

Towards a Global Ban on Anti-Personnel Mines:

International Strategy Conference

Ottawa, Canada
October 3-5, 1996

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES

**International TO
CAMPAIGN BAN
LANDMINES**

**Campagne
INTERNATIONALE POUR
LES MINES INTERDIRE**

ARCHIV
623.456
66

Contents

Introduction.....	p. 1
Conference Agenda.....	p. 3
List of Participants.....	p. 7
Conference Opening Statements	
• Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs Lloyd Axworthy.....	p. 8
• UN Under-Secretary General Yasushi Akashi.....	p. 13
• Mr. Chris Moon representing the International Campaign to Ban.....	p. 18
Landmines (ICBL)	
ICBL Call for Action.....	p. 21
ICBL Intervention to Chairman's Session.....	p. 23
ICBL Press Release.....	p. 25
"Towards a Global Ban" Panel Statements	
• Senator Patrick Leahy, US Senate, United States of America.....	p. 26
• Cornelio Sommaruga, President, ICRC.....	p. 32
• H. E. Ambassador Johan Molander, Sweden.....	p. 38
Final Declaration.....	p. 45
Chairman's Agenda for Action.....	p. 46
Conference Closing Statements	
• Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs Lloyd Axworthy.....	p. 55
• Jody Williams, Coordinator, ICBL.....	p. 58
Closing Press Conference	
• Canadian Government Press Release.....	p. 60
• ICBL Press Statement.....	p. 61
Media Clippings.....	p. 63
Central American Foreign Ministers Declaration.....	p. 72
United Nations General Assembly Resolution.....	p. 74

Introduction

From October 3-5, 1996, the government of Canada sponsored "Towards a Global Ban on Anti-Personnel Landmines: International Strategy Conference." This historic conference brought together 50 governments that have pledged support for a total ban on anti-personnel (AP) mines, as well as 24 observer states, dozens of non-governmental organizations from the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), various United Nations agencies, the International Committee of the Red Cross and other international organizations. This report includes some of the most significant elements from the Ottawa meeting.

The Ottawa process is the result of the widespread recognition of the failure of the review conference of the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) and its Landmines Protocol to adequately address the humanitarian crisis of global landmine contamination. A growing partnership of non-governmental organizations making up the ICBL, pro-ban governments and other agencies and organizations began to solidify during the review conference sessions. During the final session, Canada announced its intention of convening a meeting of "like-minded" -- those supporting a ban -- to strategize as to the best way to achieve that goal.

The Ottawa Conference yielded three concrete results: a final declaration agreed to by the 50 governments recognizing the urgent need for a ban on AP mines; the conference Chairman's Agenda for Action, an outline of actions for reaching a ban rapidly; and the bold announcement by Canada's Foreign Minister Axworthy that Canada is prepared to hold a treaty-signing conference for a total ban in December 1997. The conference was also notable for the unprecedentedly high level of cooperation with and involvement by NGOs in both the planning and execution of the conference.

The momentum has not stopped with the conference. The process begun in Ottawa will continue through the next year until December 1997, when pro-ban states will return to Ottawa, at the invitation of the Canadian government, to sign a treaty that will ban antipersonnel landmines. Between October 1996 and December 1997, the ICBL will work in close partnership with Canada and other pro-ban states to continue to build the political will that will ensure a successful treaty signing.

As was announced in Ottawa, Brussels will hold a follow-on conference in June 1997. But other states have also announced their support for the process by their willingness to convene other meetings to consider treaty language -- both before and after the Brussels conference.

The ICBL has begun planning for the next critical year. The Campaign will hold a week-long series of meetings in Brussels in December 1996 to prepare for the government meeting of June and other ICBL actions throughout 1997. In February, the ICBL will hold its 4th international landmine conference in Maputo, Mozambique to build momentum for the treaty in that most mine-contaminated continent. Campaign workshops are also being contemplated for Finland, Russia, India, Pakistan, Asia and Latin America.

The Canadian invitation to return to Ottawa in December of 1997 to sign a treaty banning antipersonnel landmines has given the world a timeframe to eliminate this indiscriminate weapon. We will all work together over this next critical year to ensure the successful completion of that goal. And we will work after the signing to ensure universal adherence to that treaty.

Towards a Global Ban on Anti-personnel Mines

International Strategy Conference - Ottawa, October 3-5, 1996

CONFERENCE AGENDA

PRE-CONFERENCE - Wednesday, October 2

1900-2130 Conference Pre- Registration
Location: Colonel By Lobby, Government Conference Centre
2 Rideau Street, Ottawa

DAY ONE - Thursday, October 3

0730-0845 Registration
Government Conference Centre

0900-1000 Conference Opening
Opening remarks by:
Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs Lloyd Axworthy
UN Under-Secretary General Yasushi Akashi
Mr. Chris Moon, representing the International Campaign to Ban
Landmines (ICBL)
Open Session
Location: Main Hall, Government Conference Centre
Chair: Canada.

1015-1230 Information Exchange I
This session will allow states to report any significant developments in their national
AP mine policies
Open Session
Location: Main Hall, Government Conference Centre
Chair: Canada.

1230-1400 Light lunch available for official
conference delegates and
observers
Location: Main Lounge,
Government Conference Centre

1230-1315 Opening of Public Information
Exhibits
Opening remarks by:
Stephen Lewis, Deputy
Executive Director, UNICEF and
Canadian singer/songwriter
Bruce Cockburn
Open Event
Location: Rideau Foyer,
Government Conference Centre

1400-1500 Chairman's Session
Discussion of conference work plan
Closed Session (Conference Delegates and Official Observers only)
Location: Main Hall, Government Conference Centre
Chair: Canada

1500-1530 Coffee Break

Y ONE - Continued - Thursday, October 3

30-1830 Global Action I
First of three sessions devoted
to government consultations
Closed Session (Government
delegations and International
Agencies only)
Location: Main Hall,
Government Conference Centre
Chair: Canada

1530-1800 Parliamentarian-NGO Sessions
Open Sessions
Location: Sussex Room,
Government Conference Centre
Chair: Francis Leblanc, M.P.,
Parliamentary Secretary to the
Canadian Minister of Foreign
Affairs

**A. 1530-1630 Setting the Stage: Anti-
Personnel Mines and the
International Community**
Response of the international
community to the global AP
mine crisis

Panel: 1. Mr. Stephen Lewis, Deputy
Executive Director, UNICEF
2. Mr. Steve Goose,
International Campaign to Ban
Landmines
3. Senator Peter Bosa,
Canadian Representative to the
International Parliamentary
Union

1630-1700 Coffee break

**B. 1700-1830 Strategy Session: NGO-
Parliamentarian Agenda for
Action**

Panel: 1. Common action for a global ban
Senator Patrick Leahy, USA
2. Mr. Ken Rutherford,
Landmines Survivors Network
3. Ernie Regehr, Mines Action
Canada, Project Ploughshares
4. Member of the European
Parliament (TBC)

000-2300 Mines Awareness and Fund-Raising Concert (optional)
Featuring Ashley MacIsaac and other Canadian Musicians
Presentations to poster contest award winners
Open to Public
Location: Ottawa Civic Centre
Tickets available at door (\$26.75) or at 1-800-361-4595

DAY TWO - Friday, October 4

830-1030 Panel Presentation I: "Towards a Global Ban on AP Mines"
Panel presentation and discussion on international efforts to achieve a global ban
Panel: 1. Cornelio Sommaruga, President, ICRC
2. H. E. Ambassador Johan Molander, Sweden
3. Senator Patrick Leahy, U.S. Senate, United States of America
4. Mr. Stephen Lewis, Deputy Executive Director, UNICEF

DAY TWO - Continued - Friday, October 4

"NGO-Government partnership for a global ban"
Statement by John Ryle, Open Society Institute

Open Session

Location: Main Hall, Government Conference Centre

Chair: Hon. Christine Stewart, Secretary of State for Latin America and Africa,
Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada

1030-1100 Coffee Break

1100-1230 **Information Exchange II**

Discussion of regional actions to support a global ban on AP mines.

