

# CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.487  
16 February 1989

ENGLISH

---

## FINAL RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Thursday, 16 February 1989, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Aldo Pugliese (Italy)

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 487th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

In accordance with its programme of work, the Conference will continue to listen to statements in plenary meetings and consider the establishment of subsidiary bodies on agenda items and other organizational questions. In accordance with rule 30 of its rules of procedure, however, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

As announced at our 485th plenary meeting, when we reach the end of the list of speakers, I intend to put before the Conference, for adoption, the report of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons contained in document CD/881. I am also glad to inform you that agreement has been reached at informal consultations on the mandate and chairmanship of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. We shall also deal with requests from non-members to participate in the work of the Ad hoc Committee. I shall put those questions before the Conference at an informal meeting once our list of speakers is exhausted. Immediately afterwards we shall resume the plenary to formalize those decisions.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, Romania and Ethiopia. I now give the floor to the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador von Stülpnagel.

Mr. von STULPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): As I am taking the floor for the first time under your stewardship, I first wish to congratulate you and your delegation on your assumption of the presidency for the month of February. I am very happy from a professional and from a personal point of view to see you, a friend, in the Chair presiding over the debates of our Conference. I also wish to thank our previous President, Ambassador Ardekani, for the excellent manner in which he presided over our sessions in the month of January. Let me extend a warm welcome to those Ambassadors who have arrived since the summer session 1988 - I refer, in particular, to Ambassador Aung Thant of Burma, Ambassador Sharma of India, Ambassador Houlliez of Belgium, Ambassador Dietze of the German Democratic Republic, Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden, Ambassador Reese of Australia, Ambassador Kikanke of Zaire, Ambassador Bullut of Kenya and Ambassador Kamal of Pakistan. I note with deep regret that some of us have left, or will in the near future leave Geneva, in particular Ambassador Clerckx of Belgium, Ambassador Rose of the German Democratic Republic, Ambassador Ekéus of Sweden, Ambassador Butler of Australia, Ambassador Ruoro of Kenya, Ambassador Hacene of Algeria and Ambassador Vejvoda of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. With all of them my delegation had excellent and amiable relations.

I would like to take the floor today to address procedural and organizational issues of the Conference, a subject which may seem both obvious and simple, but also complex and difficult at the same time. I feel certain that you will agree that procedural and substantive questions are inseparably connected. While substantive issues of arms control will be the subject of Minister Genscher's address to the Conference in the near future, I wish today to call attention to some continuing problems that our Conference has in

(Mr. von Stülpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

organizing its work. It seems to me that our Conference has reached a point where we have to make some firm decisions if we want to give the pressing problems on our agenda the proper and acceptable treatment they deserve.

Under the relevant paragraph of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, this Conference is to work substantively on the basis of consensus. The consensus requirement is the very essence of our work. It gives the Conference and its subsidiary bodies their special character and provides our *raison d'être*. The challenge of the CD's work is the patient establishment and further elaboration of shared perceptions. Only with these shared perceptions can we hope to achieve full and fruitful concentrated work by the CD.

A closer and thorough look at the CD's Decalogue and this year's agenda makes us aware again of many and continuing fundamental divergences about almost all items to be dealt with. Every topic certainly demands special attention. From the point of view of individual delegations, the request for unique priorities to be given to special subjects is certainly understandable. And the Conference certainly should not neglect the individual views of delegations or groups and the substantive reasoning they are based upon. But this Conference must find global solutions to the problems before it, and this requires the development of shared views and agreements which every member can subscribe to, or can at least live with.

Our work in the CD and the special sessions of the United Nations devoted to disarmament has shown that there are no feasible solutions to the problems under discussion or negotiation in this Conference without further significant investment of time and resources. All current items will continue to be in competition with each other for limited resources. Moreover, to judge by some recent proposals, further items may be added to our already overburdened agenda.

This situation is growing increasingly untenable. Consequently, my delegation suggest that the Conference may wish to reassess, in a pragmatic manner, the priorities for its deliberations in this year's session. We might ponder the possibility of developing consensus on what I would call a temporarily selected concentration on those subjects of the agenda the urgency of which is undisputed, and for which the prospect for consensus solutions is well founded.

Nobody would belittle the terrible consequences of a nuclear exchange or of an intensive conventional conflict. Nobody will deny the Conference the right to study in depth the issues which relate to such events, including possible security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon countries or the eventual insertion of efforts in this direction into a comprehensive disarmament programme. It may be, however, that such issues are not immediately amenable to constructive resolution here in the CD. Indeed, dissenting views in these areas appear to be at the forefront. Moreover, there are other urgent subjects on our agenda with a higher degree of commonality, and which seem closer to a consensus solution. One of the subjects which come immediately into mind is chemical weapons.

(Mr. von Stülpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

I think that the recent activities which have resulted in a notable alleviation of East-West tensions could now permit the Conference to concentrate its work on the negotiations to ban chemical weapons, even if this results in somewhat lesser attentiveness to some other points of our agenda. The unexpected and unhappy spread of the idea of the possible usefulness of chemical weapons, and the recent use of those weapons, making no distinction between combatants and non-combatants, has sharpened our eagerness to secure a global chemical weapons ban. We have seen that as long as the development, production, storage and transfer of chemical weapons is not prohibited, the danger of their use continues too. The States which attended the recent Paris Conference declared that only a comprehensive and global interdiction of chemical weapons can solve this problem.

