

(Mr. Dumas, France)

drawn from this is that the consensus obtained in Paris will allow us to anticipate universal accession to the convention as produced by the member States of the Conference on Disarmament.

On what does this consensus rest? How does this "reference" I was speaking about translate into practical terms? I will do my best to answer these two questions.

Briefly running through the articles of the Declaration, I would say that first of all there is now a confirmed link between the present prohibition on use and the future convention, a convention which will prohibit not only the use, but also the production, stockpiling and transfer of chemical weapons. 149 States have declared that they are "determined to prevent any recourse to chemical weapons by completely eliminating them". This wording from the Paris Declaration sums up perfectly, I think, the argument expounded by the President of the French Republic when he said: "We will not achieve a complete ban unless we reaffirm today the prohibition of use. This prohibition will in turn be all the better underpinned when production, transfer and stockpiling have become impossible." Beyond the differences in legal commitments that exist at present between States, according to whether or not they are parties to the 1925 Protocol, or whether they have tabled reservations to it, we now know - you now know - that there is a collective conviction on the part 149 States, a conviction that makes it possible to move from the Protocol of 1925 to a global convention: the universal condemnation of the use of chemical weapons.

The second element of reference, in the Paris Declaration is the political endorsement given there for the first time to the philosophy of the 1925 Protocol by more States than the signatories alone. The 149 States recognized the "importance" of the Protocol and its "continuing validity". They called upon those that have not yet done so to become parties to the protocol, and 12 of them have already responded positively to the appeal. Furthermore, despite the fears of those who predicted that the use of chemical arms would become widespread, dooming the negotiation of a new convention here in this very room, to failure, we have provided a new reason for persevering, new grounds for confidence in the wisdom of peoples.

There is a third encouragement, which is essential for the 40 of you who are negotiating here, as well as for those who are not members of the Conference on Disarmament but are now clearly invited to contribute to this work: the Paris Conference reaffirmed the need to step up the pace in Geneva, without overlooking the remaining difficulties but on the contrary to solve them as soon as possible. The Paris Declaration will serve as a point of reference: we will be accountable in the coming weeks for the way in which we translate this political impetus into action. If you will allow me, I will come back shortly to the way I view the resumption of your work here.

The fourth area in which I believe the Paris Declaration provides a point of reference is prevention of the proliferation of chemical weapons. It is clear to all now, I think, that we must refrain from applying to chemical weapons a logic which would bring the haves and the have-nots into confrontation. Let us therefore refuse to place one side in opposition to the other, and let us work together, industrial countries and developing