Panel: 1. Ireland
2. Philippines
3. South Africa
4. Mexico

Open Session

Location: Main Hall, Government Conference Centre

Chair: Germany

1230-1430 **Light lunch available for Conference Delegates and Official Observers.**

Location: Main Lounge, Government Conference Centre

1430-1730 **Global Action II**

Second of three sessions
devoted to government
consultations

Closed Session (Government
delegations and International
Agencies only)

Location: Main Hall,
Government Conference Centre

Chair: Canada

1430-1730 **NGO/Academic Panel**

Highlighting academic research
on the relation of the landmines
question to broader issues of
international law, development
and security

Panel: 1. Don Hubert, Dalhousie
University
2. Peter Herby, Legal Division,
ICRC
3. Noala Skinner, Kings College,
Cambridge
4. Calib Rossiter, Demilitarization
for Democracy
5. David Gowdey, author of
"Hidden Killers"

Open Session

Location: Sussex Room,
Government Conference Centre

Moderator: Perez Morangi
Nyamwange, Povoada Canada-
Angola

1900-2100 **Chairman's Dinner for
Heads of Delegation**
Location: Department of
Foreign Affairs, Pearson
Building, 125 Sussex Drive,
Ottawa, 9th Floor Dining Room.

1830-2030 **Reception for NGO
Representatives**
Closed - by invitation only
Location: Chelsea Club

DAY THREE - Saturday, October 5

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>0830-1130 Global Action III
Final session devoted to government consultations
Location: Main Hall, Government Conference Centre
Closed Session (Government delegations and International Agencies only)
<u>Chair:</u> Canada</p> | <p>0830-1100 NGO Consultations
"The Way Forward"
Location: Gatineau Room, Third floor, Government Conference Centre</p> |
| <p>1130-1300 Light lunch available for Conference Delegates and Official Observers.
Location: Main Lounge, Government Conference Centre</p> | |
| <p>1300-1500 Panel Presentation II: "An Integrated Approach to the AP Mine Challenge"
Panel presentation and discussion on the development of an integrated approach to dealing with the AP mine challenge, which will explore the degree to which a global ban and enhanced mine clearance and victim assistance can become mutually supportive objectives.
<u>Panel:</u> 1. Hans Klingenburg, Danish Foreign Ministry
2. Jerry White, Landmines Survivors Network
3. Ed Tsui, UN Department of Humanitarian Affairs
4. Linda Tripp, Mines Action Canada, World Vision Canada
Open Session
Location: Main Hall, Government Conference Centre
<u>Chair:</u> Australia</p> | |
| <p>1530-1630 Conference Closing
Open Session
Location: Main Hall, Government Conference Centre
<u>Chair:</u> Canada</p> | |

TOWARDS A GLOBAL BAN ON ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES

International Strategy Conference - Ottawa, October 3-5, 1996

Confirmed Participants:

1. Angola
2. Australia
3. Austria
4. Belgium
5. Bolivia
6. Bosnia and Herzegovina
7. Burkina Faso
8. Cambodia
9. Cameroon
10. Canada
11. Colombia
12. Croatia
13. Denmark
14. Ethiopia
15. Finland
16. France
17. Gabon
18. Germany
19. Greece
20. Guatemala
21. Guinea
22. Honduras
23. Hungary
24. Iceland
25. Iran, Islamic Republic of
26. Ireland/European Union
27. Italy
28. Japan
29. Luxembourg
30. Mexico
31. Mozambique
32. Netherlands
33. New Zealand
34. Nicaragua
35. Norway
36. Peru
37. Philippines
38. Poland
39. Portugal
40. Slovakia
41. Slovenia
42. South Africa
43. Spain
44. Sweden
45. Switzerland
46. Trinidad and Tobago
47. United Kingdom

48. United States
49. Uruguay
50. Zimbabwe

Confirmed Observers:

1. Albania
2. Argentina
3. Armenia
4. Bahamas
5. Benin
6. Bulgaria
7. Brazil
8. Brunei Darussalam
9. Chile
10. Cuba
11. Czech Republic
12. Egypt
13. Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
14. Holy See
15. India
16. Israel
17. Malaysia
18. Morocco
19. Pakistan
20. Republic of Korea
21. Romania
22. Russian Federation
23. Rwanda
24. Ukraine

International Agencies and Other Organizations:

1. International Campaign to Ban Landmines
2. United Nations -DHA
3. United Nations - UNICEF
4. United Nations - UNHCR
5. International Committee of the Red Cross
6. European Parliament
7. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies Societies
8. Mines Action Canada

Statement

96/40

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

**NOTES FOR AN ADDRESS BY
THE HONOURABLE LLOYD AXWORTHY
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
TO THE INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY CONFERENCE
TOWARDS A GLOBAL BAN ON ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES**

**OTTAWA, Ontario
OCTOBER 3, 1996**



Government
of Canada

Gouvernement
du Canada

Canada

Distinguished guests and delegates:

I am pleased and honoured to welcome you to Canada and to this strategy session, which is designed to catalyse global action to ban anti-personnel mines. I am particularly glad to see so many participants from countries most affected by anti-personnel mines – those who are most keenly aware of the horrors they inflict.

Here in Canada, it is all too easy to slip into thinking that mines do not really affect us, that they are a distant problem. Yet only three months ago I was speaking to the mother of Christopher Holopina, a young Sapper in the Canadian Forces who was killed in Bosnia when his vehicle ran over a land mine. We cannot bring back those, like Christopher Holopina, who have died, but we can work to build a fitting monument to their memory, by taking action on a global ban.

We should recognize that much of the impetus for a ban has come from those, be they victims, NGOs [non-governmental organizations], or international agencies, working in the field. In North America, it has come from people such as Brian Isfeld, who is now working with the Landmine Survivors Network to raise public awareness in Canada about anti-personnel mines, after his son Mark – a member of the Canadian Military Engineers – was killed by a land mine in Croatia. We owe an incredible debt of gratitude to millions of people around the world and, in particular, the International Campaign to Ban Land Mines, the ICRC [International Committee of the Red Cross] and UN agencies. They spoke so articulately, convincingly and relentlessly that, today, there are more than 70 countries committed to a ban.

It is clear to me that the passionate commitment of this community of organizations and individuals was instrumental in creating a momentum behind this issue that has few parallels in the history of international security and disarmament. I believe that we are seeing the emergence of a new mode of international co-operation, in which citizens, non-governmental groups, international agencies and national governments join together in a genuine partnership that makes things happen. Just three weeks ago in Ottawa I attended the opening of the Arctic Council, a unique new international body, in which indigenous groups work in full partnership with governments on the protection and sustainable development of a region that they, as residents, know better than anyone else. In the same way, this meeting will, I hope, demonstrate the synergy that arises from the democratization of international co-operation.