A total of 149 States have confirmed the urgency of this task and vowed to redouble their efforts at the negotiations on the subject here in Geneva. Redoubling our already solid and conscientious work can only mean more time, more manpower and more focused and success-oriented work. The new work programme and method proposed by the Chairman-designate of the Ad hoc Committee for 1989 reflects this view. I plead, therefore, that the Conference should utilize all possibilities to put at the disposal of this programme the necessary time and resources.

I would like to close my remarks with a thought that goes beyond the immediate necessities before us. A convention banning chemical weapons is an urgent task, in itself, and does not need elaborate justification. But there is an aspect of our efforts which goes beyond this immediate aim of the conclusion of a multilateral CW convention, and which will have an impact on future chances for all multilateral disarmament efforts. The importance of the subject of a CW ban, and the importance of our being able to negotiate an acceptable agreement on a multilateral basis, combine to constitute a litmus test of whether it is possible for the world community to conduct meaningful multilateral negotiations at all and to come up with consensus final products or not. Since Paris, we know that there is a fundamental consensus in this world that chemical weapons should be banned. Our Conference should not only acknowledge that consensus, but execute it in the appropriate way.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany for his statement, and also for the kind words that he addressed to me. I now give the floor to the representative of Romania, Ambassador Dolgu.

Mr. DOLGU (Romania) (translated from French): First of all, Mr. President, please allow me to extend my warmest congratulations to you on taking up the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament for the month of February. We are all the more satisfied when we consider that you represent Italy, a country with which Romania maintains traditional relations of friendship and co-operation. We are convinced that you will be able to guide us with wisdom and skill in our efforts during this important month as we start the 1989 session of the Conference on Disarmament. I would also like to express our most sincere thanks to the representative of Iran, Ambassador Ali Shams Ardekani, who guided the work of the Conference during the last month of the 1988 session and the inter-sessional period in a dedicated and effective manner. Finally, allow me to wish a very warm welcome to the

(Mr. Dolgu, Romania)

distinguished representatives of Burma, Ambassador Thant, India, Ambassador Sharma, Belgium, Ambassador Houlliez, the German Democratic Republic, Ambassador Dietze, Sweden, Ambassador Hyltenius, Australia, Ambassador Reese, Zaire, Ambassador Kikanke, Kenya, Ambassador Bullut, Pakistan, Ambassador Kamal, Algeria, Ambassador Chaalal, and Czechoslovakia, Ambassador Vajnar, and express the hope that we will establish close links of co-operation with them.

I would now like to share a few ideas of a general nature with you on the state of disarmament negotiations and the problems therein, as well as on some avenues the Conference might pursue. Present-day international life, in our view, continues to be marked by the existence throughout the world of enormous quantities of nuclear weapons. Their destructive capacity has been only slightly affected by the Soviet-American Treaty on the prohibition of intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles, and may indeed be enhanced as a result of the modernization of tactical nuclear forces being contemplated by NATO. At the same time, there are substantial stocks of chemical weapons, which are to be supplemented by the production of binary weapons. Nuclear weapons and chemical weapons are an integral part of armament plans and combat tactics in certain countries. All this, together with the maintenance of the nuclear deterrent as the basis for military doctrines, is hardly likely to ensure peace and strengthen security, and stimulates the arms race and maintains the risk of war.

Recently we have witnessed certain actions which had a positive influence on the climate for disarmament efforts. I am thinking in particular of the unilateral reductions in arms, troops and military expenditure announced by the USSR and other socialist countries. Back in 1985 Romania, which has always spoken out against the arms race and the increase in military budgets, stressed the need for unilateral measures to reduce armed forces, including nuclear forces, as well as the possibility of implementing such measures without detriment to the security interests of the countries involved. I would remind you that in November 1986 our country itself carried out a 5-10 per cent reduction in its effective arms and military expenditure, and expressed the wish that such an act might serve as an example for other countries.

We would also like to recall that a few years ago, when the idea of a new start in disarmament efforts was being mooted, Romania suggested the idea of a global integrated approach to disarmament. It spoke in favour of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, based on nuclear disarmament and also including measures to eliminate chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, as well as substantial reductions in conventional weapons, troops and military expenditure. We had in mind that in the way people think, as in every day life - in doctrines, in the very conception of defence and armed forces, there was an indissoluble link between the various types of weapons. It took some time for this to be recognized. But although a step is going to be taken in that direction soon in Vienna, much remains to be done. Because the individual, separate, piecemeal approach to various types of weapons still prevails. It is high time to ask a question: is it possible to guarantee peace and independence for peoples and at the same time forge real and equal security for all if we continue to act in isolation to eliminate one or two types of weapons of mass destruction - nuclear weapons and chemical weapons?

(Mr. Dolgu, Romania)

We do not consider that it is possible. This approach, by its very nature and by the nature of the results that could be achieved does not protect us against attempts to use force or the threat of force, against the possibilities that certain States might blackmail others by threatening to use one or other of these weapons.

