

(Mrs. Theorin, Sweden)

However, the task of ensuring that the Paris Conference becomes a real and lasting success lies with the Conference on Disarmament. It is up to the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons to organize its efforts in such a way that the universal commitment to a convention demonstrated in the General Assembly and at the Paris Conference is translated without delay into tangible results. The General Assembly has urged the CD to intensify its negotiations on chemical weapons with a view to the final elaboration of a comprehensive convention at the earliest possible date. In Paris the participating States unanimously called on the CD 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 up to us, here and now, to draw practical conclusions from these forceful declarations.

How shall the Conference on Disarmament live up to the expectations of the international community and of the public at large? First, it seems odd, in view of the unconditional calls for the final elaboration and conclusion of a comprehensive convention, that the mandate for the Ad Hoc Committee omits reference to the key element of "use", and that it explicitly excepts final drafting. Sweden does not favour lengthy mandate discussions. We have criticized the waste of time in procedural controversies on other agenda items. It would, however, seem natural that the CD in 1989 should demonstrate that it takes the calls of the General Assembly and the Paris Conference seriously, by immediately changing the mandate for its Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons in these two respects.

Secondly, a more dynamic method of work must be adopted whereby the hard-core issues are continuously identified, pursued and resolved. Many difficult problems transcend individual articles and will have to be dealt with concretely and systematically throughout the draft convention. This might call for a greater number of working groups and a more flexible approach to the time allotted to them. My delegation notes with great satisfaction that the incoming Chairman of the Committee apparently plans to organize its work in this manner. The co-ordination of the work will put a heavy burden on the Chairman, and necessitates the continuous and active involvement of its bureau. Consequently, other committees should be prepared to concede some of their time in favour of the chemical weapons Committee.

Thirdly, the interrelationship between ongoing bilateral and multilateral efforts must become more dynamic and efficient. It has been a waste of time for the CD to discuss the order of destruction at the very same time as it was being discussed bilaterally by the two major possessors. If bilateral efforts could be scheduled so as to produce results for the multilateral negotiation, our work would significantly gain in speed and efficiency. However, this might necessitate greater flexibility on the part of the CD also. Provisions enabling the Ad hoc Committee to meet continuously throughout the year, but with intermittent recesses for consultations and preparation, must be considered.

My delegation gave its detailed views on most aspects of the "rolling text", article by article, in its statement to the plenary on 13 September 1988. Our views have not changed. Since then, however, some encouraging developments have taken place. My Government has noted with appreciation that President Bush has identified a ban on chemical weapons as