Why Land Mines, Why a Ban?

Today, we are here to take the first steps toward a global ban on anti-personnel mines. The reasons why are well known to you all.

In 70 countries around the world, more than 100 million land mines continue to fight battles that ended months, years and in some cases many decades ago. Some estimate that anti-personnel mines kill or injure 500 people per week, 90 per cent of them civilians, too many

of them children. Around the world, over a quarter of a million people now live with the emotional and physical scars caused by land mines.

But mines do much more than kill and injure thousands of innocent people each year. They terrorize and impoverish entire communities, they burden developing countries with the special and costly needs of victim assistance, and they fuel the flames of conflict as communities are forced to re-experience the horrors of war one victim at a time.

Unfortunately, the incredible courage and personal sacrifices of those working to assist victims or clear mines is often overshadowed by the burden of knowledge that the international community is losing the struggle against anti-personnel mines.

While we may clear as many as 100 000 land mines per year, another two to five million new land mines will be deployed. While we spend millions a year on land mine victims, there are some 70 new victims every day.

Developments at the UN

Despite these grim statistics, we should not lose hope. Last week in New York at the UN, I hosted and attended some of the most encouraging meetings that I ever been to as Foreign Minister. Above all, I was delighted to see how many countries have newly joined those working on the steps to be taken towards a total ban.

In the General Assembly, speaker after speaker took the podium to commit themselves to a global ban. The United States will be leading our efforts to present a strong resolution to the UN General Assembly, calling for such a ban; our main purpose in meeting here today is to provide all the support we can to its efforts. We want to ensure that our resolution has an overwhelming list of co-sponsors, to demonstrate that the ban is real and that it is imminent.

At the same time, I met with many colleagues individually and collectively to discuss how we could move forward together to promote a ban, to help victims, and to clear mines. With my Japanese colleague I discussed ways of co-ordinating our efforts on de-mining. From Germany's Klaus Kinkel I heard interesting ideas on sponsoring co-operation between our industries to improve de-mining technology. South Africa put forward useful, practical proposals for getting rid of the many land mines in its region. I expect that we will hear more about these ideas and proposals in the coming days.

In all my discussions, it was clear that there is an unprecedented welling-up of enthusiasm and commitment. I believe that there is now the political will in the international community necessary to take

collective action to end the scourge of anti-personnel mines. The proof of this commitment is your presence here.

Challenges Ahead

I believe the international community faces two sets of challenges:

- The first is to reduce the use of anti-personnel mines while we work – quickly – to secure a global ban on anti-personnel mines.
- The second is to deal with the destructive legacy of land mines: this means identifying the resources to clear anti-personnel mines and provide care for land mine victims.

Both sets of challenges require urgent attention.

The UN, NGOs and groups of mines experts have been increasingly involved in de-mining efforts in recent years, often at high personal risk. Canada is proud of the role that our own armed forces and NGOs have played in de-mining efforts in many parts of the world. We salute the brave work of the men and women of all nations involved in this dangerous task.

In this context, I am very pleased to announce today that Canada will be making additional contributions of some \$2 million to advance the work of de-mining in different parts of the world. My Cabinet colleague Pierre Pettigrew will outline for you this afternoon how this money will put to work.

I am also pleased to announce that we will be sponsoring a Canadian seminar on de-mining technology and assistance to victims in Winnipeg in early February. The seminar will focus on enhancing Canadian capacity in both areas and will be targeted to Canadian NGOs and the Canadian private sector. And as of next year, Canada's Pearson International Peacekeeping Training Centre will be incorporating a land mine awareness module into all its courses.

Our task now is to follow up on the Copenhagen Conference on de-mining. I look forward to the report on the Conference which will be presented during our meeting, and I know that others here have concrete proposals about where we go next. As part of this discussion, I propose that we consider the possibility of setting up a working group of technical experts to focus on developing cheaper and less dangerous means of de-mining.

My conversations with colleagues from affected states and donor countries lead me to believe that these are areas where we can develop partnerships with other states, with NGOs and with the private sector, particularly in terms of assistance to victims.

I am also convinced that if we can make real progress on the ban agenda – the political agenda – it will have a direct and positive

effect on efforts to deal with human agenda – clearance and victim assistance. That is why the purpose of this meeting is to galvanize and catalyse international action to negotiate a global ban on anti-personnel mines.

I hope that the international community will move with deliberate speed and a clear sense of purpose to these negotiations. Canada is not prepared to see process road-blocks thrown in the way of launching and quickly concluding a convention banning land mines. The signs are positive. A broad-based group of like-minded countries, NGOs and international agencies have already taken the decision to act: whether through national policy restrictions on use or concerted campaigns to build public awareness and provoke international action.

At the beginning of this year, when Canada announced its moratorium on use, production and export, we were in a group of less than 10 countries with such restrictions. Since then, dozens of countries have made changes in national policy: some key producers – such as Italy and Brazil – have stopped producing; many countries have stopped exporting mines; land-mine-affected states have committed themselves to a ban; and many important countries have placed restrictions on use. Yesterday, my colleague the Minister of Defence announced that Canada will be cutting its inventory of land mines by two-thirds, effective immediately.

I would suggest that the trend is pretty clear. Can we sustain and build this momentum? I believe we can. I believe we are firmly on our way to a ban, given the overwhelming support of the international community and the convergence we are seeing in the aims and efforts of states, regional organizations, the United Nations, parliamentarians and NGOs around the world.

Conclusion

The convergence of efforts of every individual and every group here today forms part of that momentum that will bring us to a global ban. But I would like, if I may, to close by reaching out to one group in particular, to the young people among us and outside these walls.

A ban on land mines is a promise of a more secure future; as such, it is an issue of direct concern to all young people. Moreover, by adopting this issue as theirs, young people will bring to bear their special capacity to move the process forward, to change the international agenda. As the Italian philosopher Calvadosi said, "There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things." It is young people who have the strength, the hope and the vision of the future to bring about a new order, one in which land mines are no more than a grim and distant memory.

Thank you.

**Statement by Mr. Yasushi Akashi, Under-Secretary-General for
Humanitarian Affairs, on behalf of the Secretary-General, at the
International Strategy Conference on Land Mines, Ottawa, 3-5 October 1996**

Mr. Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is an honour for me to represent the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, at this International Strategy Conference on Land Mines. I should also like, as head of the Department for Humanitarian Affairs, to express my deep appreciation to the Government of Canada for its initiative in convening this Conference. I am confident that this occasion will provide an important impetus to the global endeavour aimed at putting an end to the scourge of land mines.

The use of land mines against civilians, humanitarian workers, and peace-keepers is indefensible. It is an affront to the human conscience. Countless millions of land mines pollute roads, fields and communities, and act as a brake on the efforts of people struggling to rebuild their lives after years of conflict. Because of these mines, thousands of innocent civilians will continue to be brutally injured and suffer horrific mutilation. Many will die. Vast spaces of arable land will lay fallow. Whole regions will remain uninhabitable. In many cases, there will be no genuine peace at the end of years of conflict.