An effective and equitable nuclear and chemical weapon disarmament process should be so designed that it does not lead to new imbalances in international life and does not open the way to the appearance of power centres which might impose their own domination on the world. Such a process would have to be based on the principle of equal security for all States. All this leads us to consider that nuclear and chemical disarmament should be dealt with in a unitary manner and that the simultaneous elimination of these weapons, and the shift to general disarmament, constitute the major objective at the present stage. Romania, which possesses neither nuclear weapons nor chemical weapons and has no intention of producing them, believes that firm action is required to achieve the stage-by-stage elimination of these weapons as soon as possible, which would pre-suppose the cessation of production and testing as well as the destruction of all nuclear and chemical weapon stocks and the outlawing of these weapons.

On this basis it would seem necessary for this new session of the Conference on Disarmament to make its contribution to establishing the foundations for an effective negotiating process in nuclear and chemical disarmament taking place simultaneously. Specific measures must be adopted which could lead to the complete elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, the prohibition of such weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles. These measures should be designed in a unitary way as components of a set of actions intended to contribute to international stability, to place relations between States on new foundations, on equality and respect for independence and sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs and the elimination of force and the threat of force.

Given the representative nature of the Conference as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, it is necessary for the objectives set out above to be included in the draft Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, which contains actions and measures to be taken by the existing negotiating bodies and States - at the regional, bilateral or multilateral level - in all the areas of disarmament. Such a programme would provide for a closer link between the bilateral, regional and universal negotiations so that the measures adopted would be complementary, while encompassing the whole range of disarmament issues. On the subject of nuclear disarmament, Romania continues to insist that negotiations between the USSR and the United States on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic arms should be stepped up in order to arrive at agreement in this field before the end of this year. At the same time we consider it necessary for negotiations to be conducted, with the involvement of all States, to totally eliminate nuclear weapons and outlaw them. In this area Romania puts forward the following proposals.

An immediate start on the elaboration of a universal treaty for the total prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons, by stages. Such an agreement

(Mr. Dolgu, Romania)

will cover the prohibition of the production, development and testing of nuclear weapons, and the destruction of existing nuclear weapon stocks and their delivery systems.

Establishment of a special body with the participation of all the nuclear Powers, as well as other States, to negotiate a universal treaty on the prohibition and liquidation of nuclear weapons.

A start on concrete negotiations to eliminate arsenals of tactical short-range nuclear weapons.

Without awaiting the total elimination of nuclear weapons, withdrawal of these weapons by the States which possess them to within their own national frontiers.

Establishment of nuclear-weapon-free and chemical-weapon-free zones so that more and more areas of the globe can be free from the danger inherent in weapons of mass destruction.

Transformation of the Balkans into a zone of peace, co-operation and good-neighbourly relations, free of nuclear and chemical weapons, without foreign troops or military bases, and the creation of such zones in other regions of the world.

On the nuclear test ban, Romania proposes:

The immediate cessation of all nuclear weapon tests and the negotiation of an agreement on a halt to the development of these weapons, with universal participation. Of importance in this regard is the initiative to amend the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, in order to have this Treaty extended to cover underground areas, where tests are conducted at present. Romania has already indicated its agreement to the convening of an international conference on this subject and its resolve to play an active part in it. Concerning the current negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on the gradual limitation of the number and yield of nuclear tests, we consider that they should constitute only an intermediate stage, the final objective being the cessation and prohibition of all nuclear weapon tests;

The establishment of an international system to monitor compliance with the commitments undertaken by States on the cessation of nuclear tests, through the creation of a communications network amongst existing seismic stations in various countries. Romania reiterates its readiness to participate in the proposed system of verification with the technical facilities it possesses.

As regards the prevention of an arms race in outer space, Romania proposes:

The cessation of any action or arms programmes designed to extend the arms race into space;

(Mr. Dolgu, Romania)

The negotiation of a universal agreement providing for renunciation of any use of space for military purposes, and its use for exclusively peaceful purposes under appropriate international control;

The creation, under the United Nations, of a special body to monitor compliance with agreements on the non-use of outer space for military purposes and the launching of satellites and other objects into outer space.

On the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, Romania submits the following proposals:

In the light of the interdependence between chemical weapons and nuclear weapons, the development and implementation of the convention on the elimination of chemical weapons should be carried out at the same time as the development and implementation of a universal treaty on the prohibition and the complete stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons;

The future convention on the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons and the agreed verification measures should in no way affect the development of the chemical industry or the technical and scientific potential of each and every country, or their use for economic and social progress;

The guaranteeing of the broadest possible access by all countries to the achievements of modern science and technology, and the promotion of peaceful co-operation in the chemical field;

Pending the destruction of all chemical weapons, chemical-weapon States should undertake not to make any use of these arms in any circumstances.

On the prohibition of radiological weapons and the production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, we propose:

Speeding up of negotiations to draw up an international instrument to prohibit radiological weapons. In this context we support the idea of an international agreement prohibiting attacks on peaceful nuclear facilities, an issue of special importance, in particular for regions where such facilities are highly concentrated, as is the case in Europe;

In-depth examination, in the context of the Conference, of the problem of the production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction based on new principles, such as lasers, wave propagation, particle emission and so on, in order to identify ways and means of preventing such dangerous developments;

A commitment on the part of States to prohibit the use of new achievements of science and technology for destructive purposes, for the development and production of new weapons.

