

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

is not inconceivable under the circumstances that both technical experts and non-experts might lose sight of the overall structural logic of the convention, obviously each into different directions. While we are all for the early realization of a CW convention, there is an additional consideration of importance. That is the fact that the convention, by necessity, will be an instrument which will place the world's chemical industry under some restrictions. Since extensive control of what is in effect a gigantic and mature industry is neither feasible nor desirable, it is important to draw a clear line at which an effective ban on chemical weapons can be carried out without undue interference in the day-to-day operation of the peaceful chemical industry. That is easier said than done, but obviously there is no alternative.

It seems to me that there are several key provisions in the convention that mark the dividing lines, and once these are identified and become parts of a shared common understanding, then ways can be found so that the respective details may be handled separately by appropriate experts in the most expeditious manner. If we were to fail to clarify these key provisions, then it is possible that the conceptual framework of the convention might be overwhelmed by the nuts and bolts aspects of the detailed provisions. Then we would indeed be wasting what seems to be a common political will to achieve this convention as soon as possible.

(Mr. Kerroum, Algeria)

True, considerable commendable effort has been made and progress has been achieved in the discussions on a chemical weapons convention. However, while it notes this positive development, the delegation of Algeria today is more inclined to express its concern at the trend which is emerging. It appears that little by little we are losing sight of the objective of a total ban on chemical weapons and that we are now envisaging a concept closer to a non-proliferation régime. If this trend was confirmed, it would mark a step backwards and one all the more negative in that it would carry within itself the seeds of the inevitable failure. Over and above the requirement of security, the signature of and compliance with an agreement of this nature are of necessity dependent on the production potential and development needs of States. I must therefore reaffirm what I said on 25 February 1986: that a chemical weapons convention "can only mean the total elimination of chemical weapons if it prohibits their development, production and stockpiling. It cannot possibly have a non-proliferation function or constitute any sort of obstacle to the chemicals industry, which is the very foundation of development, particularly in agriculture".