Since the Paris Peace Accords ended the war in Cambodia in 1991, the international community, with the active participation of Canadian personnel and others, has been systematically engaged in mine clearance in that country. Nonetheless, at present rates of clearance, it will take 130 more years to free Cambodia from the scourge of land mines. And Cambodia is far from alone. Mozambique, Afghanistan, Angola, Laos, the former Yugoslavia are all suffering from the land mines plague. As many as 70 countries are infected. We cannot - we must not - allow this plague to continue.

The Government of Canada is to be commended for its timely action to bring together so many representatives from governments, non-governmental organizations and international bodies to consolidate efforts in support of a global ban on the production, use and export of land mines.

As you know, during the past several years, the Secretary-General has devoted considerable efforts to persuade world leaders to agree to a total ban on all land mines. He is encouraged by the fact that the number of States which support a global ban on anti-personnel land mines has significantly increased since the Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons concluded its work last May. It is also heartening to note that the number of States having adopted unilateral bans on the transfer or use of such mines continues to grow.

Those of you who followed the opening of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly last week will have been very encouraged by the number of countries that chose to use that forum to announce their support for the total elimination of these terrible weapons. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Brazil, who was the first speaker in the general debate at the United Nations General Assembly, announced his Government's decision to declare a moratorium on the export of land mines and called for all countries that export land mines to join Brazil in this decision. The following day, President Clinton went much further, with his announcement that the United States will support a global ban on anti-personnel land mines.

These two examples, together with many others, demonstrate that there is progress - considerable progress - but we must keep up the pressure and maintain our efforts until every government has agreed to a total and unequivocal ban on land mines.

The agreement on Protocol II of the CCW Convention, as amended on 3 May 1996, has set a new precedent for international and humanitarian arms-control law. Although this agreement fell short of my own expectations and that of the international public, significant progress has been made in a number of areas. The scope of application of the Convention has been extended to cover internal conflicts. For the first time, the provision bans the transfer of all non-detectable anti-personnel land mines. And, of particular importance for many of you here today, the provisions governing the protection of peace and humanitarian missions have been strengthened.

The amended Protocol also stipulates that annual conferences of the States Parties will be held to deal with the implementation of the amended Protocol. I sincerely hope that those conferences will sustain the impetus garnered here today, and will attract the public and political support of States for the search for a lasting solution to the problem of anti-personnel land mines - for their complete ban. The Secretary-General and I are fully committed to these efforts.

In his capacity as depositary of the "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects", the Secretary-General transmitted the amended Protocol II to all States. Early acceptance and entry into force, as well as universal adherence to and full compliance with the provisions of the amended Protocol, are essential for its implementation. We urge all parties to undertake the necessary measures so that the amended Protocol will enter into force as soon as possible.

While we continue to pursue a total ban on land mines, the United Nations will simultaneously strengthen its capacity and efforts to address the problems of the millions of mines that are already in place. This is a very costly and dangerous operation, and I would like to take this opportunity to personally thank all those who daily risk their lives helping remove these weapons often under the most difficult of circumstances.

I would also like to thank those governments that have provided support to the de-mining activities of the United Nations, and to urge the governments gathered here to lead the way in the provision of future support.

The purpose of this Conference is to move the international community toward a global ban on land mines. Other priorities of the international community include assistance to the victims of land mines, and mine-clearance activities. A recent conference in Denmark focussed on the need to develop international standards and to improve technology for mine clearance. All of these activities will have to be effectively managed in order to ensure a coherent and efficient international campaign to rid the world of these cowardly weapons once and for all. To assist with this coordinated approach, the U.N. Department of Humanitarian Affairs, as the focal point within the United Nations system for all matters related to land mines, is ready to play its full part and is committed to the success of its mission.

There are an estimated 110 million mines buried in the ground in more than 70 countries around the world. These mines are waiting to kill and maim innocent children and will continue to kill and maim for many decades to come. This must be stopped! It is within our reach to convince those countries who allow the production, stockpiling, marketing and use of land mines to stop doing so.

Your conference is an important contribution to this endeavor. I wish you all well in your deliberations over the course of the next few days.

International Campaign to Ban Landmines
Presentation to the Opening Session
of the Ottawa Conference
3 October 1996

by Chris Moon

Mr. Foreign Minister, distinguished delegates and participants,

It is an honor to speak at the beginning of this historic undertaking. I am speaking on behalf of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, a coalition of more than 650 non-governmental organizations in more than three dozen nations, dedicated to the elimination of antipersonnel landmines. Since 1992 we have called for no production, export, stockpiling or use of antipersonnel mines, as well as for greatly increased resources for humanitarian mine clearance, mine awareness, and victim assistance programs.

Many countries have taken impressive steps unilaterally -- critical elements in the movement toward a ban. But the Campaign believes that this first pro-ban conference is the most important step so far in the effort to rid the world of this inherently indiscriminate weapon that kills or maims a man, woman or child every twenty minutes. Eighteen months ago, whilst supervising a demining project in Mozambique, I lost my lower right leg and right hand to a mine buried below detector range. I do not consider myself to be a victim because I chose to clear mines. People in the mine-affected countries have no choice and there others here who did not chose to encounter landmines in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Somalia or Israel, but have suffered because they did.

No one should doubt that there has been a sea-change in the international attitude toward controlling and eliminating antipersonnel landmines. Delegates to this conference hardly need reminding that it was just one year ago when the Vienna CCW Review Conference deadlocked. Some might have considered it a lowpoint in the ban movement; but it was, in part, the international focus on the CCW review which helped result in the truly stunning momentum of the movement to ban antipersonnel mines. The impressive number of governments here in Ottawa today -- almost as many as participated in the CCW review -- is a sure indicator of the new reality: a comprehensive international ban can no longer be considered utopian. It is clearly an attainable goal. There will be a ban, it is only a question of when.

The success of this meeting could well determine whether we achieve a ban in

Steering Committee:

**Vietnam Veterans of
America Foundation**
Coordinator
RR 1, Box 871
Putney, VT 05346 USA
Ph: +802-387-2080
Fax: +802-387-2081
Email: banmines@sover.net

**Afghan Campaign to
Ban Landmines**
Islamabad, Pakistan

**Cambodia Campaign to
Ban Landmines**
Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Handicap International
Paris, France

Human Rights Watch
Washington, DC, USA

Medico International
Frankfurt, Germany

Mines Advisory Group
Cockermouth, Cumbria, UK

**Physicians for
Human Rights**
Boston, MA, USA

Radda Barnen
Stockholm, Sweden

the near term – by the year 2000 or even sooner – or whether it is accomplished in the long run, one or two or three decades from now. The next year or two are a crucial period which will determine if the landmine crisis will be treated as a humanitarian and socio-economic crisis deserving of highest priority or whether it will be relegated to the diplomatic and disarmament dust bin, just another one of the dozens of urgent issues facing us all. The actions of the people gathered here, and those they represent, will make the difference.

Foreign Minister Axworthy, I would like to express the deep appreciation and admiration of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines for the leadership that Canada has shown, and for your personal commitment on this issue. The steps that Canada has taken at the national and regional levels, and now internationally by convening this meeting, have served as concrete examples to other governments.

We also very much appreciate the recognition that you and the Canadian government have given to NGOs and the International Campaign to Ban Landmines for the role we have played on landmines. We fully realize that Canada is breaking new ground with this conference in permitting NGOs to participate in a very substantive fashion. While we believe this can serve as a model on other issues, it is particularly appropriate here because we are convinced that a ban is likely to be achieved most rapidly and effectively through greatly increased cooperation and coordination among governments, NGOs, international organizations, and U.N. agencies. History should remember this meeting as the point at which NGOs and a large number of governments began working together seriously to achieve a common aim.