On the activities of the Conference on Disarmament:

We are in favour of the creation within the Conference, from the very outset of the necessary ad hoc committees to deal with the main problems on the agenda, so that concrete negotiating work can be carried out; we believe



(Mr. Dolgu, Romania)

that there is a very special need for the establishment of an ad hoc committee to study the problem of nuclear disarmament in depth and adopt the necessary measures to permit effective negotiations in this area, and a committee on the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests; we would like to see the re-establishment of the committees which operated during the previous session on various other items on the agenda. We agree with the view that once created, these committees should remain in operation until their mandates have been carried out.

We believe that access to the work of the Conference should be open to all interested countries, so that they may present their positions, make proposals and play an active part in the negotiations, in order that the negotiating process on disarmament should take account of the positions and interests of all countries.

Lastly, in order to increase the effectiveness of the Conference, it would seem necessary that all States which have embarked on bilateral or regional disarmament negotiations should systematically keep the Conference on Disarmament informed of progress in their negotiations and the results achieved there through direct reporting or through the United Nations Secretary-General.

That concludes my statement. I would like to assure you of the Romanian delegation's co-operation in your efforts to identify new areas of agreement, to broaden existing areas of agreement and to move the work of our Conference forward.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Romania for his statement, and also for the kind words expressed to me and to my country. Now I give the floor to the representative of Ethiopia.

Ms. SINEGIORGIS (Ethiopia): It gives me great pleasure to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference for this month. We are happy to see you guide our deliberations, and are confident that under your wise stewardship our task will be crowned with success. I would like to assure you of my delegation's full support in the discharge of your important responsibilities. I would also like to avail myself of this opportunity to express my delegation's gratitude for the able manner in which your predecessor, the distinguished Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ambassador Shams Ardekani, conducted the deliberations of the Conference from last September. It is also my pleasant duty to welcome the new Ambassadors of Australia, Belgium, Burma, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Pakistan and Sweden, who have just joined us. I extend to them my best wishes and assure them of my delegation's full co-operation. On a sad note, it is with a heavy heart that I express our sorrow and grief over the untimely demise of Miss Aida Levin, a good friend and a very able member of the secretariat.

Looking back, 1988 was an eventful year which witnessed significant improvements in the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. As a result of this, today, the prevalent view is that world peace and security is best maintained and consolidated through disarmament rather than

(Ms. Sinegiorgis, Ethiopia)

by pursuing a dangerous and insane policy of armament and a spiralling arms race. The INF Treaty signed and ratified by the two major Powers, whose implementation is already under way, and the agreement to reduce their strategic offensive arms by 50 per cent, augur well for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Moreover, the Paris Conference on the prohibition of chemical weapons which took place from 7 to 11 January 1989 was a reaffirmation of the universal political will to ban chemical weapons. The Final Declaration, which was unanimously adopted, should serve as a clarion call for the speedy conclusion of the long-awaited convention.

It is the view of the Ethiopian delegation that the present favourable atmosphere offers us a unique opportunity to consolidate the achievements attained over the last year and to work diligently to capture new commanding heights in all areas of disarmament endeavours.

As the maintenance of global peace and security concerns the vital interest of all nations, it is our conviction that all disarmament efforts should always uphold the indispensability of multilateral negotiations. In other words, bilateral avenues cannot and must not replace the multilateral framework; they should only be supplementary to it. In this respect, I would like to stress that if global peace and security are to be guaranteed, the security of all nations must be met.

Concerning the question of a nuclear test ban, which is of prime importance to the work of this Conference, it is regrettable that this body is still unable to commence substantive work. When the partial test-ban treaty was signed a quarter of a century ago, it was hoped that the risk of a nuclear catastrophe would be minimized. It was even expected that the Treaty would eventually be followed by other agreements to halt underground nuclear weapon testing. Much to our disappointment, however, nuclear weapon testing has continued unabated, and as a result the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons has reached extraordinary levels. In this connection, the Ethiopian delegation fears that the step-by-step negotiations currently under way between the United States and the Soviet Union may not lead to the achievement of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, but may permit continued nuclear testing and promote qualitative improvement. If the nuclear arms race is to be halted, it is imperative that a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be concluded - and we all agree on this, I am sure. Needless to say, urgent negotiations should commence without delay. In this regard, we are of the view that the prevailing political climate is most propitious for such an undertaking, and therefore cannot overemphasize the need for flexibility in order to establish an ad hoc committee on a CTBT with an effective mandate.

Another issue that figures prominently on the agenda of the Conference is the prevention of an arms race in outer space. As we are all aware, outer space is mankind's common heritage and should be used exclusively for the benefit of humanity. The 1967 outer space Treaty and other relevant legal instruments governing States' activities in outer space leave much to be desired. Indeed, rapid achievements in science and technology have made the legal régime ineffective. It is therefore necessary to initiate appropriate measures to reinforce the existing legal régimes. Ethiopia supports the

(Ms. Sinegiorgis, Ethiopia)

proposal for the establishment of a committee or group of experts which will look into definitions and verification techniques. This, in our view, will lay the technical groundwork to enable the ad hoc committee to pursue its task more effectively. The longer we delay in adopting a common approach to tackle the prevention of an arms race in outer space, the greater the difficulties we will face. Our concerted effort should be deployed to realize the objective of the prohibition of the use of outer space for hostile purposes. Likewise the vast potential of space technology should be used for the advancement and the well-being of mankind.

