisions of the draft convention can and should be much broader in scope than the protocols.

(Mr. Martin, United States)

Thus, since the convention and protocols serve different purposes and are addressed to different weapons, it seems appropriate to my delegation that they differ in their provisions and terminology.

The final major issue I wish to discuss today concerns the relationship between the draft environmental warfare convention and the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes. The preamble to the draft recognizes that use for peaceful purposes could improve the interrelationship of man and nature and contribute to the preservation and improvement of the environment for the benefit of present and future generations. Article III states that the provisions of the convention shall not hinder the peaceful use of environmental modification techniques or international co-operation in the utilization, preservation, and improvement of the environment for peaceful purposes. The intention of article III is to make clear that the convention does not impinge on or affect peaceful uses or any issues concerning their possible regulation. However, if other delegations find that the present wording can be interpreted as implying that the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes is not, or should not be, subject to international regulation, we would be ready to consider changes to remove that implication.

In connexion with peaceful uses of environmental modification techniques, it has been suggested that the convention should contain a positive commitment by parties to co-operate in the promotion of such uses, along the lines of article X of the Biological Weapons Convention. There is, however, no clear parallel between the peaceful uses of biological agents, notably for medical research, and the potential but as yet largely undeveloped peaceful use of environmental modification techniques. These techniques are still in a very early state, and it is not clear what benefits they will have or whether the benefits will outweigh any risks involved. We, therefore, think it only prudent in this convention not to commit parties to the encouragement and promotion of the development and use of environmental modification techniques. Having said that, I should point out that all United States research in the field of environmental modification is conducted on an unclassified basis, and there is absolutely no desire on our part not to share technical information. The issue, as we see it, is simply whether or not it is advisable to deal with the question of peaceful uses in this convention. We think not.

Before concluding, I would like to mention another issue that was raised at the General Assembly last fall. It concerns article IV of the draft convention. It was indicated at the General Assembly that this article could be in need of clarification. As I noted at the time the draft was tabled before the Committee, the purpose of

(Mr. Martin, United States)

article IV is simply to provide for the legal implementation of the convention within a State party, wherever this may be needed for the purpose of domestic law. We are fully prepared to consider suggestions for improving the language of this article in order to assure that its purpose is made clear.

These are our views on some of the issues that have been raised by other delegations. We look forward to further discussion of these and other issues as a means of developing a fuller understanding of the positions of government. Let me once more encourage all delegations having views on various aspects of the draft to state them as soon as possible during the spring session, thus furthering our work towards eventual agreement on a generally acceptable convention text.

The CHAIRMAN: Following consultations with members of the Committee, the Co-Chairmen propose that the informal meeting requested by the representative of Romania be convened on Friday, 5 March, at 10.30 a.m., to discuss the Committee's organization of work, including the question of the format of the Committee's report and the question of a comprehensive review of the CCD's procedures.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Co-Chairmen also suggest that the Committee consider, pursuant to the request of the representative of Sweden, holding informal meetings with experts on the question of remaining problems with respect to the achievement of a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons tests on 20-23 April, as compatible with the Committee's schedule of plenary meetings.

In addition, at the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Co-Chairmen suggest for the Committee's consideration that an informal meeting with experts on the question of the prohibition of new weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons be convened during the spring session on a date to be determined after appropriate consultations, possibly in early April.

Finally, at the request of the representative of the Netherlands, the Co-Chairmen suggest that the Committee consider holding informal meetings on the draft convention on the prohibition of military and any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques during the spring session on a date to be determined after appropriate consultations.

An announcement with respect to these last three items will be made following completion of the consultations that are called for.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.