It is worth noting that the NGOs who have formed the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, along with the ICRC, were responsible for bringing this issue to international prominence and the attention of governments and the public. Indeed, the roots of this very meeting can be traced directly to NGOs and to the International Campaign. In Vienna in October 1995, at the CCW Review Conference, the Campaign highlighted the formation of an identifiable and committed group of pro-ban governments as a top priority. At the time, we counted only 14 such governments. In January 1996 the ICBL convened the first meeting of pro-ban states, attended by 8 governments, on the final day of the Geneva CCW “technical” meeting. Two more meetings of pro-ban states were held during the final CCW session in Geneva in April and May 1996, the first sponsored by the Quaker Geneva office and the ICBL, the second by the Canadian government and the ICBL. Roughly 16 governments attended each of those meetings and it was during those meetings that Canada expressed its intention to host this meeting.

By the end of the CCW Review Conference, we counted 39 pro-ban

governments, including ten that declared their support during that final 2-week session. I think that both the Campaign and the Canadian government have been surprised and pleased by the response to this conference. Nearly 20 nations that had not previously committed support for an immediate and comprehensive ban are attending here as full participants.

Mr. Foreign Minister, distinguished delegates, the International Campaign is hopeful that a strong final declaration will be agreed to here, but even more hopeful that a concrete plan of action will emerge to get us rapidly to a ban. The International Campaign calls on this conference to challenge the international community to achieve the goal of no production, trade or use of antipersonnel mines by the year 2000. The International Campaign calls for a partnership of states that have already taken meaningful unilateral steps and will work with the ICBL, ICRC and UN agencies to fulfill the action plan leading to a total ban. Finally, the International Campaign calls on all governments participating in this meeting, who have not yet done so, to take national steps to ban all antipersonnel mine exports, effective immediately; to ban antipersonnel mine production and use; and to begin destruction of stockpiles with the goal of completion by the year 2000.

Foreign Minister Axworthy, the world is calling for a ban. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines presented to the CCW review conference the *signatures of millions of people from dozens of countries calling for ban*. The International Campaign and the United Nations have continued to gather signatures as citizens are demanding the elimination of this weapon with ever-increasing urgency. On behalf of Ambassador Akashi from the UN; of Usman Fitrat, Jerry White and Ken Rutherford of the Landmine Survivors Network and Brian and Carol Isfeld, whose son Mark died while demining in Bosnia we would like to present to you, for this conference, these 2.6 million signatures.

Thank you.

The International Campaign to Ban Landmines Call for Action on Anti-Personnel (AP) Mines

While there has been tremendous movement toward a ban, as evidenced by the converging here in Ottawa of like-minded states, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), United Nations agencies, pro-ban Parliamentarians and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the continued development of the ban movement requires concrete steps. Thus, the ICBL would propose the following:

A global ban on AP mines will be achieved most rapidly through increased cooperation and coordination within the international community. The International Campaign calls for an international partnership to carry out an action plan to achieve a total ban. This partnership should include states that have already taken meaningful unilateral steps to ban mines and would work closely with the ICBL, ICRC and UN agencies to fulfill the action plan.

The achievement of a ban will require action globally, regionally and nationally by governments, the ICBL, the ICRC and UN agencies to ensure the continued building of public awareness to galvanize the political will necessary to accomplish the rapid completion of a ban treaty.

International steps could include:

1. Laying the groundwork for a new legally-binding international treaty banning AP mines through free-standing negotiations outside the UN framework.
2. Expanding the number of governments making a political commitment of support for an urgent, comprehensive AP mine ban.
3. Ensuring passage of a strong UN General Assembly resolution in 1996, building on previous resolutions calling for export moratoriums, that calls for bans, or at a minimum, moratoria on production and use, as well as export.
4. Establishing an international register on landmines in order to promote transparency on AP mine production, export, and stockpiling.
5. Increasing funding, particularly from international financial institutions, for

Steering Committee:

**Vietnam Veterans of
America Foundation**
Coordinator
RR 1, Box 871
Putney, VT 05346 USA
Ph: +802-387-2080
Fax: +802-387-2081
Email: banmines@sover

**Afghan Campaign to
Ban Landmines**
Islamabad, Pakistan

**Cambodia Campaign to
Ban Landmines**
Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Handicap International
Paris, France

Human Rights Watch
Washington, DC, USA

Medico International
Frankfurt, Germany

Mines Advisory Group
Cockermouth, Cumbria

**Physicians for
Human Rights**
Boston, MA, USA

Radda Barnen
Stockholm, Sweden

mine clearance, mine awareness, and victim assistance programs, emphasizing the critical link between such programming and comprehensive post-conflict development programs in any mine-affected country and the critical link between a ban on APMs and the ultimate ability to create a truly mine-free world.

Regional Action could include:

1. Promoting regional approaches to the AP mine ban: building on the recent decision by Central American presidents to ban use, production and trade of APMs, encourage other regions to follow suit and establish more mine-free-zones, in which all governments of a region would commit to no production, stockpiling, trade or use of AP mines.
2. Encouraging increased funding for mine clearance and victim assistance to those regions which have declared themselves "mine-free zones."

National Action could include:

1. Encouraging governments that have expressed support for an AP ban, but have not yet done so, to take concrete domestic steps to ban APMs, including: the adoption of national bans on production, export, and use of APMs; destruction of AP mine stockpiles by the year 2000; make public detailed information on past and current APM stockpiles, production and trade.
2. Encouraging ratification of the revised Convention on Conventional Weapons with the reservation by ratifying states that they are doing so with a mind to encourage an international treaty completely banning APMs.
3. Public awareness activities (petition campaigns, awareness days, ads in print/tv/radio, documentaries) by NGOs, UN, ICRC, governments.
4. Increased research, analysis, and dialogue on the issue of the military necessity of landmines; increased dialogue would include ongoing meetings between military and the ICBL, ICRC, UN agencies as well as encouraging debate within military alliances, such as NATO.
5. Increased research on government and private manufacture, stockpiling and transfer of APMs; and increased focus on convincing private manufacturers of APMs and APM components to get out of the business.

**ICBL Comments to the Chairman's Session Ottawa Conference
3 October 1996**

delivered by Jody Williams, VVAF
Coordinator, ICBL

Mister Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to address the conference again on behalf of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. I wanted to take a few moments to give our view of what is necessary to achieve a ban on antipersonnel landmines. We have distributed a Campaign action plan so I will not take the time to read it to you here. I will only take a few moments to stress the most critical elements to achieving a ban.

There has been tremendous movement toward a ban in the past four years. When we started the International Campaign to Ban Landmines nothing was happening on the issue. That we are all here today in Ottawa is evidence of the continuing movement toward a ban of AP mines.

Reaching a ban requires leadership. Leadership is the result of focussing on a goal and not looking down at the obstacles to reaching that goal. Canada has shown visionary leadership in convening this conference. In taking the initiative to move quickly beyond the CCW and strategize here to build momentum for a ban.

We also appreciate the willingness of the Canadian government to work so closely with the ICBL and Mines Action Canada. We appreciate the fact that so many countries have included NGO representatives on their delegations to this conference.