It is gratifying to note that much progress has been made in the elaboration of the convention on chemical weapons during the past year. In this regard, I hasten to add that the Paris Conference has been a resounding success. We note with satisfaction that the Conference not only made the reaffirmation of the 1925 Geneva Protocol possible, but also called upon the Conference on Disarmament "to redouble its efforts, as a matter of urgency, to resolve expeditiously the remaining issues and to conclude the convention at the earliest date".

In this connection, I would like to seize this opportunity to convey the profound appreciation of my Government to the Government of France for convening the Conference and for its generous hospitality. I would also like to proffer our sincere thanks to His Excellency Mr. Roland Dumas, Minister for Foreign Affairs, for having taken his precious time to officially introduce to us the Final Declaration of the Conference. Let me also pay a particular tribute to the distinguished representative of France, Ambassador Pierre Morel, for his indefatigable efforts in the preparations for the Conference.

It is evident from the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference that there is an expressed general will to ban chemical weapons once and for all. Moreover, the Final Declaration states, inter alia: "The participating States stress the necessity 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".

Ethiopia was among the first States to accede to the 1925 Geneva Protocol. It is one of the paradoxes of history that Ethiopia was also one of the first countries to fall victim to the use of chemical weapons. Ethiopia therefore considers these weapons and their complete destruction a matter of the utmost priority. Furthermore, it is my duty to inform this Conference that my country does not produce or stockpile chemical weapons.

At this juncture, we would like to note with satisfaction the considerable progress made during the inter-sessional work of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. We welcome the deletion of appendix III on security stocks. My delegation also commends the work done in the areas of confidentiality, assistance and protection, as well as the conduct of challenge inspections. In this regard, I would like on behalf of my delegation to express my sincere gratitude to the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, His Excellency Ambassador Sujka of Poland, for his timeless efforts in successfully guiding the deliberations of the Ad hoc Committee. Our appreciation also goes to the chairmen of the three working groups, namely Mr. Andrej Cima of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Pablo Macedo of Mexico and Mr. Sadaaki Numata of Japan.

(Ms. Sinigiorgis, Ethiopia)

A quarter of a century ago, a summit conference of the Organization of African Unity held in Cairo declared Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Despite this clearly expressed wish, however, the denuclearization of Africa has not yet materialized. It is common knowledge that the racist South African régime has now achieved the capability to produce nuclear weapons. My Foreign Minister stated in his address to the forty-third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations that "the implications of this ominous development for international peace and security cannot be overemphasized. Such capability, acquired by a régime that would have no scruples in using them, should be viewed with alarm by all who have genuine concern for the maintenance of international peace and security". I would like to stress that this situation is of grave concern to Africa.

Of equal concern to Africa is the issue of dumping of nuclear and industrial wastes in and around the continent. The forty-eighth ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, held in Addis Ababa in May 1988, declared the dumping of nuclear and industrial wastes in Africa to be a crime against Africa and its people. The forty-third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which also had this matter before it, adopted two resolutions in which, inter alia, it expressed "profound concern regarding practices of dumping nuclear and industrial wastes in Africa, which have grave implications on the national security of African countries", and called upon all States "to ensure that no radioactive waste is dumped in the territory of other States in infringement of their sovereignty". In this connection my delegation condemns the dumping of nuclear waste and calls on all those involved in this heinous operation to cease their infamous activities.

Finally, I wish to reaffirm once again my Government's firm support for multilateral disarmament efforts, for the cause of international peace and security and for the success of the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Ethiopia for her statement and for the kind words she addressed to the Chair. I have no other speakers on my list for today. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor? I see none.

I should like now to put before the Conference, for adoption, the report of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, contained in document CD/881. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Conference adopts the report of the Ad hoc Committee.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: As agreed at the outset, I shall now suspend the plenary meeting and convene an informal meeting to take up the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, the appointment of its Chairman and requests from non-member States to participate in our work.

The meeting was suspended at 11.30 a.m. and resumed at 11.45 a.m.

The PRESIDENT: The 487th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is resumed.

(The President)

I now turn to working paper CD/WP.360, dealing with the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. In connection with the process leading to the adoption of that working paper, I would like to make the following remarks.

I had consultations in connection with some proposals advanced about the mandate of the Committee on CW at the plenary session on 7 February. From my consultations with all the groups, a consensus did not emerge, but there was a general will to start the work of the Committee without delay. In consideration of these facts and in order to start the work, I propose that we re-establish the Committee on the basis of the existing mandate. Therefore, I shall now proceed to put before the Conference for adoption working paper CD/WP.360. If I see no objection, I shall take it that the Conference adopts the draft decision.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I would like to add some other words after the adoption of the decision on the mandate. I hope that the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, which has just been re-established, will work in the spirit of the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference.

I now turn to the appointment of the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. I understand that there is consensus on the appointment of Ambassador Pierre Morel of France as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, as recommended in the report of the Ad hoc Committee adopted today. May I take it that the Conference so agrees?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I extend our congratulations to Ambassador Morel on this important assignment. We are glad to have him in that position. I also wish him every success in discharging his important responsibilities as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee. Is there any other delegation wishing to take the floor? I give the floor to the representative of Sweden.

Mr. MOLANDER (Sweden): As item co-ordinator for chemical weapons of the Group of 21, I have been empowered to make the following statement.

The Group of 21 expresses its satisfaction that the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons has been re-established. The Group would also like to take this opportunity to extend its sincere congratulations to Ambassador Morel of France as the new Chairman of the Committee. Ambassador Morel embodies the very spirit of the Paris Conference, to which he made such decisive contributions with his dynamism, enthusiasm and intellectual discipline. The Group of 21 pledges to work with him in that very spirit.

At the opening meeting of the Conference, on 7 February, as you have just recalled, Mr. President, the Group of 21 proposed that the mandate for the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons should be improved, firstly by including a reference to the prohibition of use of chemical weapons, and secondly, by deleting the phrase "except for its final drafting". The Group of Socialist States and China supported these proposals.

(Mr. Molander, Sweden)

The proposals were not intended to be controversial. In fact, the Group could not foresee that the proposed amendments could cause difficulties to any group or any country which participated in the General Assembly and the Paris Conference, where such language was agreed to by consensus. It is therefore with a considerable degree of disappointment that the Group of 21 has taken note of the fact that the Conference as a whole is not in a position to join consensus on the two proposals.

The Group of 21, however, considers that it is of paramount interest that work in the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons should be pursued immediately. It has therefore agreed not to press further its proposals for an improved mandate, thus enabling the Committee to start its substantive work as of this week. The position of the Group is clear, however, and it hopes that the Conference will wish to review the mandate at an appropriate time during the 1989 session.

Whatever the mandate, the Group of 21 is ready, in the words of the Paris Declaration, "to redouble its efforts, as a matter of urgency, to resolve expeditiously the remaining issues and to conclude the convention at the earliest date". It is our hope that the future work of the Committee from its very beginning will show that our resolve is shared by all.

This concludes the statement of the Group of 21.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Sweden for his statement. Is there any other delegation wishing to take the floor? I give the floor to the representative of Bulgaria, Ambassador Kostov.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): It is a pleasure for me to congratulate Ambassador Morel on behalf of my Group on his election as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. I would like to assure him of my Group's readiness to co-operate in the course of the negotiations which lie ahead during this year.

We have just adopted the mandate for the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. I would like to make the following statement for the record on behalf of the Group of Socialist States.

First, the Group of Socialist States believes that the final elaboration at the earliest date of a multilateral convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of all chemical weapons, and on their destruction, is a matter of highest priority for the Conference on Disarmament.

Second, the world community expects us to conclude our work urgently and responsibly. This request was explicitly made in resolutions 43/74 A and C of the General Assembly of the United Nations and in the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference on the prohibition of chemical weapons. We consider these documents as manifestations of the strong political will of all participating countries to do everything possible to rid the world of chemical weapons.

Thirdly, the year 1989 will be crucial on our way to a chemical-weapon-free world. We are obliged by the world community to mark

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

that we are entering a new phase in our negotiations. From this point of view last year's mandate is outdated and does not duly reflect the present situation and the tasks before us. We have in mind, first of all, the need to delete the restrictive provision "except for its final drafting", as well as to indicate that we have a clear mandate from the Paris Conference to achieve a convention not "at the earliest possible date" or "as soon as possible", but simply "at the earliest date". It was also suggested that we should reproduce the full title of the convention, which includes the prohibition of use, as in the General Assembly resolution and as in the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference. Changing the mandate would be a clear signal that we are seriously addressing our commitments expressed in the Paris Declaration.

Fourthly, our group made specific proposals to this effect during the consultations on the mandate. We also supported the amendments to the old mandate proposed by the Group of 21 at the plenary meeting on 7 February.

Fifthly, we are disappointed that it has not been possible so far to improve the mandate of the Ad hoc Committee. We still do not understand the rationale of the Western Group, which opposed any change in the mandate. However, bearing in mind that lengthy discussions on the mandate would be detrimental to the substantive work of the Committee, we decided not to stand in the way of the decision just taken. But we do not consider this issue closed, and believe that it should be possible to continue the consultations on the mandate with the aim of coming to an agreement during the current session of the Conference.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Bulgaria, Ambassador Kostov, for his statement. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor? I give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Solesby.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): I look forward to congratulating you, Mr. President, and to welcoming our new colleagues when I take the floor to speak on behalf of the United Kingdom. This morning I am speaking on behalf of the Western Group.

As Co-ordinator of the Western Group, I warmly welcome the establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. The speed with which this has been accomplished is a good augury for our future work. It has followed detailed, informal consultations held by yourself. I thank you, Mr. President, and colleagues from all groups who have helped to make this possible.

The Committee has a task of great importance before it. We look forward to resuming the substantive negotiations without delay. The important thing is that each of us here should contribute to our utmost to resolving the remaining problems in our negotiations. We will all have in mind the call of the Final Document of the Paris Conference to redouble our efforts. Indeed the report of the Ad hoc Committee in CD/881, which we have just adopted, contains the consensus recommendation that "the results of the Paris Conference on the prohibition of chemical weapons be taken into account in the future work on the convention".