We have moved as quickly as we have toward a ban because the ICBL, the ICRC, UN agencies and governments have pushed to make change happen. We applaud the willingness of Belgium to convene a follow-on conference that will demonstrably contribute to the movement toward a ban and Norway's expressed desire to actively contribute to the ban process and host a third pro-ban meeting.

Between now and the time of the conference in Belgium, countries must convert their words to action at the national, regional and international level. We echo the words of the delegate from Norway that states must put their policy into practice.

It is no longer enough to have moratoria on use, production and trade. It is no longer enough to call for suspensions of use except when you want to use them. You can no longer play both sides of the coin. For the Campaign, putting policy into action means national bans. Not moratoria, not half measures, no exclusions, no exceptions.

We will work regionally to encourage the continued establishment of mine-free zones. When such a zone has been established, we will work hard to encourage increased funding for clearance and victim assistance for those regions which have become mine-free zones.

I would also like to comment on the issue of an appropriate forum to negotiate a ban. We have heard governments here say that we cannot move forward until everyone is at the table. The Campaign does not believe that the world must or should wait for everyone to agree before moving forward.

We are not encouraged to hear the suggestion that the CD is the appropriate forum for negotiations. It is a closed club. It is an exclusive club. It only has 53 members. There are many other reasons to argue against the CD and I will not elaborate them now. But I will point out the two fundamental reasons that this Campaign is advocating free-standing negotiations outside the UN framework:

1. The global landmine crisis is a humanitarian issue not a security issue. Because it is a humanitarian issue and not a security issue, a ban treaty should not be negotiated within an arms control framework like the CD.
2. The world is calling for the urgent completion of a ban treaty. In proposing the CD, governments are using the example of the successful completion of negotiations of a chemical weapons treaty in that forum. It is important to point out that those negotiations took decades. Decades is not exactly an urgent timeframe.

I would like to conclude by noting again that achieving a ban requires visionary leadership -- like the leadership shown by Canada in convening this conference. We would hope that Canada will continue its leadership. We will be thrilled to continue to work in partnership with the Canadian government and with those governments that have taken meaningful steps toward change. And we will press governments that have not done so to do so. This Campaign is a voice for the victims and we will do what we can to ensure the urgent completion of a ban.

Thank you.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

October 4, 1996

Contact: Jerry White or Barbara Ayotte
(613) 990-6761 or (613) 991-2885

NGOS DEMAND BAN ON LANDMINES BY THE YEAR 2000

OTTAWA- At the opening of a historic conference, Canada was applauded for its decision to convene the first meeting of pro-ban states. "For momentum to continue, however, concrete political action at all levels--national, regional, and international--is critical for achieving this global ban," said Jody Williams, coordinator of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines.

"There is tremendous movement to achieve a ban. This conference signifies that," said Williams. "We will continue to work with those countries who have taken meaningful steps and will continue to push those who have not."

The International Campaign presented delegates with an action plan outlining steps to achieve the ban by the year 2000. "The International Campaign calls on this conference to challenge the international community to achieve the goal of no production, trade, or use of antipersonnel mines by the year 2000," said Chris Moon, a British mine clearance expert who lost his lower right leg and right hand to a landmine in Mozambique in 1995.

The International Campaign maintains that free-standing negotiations outside the United Nations should be the framework for dealing with landmines. It is critical the landmines issue be treated as one of humanitarian and socio-economic crisis and not one of disarmament. "We are here as a voice for those who live with the horror of landmines every day," said Williams.

Impetus for a ban is growing and will only move forward with increased coordination between countries and organizations.

The International Campaign to Ban Landmines is a coalition of more than 650 nongovernmental organizations in over 40 countries. The international campaign calls for an international ban on the use, production, stockpiling, and transfer of antipersonnel landmines and for increased resources for victim assistance and mine clearance.

Steering Committee:

**Vietnam Veterans of
America Foundation**
Coordinator
RR 1, Box 871
Putney, VT 05346 USA
Ph: +802-387-2080
Fax: +802-387-2081
Email: banmines@sover.i

**Afghan Campaign to
Ban Landmines**
Islamabad, Pakistan

**Cambodia Campaign to
Ban Landmines**
Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Handicap International
Paris, France

Human Rights Watch
Washington, DC, USA

Medico International
Frankfurt, Germany

Mines Advisory Group
Cockermouth, Cumbria

**Physicians for
Human Rights**
Boston, MA, USA

Radda Barnen
Stockholm, Sweden

#

U.S. SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY

VERMONT

**SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY
"TOWARDS A GLOBAL BAN ON
ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES"
OTTAWA
OCTOBER 4, 1996**

Good morning. I would like to say a few words about two of my distinguished colleagues on this panel, Mr. Sommaruga and Ambassador Molander.

I began my own crusade against landmines seven years ago when I saw what mines were doing to children in Central America and Africa. I visited prosthetics clinics supported by the Leahy War Victims Fund in those places, and everywhere I went the International Committee of the Red Cross was already there.

And when I introduced my legislation to stop exports of anti-personnel mines from the United States, and then to stop their use, I turned to the ICRC for the facts and the legal arguments, to win the support of a majority in Congress.

Many people have contributed to this effort, which has grown remarkably in the past few years, but the ICRC has been the guiding light for all of us. The ICRC was there aiding mine victims before anyone else was paying attention, and Mr. Sommaruga has been a powerful voice for a global ban.

Ambassador Molander agreed to chair the CCW review conference even though he was already convinced that only a global ban would solve this problem. And he knew that the CCW review conference would not achieve what was in fact impossible at that time and in that forum.

So I want to applaud Ambassador Molander for accepting the challenge.

I know some of you were there and saw how hard it was to get consensus on anything. Some of the changes were far-reaching, like expanding the scope of the Protocol. Others, I am afraid, will have little effect. One — narrowing the definition of anti-personnel mine, troubles me a great deal.

But the reality is that without the CCW conference I doubt we would be here today. In large measure, I credit Ambassador Molander with making this Ottawa conference possible, because he has tirelessly pressed for stronger action.

I was unable to attend the CCW negotiations, so I am very pleased to be here. The Canadian Government deserves our gratitude for its leadership in seizing the opportunity presented by the growing list of countries – 41 at last count, that have declared support for an immediate, total ban.

We are starting a new phase in what is admittedly a great challenge – ridding the world of one of the most insidious weapons ever used.

For the past four years, we have accomplished a great deal by educating the public, and their leaders, about the effects of landmines.

We have emphasized their inherently indiscriminate nature, and discredited the argument made by some members of the military that it is people who use landmines irresponsibly that are to blame, not the mines themselves. Both are to blame.

We have documented the outrageous human toll, in people maimed and killed per minute, per day, per month, per year. We have all seen the pictures of mutilated children who innocently picked up a shiny object only to lose their arms, their face, or their lives.

We have described the horrendous costs to whole societies, in human and economic terms.

Our Secretary of State, among others, has called the scourge of landmines "mass destruction in slow motion," and the State Department has said that landmines "may be the most toxic and widespread pollution facing mankind."

Virtually every major newspaper from New York to Tokyo, CNN and the major television networks, have reported extensively on the problem.

The public has listened. Everywhere I go people talk about a landmine ban. Whenever President Clinton sees me coming and before I can get a word out, he says "I know Pat, landmines." At the United Nations last week, he renewed his appeal for the urgent negotiation of a worldwide ban.