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

Western Group countries have made major contributions in the past, and intend to maintain their efforts intensively in the months ahead. We want a good convention as soon as possible. As the distinguished Ambassador of Belgium, speaking as the Western Co-ordinator, said on 7 February, "What I can assure you of is that the Western Group, together with all the other delegations, will seek the most realistic, the most effective and the most expeditious way to arrive at the conclusion of a convention which will free mankind from the fear of chemical weapons".

While I have the floor, I would like to refer to one particular passage in the Paris Declaration, namely that which establishes that "any State wishing to contribute to these negotiations should be able to do so". The Western Group of countries is pleased that a larger number of Governments, not members of the Conference on Disarmament, have applied to participate in the work of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons than ever before. We believe the work of the Ad hoc Committee will much benefit from the presence of all these countries, and look forward to co-operating with them.

Lastly, I should like to join others in expressing the pleasure of the Western Group of countries at the accession of Ambassador Pierre Morel as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee. His well-known personal qualities, and above all his eminent contribution to the successful outcome of the Paris Conference, give us every confidence in his leadership of our work during the coming months.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Solesby, for her statement and now I give the floor to the representative of China, Ambassador Fan.

Mr. FAN (China) (translated from Chinese): At the outset, I am most pleased to express my warm congratulations to Ambassador Morel of France on his assumption of this year's chairmanship of the Ad hoc Committee on CW. I am confident that, under his able guidance, the work of the Committee will be crowned with new successes. I also wish to avail myself of the opportunity to express my appreciation to Ambassador Sujka of Poland for his positive contributions.

As far as the mandate of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons is concerned, we have conducted serious discussions under your guidance, Mr. President. I have made known the position of the Chinese delegation, including its views on the statement made by the Group of 21. Today I would simply reiterate that the Chinese delegation hopes that this year's mandate for the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons will see some improvement in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the forty-third session of the General Assembly and the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference. At the same time, the Chinese delegation is also ready to adopt a flexible attitude and to go along with the existing mandate so that the Committee may start its substantive work as soon as possible.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of China, Ambassador Fan, for his statement. Is there any other delegation wishing to take the floor? I see none.



(The President)

I now turn to requests from non-members to participate in the work of the Ad hoc Committee. In that connection, I should like to note that for technical reasons relating to a process of consultations, the secretariat had to prepare the working papers relating to invitations to non-members with a reference to a subsidiary body on agenda item 5. This should be disregarded, as we have not been able yet to re-establish that Ad hoc Committee. We shall consider the references to a subsidiary body on agenda item 5 as deleted from working paper CD/WP.359 and Add.1 to 19. When we re-establish the Ad hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, we shall then take the working papers up again to deal with agenda item 5. I shall list those countries requesting participation under agenda item 4, "Chemical weapons": Norway, Spain, Finland, Switzerland, Austria, Ireland, New Zealand, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Portugal, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Denmark, Turkey, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Bangladesh, Syrian Arab Republic, Greece, Tunisia, Zimbabwe (which has also requested participation under items 6, 7 and 8 on the agenda) and Iraq.

May I ask the Conference whether there is consensus on inviting those non-members? I give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ambassador Ardekani.

Mr. ARDEKANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): At the outset, Mr. President, allow me to join other colleagues in congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament for the month of February. I am confident that with your diplomatic skill and personal abilities, the Conference will mark notable success in discharging its duties. Also, in the light of the good relationship and co-operation between our two republics you can count on the full support of the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran in successfully carrying out your weighty responsibility.

I would also like to welcome our colleagues who have joined us since last summer - the distinguished Ambassadors of Burma, India, Belgium, the German Democratic Republic, Sweden, Australia, Zaire, Kenya, Pakistan, Algeria and Czechoslovakia. To all of those colleagues who, at the end of their term of duty here, have departed in pursuance of other duties and functions, I wish them well. At this juncture, I would also like to congratulate Ambassador Pierre Morel of France on his assumption of the chairmanship of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. I am sure that under his able chairmanship the Committee will mark substantive success. I assure him of the full co-operation of my delegation. I would also like to thank Ambassador Sujka of Poland for his outstanding job during the 1988 session.

Since the procedural and substantive work of the Conference are closely interlinked, my statement concerns the former, while Minister Dr. Velayati in his address to the Conference in the near future will address the latter, i.e. substantive subjects.

The dynamics of disarmament indicate changes in the world; the world of unilateral, bilateral and multilateral disarmament; and the world of understanding. The world of freeing resources from armaments and allocating them to improving the living conditions of the people, eradication of ignorance, poverty and disease, and the world of freeing people from fear and insecurity.

(Mr. Ardekani, Islamic Republic of Iran)

Unfortunately, there are a few who do not discern this change. Those who do not appreciate that the world is changing or do not want to believe that. Let us hope that global negotiations on effective disarmament, with their collective nature, will be the instrument which expedites and paves the way for increasing understanding about this changing world. When we say the move toward disarmament is being expedited, it is because we observe that the draft of the convention banning chemical weapons is in the process of being finalized. This is an achievement for the Conference on Disarmament as the sole international body for disarmament negotiations. We have noted that the Paris Conference reaffirmed the role of the Conference on Disarmament in finalizing a convention on all aspects of chemical weapons.