Every member of the United Nations General Assembly is on record supporting the "eventual elimination" of anti-personnel mines. There has been great progress towards stopping exports of these weapons, with the notable exception of China, and many Western governments have taken steps to halt production and use and destroy their stockpiles.

This is remarkable progress, but it has taken place without a plan of action for achieving a global ban. That, of course, is why we are here, and the Canadian government deserves great credit and our thanks for the leadership it has shown in seizing the initiative and hosting this conference.

As we begin this new phase, we should keep two points in mind:

— The first is that the world is not yet ready for an international ban on anti-personnel mines. We saw that in Geneva, and we saw it when President Clinton said that the United States will not end its use of anti-personnel mines until there is an international ban.

— The second is that an international ban is achievable, and probably in less time than any of us would have thought. Out of 187 nations, only a handful oppose it.

It is no secret that I was disappointed that President Clinton did not renounce U.S. use of anti-personnel mines, as many of our allies have done. I believe that, with the possible exception of the Korea DMZ — a unique situation where we need to act in unison with our South Korean allies, the United States, the world's strongest military power, could responsibly end its use of these weapons immediately. Doing so would give a tremendous boost to the effort for a global ban.

I am not alone in thinking so. 15 of my country's most distinguished retired military officers, including our former commanders in Korea, Vietnam, NATO and the Persian Gulf, agree with me.

Despite that, I take seriously the President's commitment to negotiate an international ban, with a view to completing the negotiations "as soon as possible."

There has already been considerable debate over the forum for those negotiations. There is disagreement within my own government. Some favor the U.N. Conference on Disarmament; some favor the CCW; others a newly established forum outside the U.N. system. I know the European states are also divided on this.

The importance of this question cannot be overstated. The composition of the forum, rules of procedure, and the nature of the agreement to be negotiated will affect the pace and success of our efforts in the future.

I recognize the arguments in favor of the CD — it is already established and has its own budget. All major powers are members. It served us well in the recent negotiations on a nuclear test ban.

I also recognize the arguments in favor of the CCW, which is the only forum where this problem can be debated by all countries. But I am convinced that those arguments are outweighed by the problems the CD and CCW would pose to early progress in negotiating a global ban on anti-personnel mines.

Several major powers have made clear that they oppose a total ban, and any one of them can block consensus indefinitely. We saw that happen with the chemical weapons treaty, and we saw how it prevented the adoption of modest proposals at the CCW review conference.

Ultimately, an international ban will need to include those countries. But the question is how best to get there? Do we permit a few to prevent progress from the outset, or do we pursue a course that seizes the momentum we have to get an early agreement among like-minded states, and then try to bring the outsiders in?

I strongly favor the latter course, and see no reason why the 50-plus nations represented here could not begin this process immediately. I am convinced that in a short time, that number would double and then triple.

So while I strongly support President Clinton's appeal for these negotiations, we cannot afford to lose momentum.

As it was pointed out yesterday, non-governmental organizations — the Red Cross, Vietnam Veterans, Mines Action Canada — and parliamentarians, have led this effort. Until the Congress passed my amendment to halt U.S. exports, governments ignored this problem. Since then, we have seen how the armed forces have resisted our efforts.

Getting to a ban is a matter of political will, and our success is largely due to our ability to be a voice for the public's revulsion towards these weapons.

We have seen that unilateral action is absolutely key. It has been the driving force in this effort.

Today, four years after President Bush signed my export moratorium into law, 46 governments have stopped exports. We have, in effect, a de facto export ban. One of our goals in this next phase should be to make those moratoria

permanent. Every nation represented here should do this without delay.

Another major focus should be to stop making the problem worse by producing more mines. There is no justification for adding to the incalculable misery these weapons already cause.

With tens of millions in stockpiles already and every nation on record in favor of their eventual elimination, we should put the mine companies out of production, forever. Every nation here should do this.

Regional initiatives in support of these goals would also be important, as we have done in adopting a Western Hemisphere mine-free zone. Africa should be next. Imagine a mine-free Africa, a continent where today whole countries have been turned into death traps from millions of landmines.

I want to mention two other initiatives.

Seven years ago I established the Leahy War Victims Fund, a \$5 million fund in the U.S. foreign aid budget. It has provided artificial limbs for mine victims from Central America to Vietnam. But far more is needed.

This is a worldwide scourge and we need an "International Mine Victims Fund," supported by governments, the World Bank, private corporations and foundations, with a sufficient endowment to produce the annual income to sustain these programs indefinitely.

Finally, in a few weeks, in a few weeks I will introduce, on behalf of my government, a resolution in the United Nations that calls on all states to support negotiations for a ban, and to take unilateral steps such as those I have suggested. This goes farther than previous resolutions, and deserves broad support. We need to work together to encourage governments that are not here to cosponsor.

These are ambitious goals, but with over 40 nations supporting an immediate ban, there is no excuse. As Jody Williams of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines said so eloquently yesterday, it is time for governments to put policy into practice. Let us remember Chris Moon, and Ken Rutherford and Gerry White, and the other landmine survivors here. It is they who remind us why we are here, and of the humanitarian urgency of this task.

I want to close by again expressing my gratitude to the Canadian government for holding this conference. The fact that so many pro-ban nations are here should

encourage all of us. But while it is fine to hold conferences and negotiations in beautiful cities like Geneva and Ottawa and Washington, perhaps next time we should put the negotiating table in the middle of a minefield in Cambodia. And we can tell the officials whose job it is to negotiate a ban to walk out to the table, and if they have not banned landmines by the end of the first day, we will put the table in another field, and they can walk through it. How long do you think it would be before they had banned anti-personnel landmines forever?

Thank you very much.



COMITÉ INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE

Towards a Total Ban on Anti-personnel Mines

International Strategy Conference

Ottawa, 3-5 October 1996

Statement of Cornelio Sommaruga

President

International Committee of the Red Cross, Geneva

4 October 1996

I would like to pay tribute at the outset to the Canadian government and in particular to Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy for undertaking this important initiative to bring the international community together, for the first time, in pursuit of the total prohibition and elimination of anti-personnel landmines. This conference is invested with the aspirations of many tens of thousands of potential civilian victims who simply wish to live their lives without fear that the land which feeds them will kill or maim them, that the rains and streams upon which they depend will carry the seeds of unspeakable suffering, that a step too far will be the last. This is not too much for a human being to hope for; this is why this conference can and must succeed.

Every single day our doctors and nurses have to look into the eyes of children writhing in pain from a limb turned into a bloody tangle of blood, dirt, plastic bits, bone fragments and flesh. Eyes which ask us "why, why, why?"; to which we have no coherent answer. Neither, so far, has the international community.

Given its mandate to care for and protect the victims of war the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) would have been negligent if it did not act. In our field work we have made intensive efforts to develop effective surgical techniques for mine victims and to expand prosthetic and rehabilitative care. In 1995 alone ICRC's 33 prosthetics programs fitted nearly 8 thousand amputees and manufactured some 11 thousand prosthesis. Over the past decade we have treated over 30 thousand mine victims and cooperated with local and national medical personnel to assist many times that number. We are currently running mine awareness programs for civilian populations in six countries on four continents.