Adherence to an absolute prohibition of chemical weapons should be globally verifiable, unconditional, and subject to no divergent interpretation. It should be unlimited in its application and duration. It should also have horizontal and vertical scope within and between countries. Under this convention, no justification should ever permit the use or threat of use of chemical weapons, nor should any one even seek to invoke Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations to justify the production, stockpiling or transfer of chemical weapons within the territory of a country or against any other nation. The verification and investigation procedures should be effective and leave no room for any violation. Any violation should be dealt with in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

As the Conference on Disarmament is reaching the final stages of its deliberations on the draft of the new convention, it is our duty to involve non-member States and seek their adherence to this convention. In this regard, in particular, the adherence of those States which have used chemical weapons, those which assisted the violators in obtaining the technology to produce and use chemical weapons, those which provided them with delivery systems, and those which violated their commitments under the Geneva Protocol of 1925, is of the paramount importance. It is also essential to secure the adherence of those States which have or can acquire the capability to produce, stockpile or use chemical weapons.

Obviously, the dynamics of change in the world dictate that if a Government considers itself free of obligations with regard to the prohibition of chemical weapons, the determination of the world community should prevent such behaviour and should not allow a fiasco to take place.

It is in this sense that we believe the presence of observers in this august body should not be utilized for old polemics and politics of chicanery. This Conference has heard declarations in recent times by members which announced unilateral and bilateral reductions of weapons of mass destruction and the adoption of confidence-building measures. The Conference therefore cannot make its podium available to those who do not move in this direction. This is not a podium for those who do not move toward peace and collective security and relaxation of tension. The Conference should allow those observers which would like to work genuinely for the cause of disarmament in general, and the complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the removal of the nuclear threat in particular, to render their sincere contribution. It is in this spirit that their performance at the Conference

(Mr. Ardekani, Islamic Republic of Iran)

will be judged - on their future co-operation and participation in the Conference on Disarmament. Their performance in other areas in easing tensions and moving toward peace will also be under advisement and evaluation.

I hope that past experience will be our torch for our march towards the future for a safer world in which common sense rules over arms.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ambassador Ardekani, for his statement, and also for the kind words he addressed to me and to my country. In the light of his statement, I take it that the Conference adopts the draft decisions.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform you that additional requests for participation in our work have been received from Chile and Viet Nam. They have been circulated in the delegations' pigeon-holes, and we shall take them up at our next plenary meeting on Tuesday. I give the floor to the representative of France, Ambassador Morel.

Mr. MOREL (France) (translated from French): Mr. President, allow me to thank you for your very kind words and to thank all the delegations here for the trust that they have just shown, first of all in my country, in my delegation and finally in me personally. I would like to take up the very words of Mr. Roland Dumas, Minister of State and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic, who said a few days ago, in this very room, that we were very appreciative of the honour and responsibility conferred on us in this way with the chairmanship of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. For my part I would add that we will do everything within our power to live up to this honour and responsibility. Allow me also on this occasion to thank all my colleagues here for the gestures of friendship, encouragement and good wishes that have been extended to us. I can say very sincerely that they will enable us to cope together and to deal with very demanding tasks in our work. These signs of friendship, this encouragement, these wishes also show that, beyond political will, above and beyond the facilities that are made available, there is a human and personal element without which no major endeavour is possible.

Next I would like to pay tribute to my predecessor, Ambassador Sujka, who in an exceptional way represents in the Conference, and in particular with regard to chemical weapons, continuity and also, in a certain way, the history of these negotiations, because he was Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons twice. And I would like to emphasize that what he accomplished with his three group chairmen, and with contributions from all delegations, during the year 1988, was a remarkable effort on the substance, which is reflected in the "rolling text", but which goes beyond what is recorded in the "rolling text". I am stressing this because I think that without that effort, what was achieved at the Paris Conference would have remained slightly insubstantial, and that as a result of the work accomplished in 1988 that achievement, on the contrary, can now take on its true dimensions.

And this will be my last point. The impetus has been building up for a long time. We must pursue it and build on it. The best way of responding to

(Mr. Morel, France)

the confidence which has been shown in me - and for which I would like to thank all the delegations again - the best way of applying our collective determination, as manifested in the United Nations resolutions adopted by consensus, as manifested in the Paris Declaration and, of course, in the mandate itself, is quite simply to announce that the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons will meet tomorrow morning at 10 a.m., then again on Monday, at 3 p.m., and that during next week each of the five working groups will have its opening meeting with full conference services. In this way, at the end of next week the actual substantive work will have begun in all the areas where serious problems remain for us to solve.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of France, Ambassador Morel, for his statement. The secretariat has circulated at my request a timetable for meetings to be held by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies during the coming week. As usual, this timetable is merely indicative and we can proceed to change it or to adjust it depending on the circumstances. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Conference agrees to the timetable.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I should also like to recall that the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, which we re-established today, will hold its first meeting tomorrow, Friday 17 February, at 10 a.m. in Conference Room V.

In addition, I should like to inform you that the secretariat has received a telegram from the former representative of Peru in the Conference, Ambassador Jorge Morelli-Pando, transmitting to me, as well as to the other representatives, his appreciation for all the co-operation received when he was accredited to the Conference, which he left to take up new important functions as Ambassador of Peru in Ecuador.

I have no other business for today. I now intend to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Tuesday, 21 February at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.