In addition to its specific operational mandate as an impartial humanitarian organization in situations of armed conflict the ICRC is charged with the promotion and development of international humanitarian law. Based on our field experience we began consultations in 1992 with military commanders, diplomats, and legal and medical experts to develop a view of what could be done on the legal level. By early 1994 we were convinced that anti-personnel mines were too cheap, too small and too difficult to use according to the complex rules of the 1980 UN Convention. At that point we publicly stated our view that these mines are an indiscriminate weapon and that the only effective solution would be an absolute prohibition on their production, transfer and use. My first high level political contact on this issue was here in Ottawa with the Honourable Prime Minister of Canada, Jean Chrétien, in May 1994.

Anti-personnel mines must not only be outlawed, but their use must also be stigmatized, so that whatever their understanding of the law combatants will choose not to use them because they are considered abhorrent to the societies in which they operate. Towards this end the ICRC, along with the entire Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement launched in 1995, for the first time in its history, an international media campaign seeking to stigmatize AP mines and call for their elimination. Global efforts to reach the public on this issue have been effective. A recent survey by the Gallup organization of public opinion in 21 countries, from both north and south, shows support for a total ban by 60 to 92 percent of these populations, including - I am glad to say - 73% of Canadians.

Since 1994 the ICRC has had the privilege, in keeping with its mandate as guardian of the Geneva Conventions, to participate and contribute background documentation to the preparatory process and meetings of the Review Conference of the 1980 UN Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons.

The ICRC warmly welcomed a number of improvements in the landmines Protocol including its extension to apply in both international and non-international armed conflicts, clear assignment of responsibility for mine clearance, requirements that the location of all mines be recorded, new protections for ICRC and other humanitarian workers and a requirement that States enact penal sanctions to punish serious violations of its provisions.

Unfortunately, the new limitations on the use of anti-personnel mines, covering detectability and self-destruction of certain mines, are weak and overly complex. There is a danger that these provisions will not be implemented in the type of conflicts in which most recent use has occurred. Poorly trained or equipped forces may be unwilling or unable to abide by a complex set of rules or pay an increased price for self-destructing mines. It is indeed appalling that parties are not required to implement even these minimal restrictions on use until 9 years after entry-into-force of the revised Protocol, which means around 2007. By this time we expect that mines will have claimed well over 200,000 new victims - unless States do far more than is required by the law.

We are therefore greatly encouraged that more than forty States have come to Ottawa ready to do more; determined to go beyond what could be achieved by the lowest common denominator in a process of consensus and explore what must be done in the name of humanity, compassion and enlightened self-interest.

It is our belief that the Ottawa plan of action towards the elimination of anti-personnel mines can build upon four conclusions which many States have accepted, explicitly or implicitly, in supporting a total ban:

1. that States have a moral and humanitarian responsibility to protect their own populations and territories from the proven effects of anti-personnel mines;
2. that these weapons are inherently indiscriminate;
3. that, as agreed by a wide range of acting and former military commanders, the use of anti-personnel mines in accordance with law and doctrine is difficult, if not impossible, even for modern professional armies, and
4. that the limited military utility of anti-personnel mines is far outweighed by their human, economic and social costs.

In accepting these conclusions one is compelled to move beyond negotiation to independent action. The end of the landmines crisis can not await a globally negotiated consensus. Indeed, few, if any, emergencies of this scale have been resolved by consensus. The ICRC is convinced that leadership by like-minded governments, non-governmental bodies and the concerned public is now indispensable in ending the landmines crisis. Let me indicate the kind of steps we have in mind:

1. **National and Regional Initiatives** - National governments and regional or sub-regional organizations can decide to eliminate anti-personnel mines from their own territories and thus contribute to a global solution. The twenty-five States which have renounced the use of anti-personnel mines and the eleven which are destroying their stockpiles have begun the process of changing State practice. When a critical mass of States have taken such steps a de

facto ban will have been achieved; a legal ban may follow as State practice changes.

We welcome the resolution adopted in June by the **Organisation of American States** which called for the establishment of an "Anti-personnel Mine Free Zone" in the Americas. A similar initiative of the **Central American Parliament**, in which national renunciation of AP mines is combined with increased assistance for mine-clearance and victim assistance could make Central America the first mine infested region to free itself from this scourge.

In February 1996 the Council of Ministers of the **Organisation of African Unity** called on sub-regional organizations to launch initiatives for the prohibition of AP mines in support of the OAU's previous commitment to a total ban.

Although such action has not yet reached governmental level in Europe, the **European Parliament**, on 13 May, called on all Member States to unilaterally ban the production and use of AP mines and to destroy existing stocks.

2. At the **global level** the Ottawa conference must clearly signal the beginning of the end of anti-personnel mines. It can only do so by committing States present to a specific plan of concrete actions which they will take independently and encourage others to take. Renunciation of the use of anti-personnel mines by a specific early date and a permanent end to their production and transfer should be the hallmarks of the Ottawa Group and an example for others to follow. Indeed many of the States present have already undertaken such commitments. In taking on such political commitments States of the Ottawa group will be in a stronger position to promote consideration of similar steps in resolutions of the UN **General Assembly** and regional fora.

The Ottawa Group can also commit themselves to specific forms of political cooperation and material assistance among themselves, for instance in the destruction of existing mines and mine clearance activities. We hope this Group will launch a process of regular meetings which will review progress in implementing the Ottawa declaration and consider new means to promote a global ban.

3. Although it is essential to continue building support for a future global legal ban on anti-personnel mines it is our view that it would be premature to begin **new global negotiations for a ban** before regional and political efforts, such as that being launched here, have a chance to mature. Given that recent negotiations by consensus on legal restraints produced only modest results the ICRC is concerned that new negotiations, particularly if conducted on the basis of consensus, would lead to further disillusionment with the negotiating process and could divert attention from national and regional decisions on how to achieve progress in particular geographic areas. In addition, there is a real danger that negotiations conducted exclusively in a disarmament context, as is now being considered, would quickly lose sight of the humanitarian purpose and humanitarian law basis of this exercise.

4. Progress in international humanitarian law is the result of an ongoing dialogue between military imperatives and humanitarian concerns. The ICRC sought to launch an in-depth dialogue on the **military utility** of anti-personnel mines through the publication, in March

1996, of a study by military commanders on the actual use and effectiveness of these weapons in 26 conflicts. The ICRC will seek in 1997 to broaden and deepen our dialogue on this issue with military officers and research institutes and would encourage efforts of others in the same direction.

5. Currently only a small proportion of mine victims have access to rehabilitation programs. Greatly **expanded resources for emergency medical treatment and lifetime prosthetics care** to victims are needed. National and international agencies must be encouraged to increase support for these essential efforts both through bilateral arrangements and through humanitarian agencies.

6. In 1995 pledges announced for **mine clearance** amounted to around \$100 million of the estimated \$33 billion required to clear all currently emplaced mines. A massive and long-term international effort is needed if future generations are to be spared paying the price for today's **landmine legacy**. Clearance efforts also need to be integrated into comprehensive **national and regional efforts** to ensure that new mines are not laid and that the needs of **affected populations** are addressed.

In closing I would like to return to the human face of the landmines crisis.

Much of the emphasis in efforts to ban anti-personnel mines has been on the fact, also stressed by the ICRC, that they injure combatants and civilians alike without discrimination. This focus on non-combatants is of great importance. However, it has stolen attention from another group of potential victims of war who are provided protection by international humanitarian law, namely, soldiers.

Article 35 of Protocol I additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 re-states a long-standing customary rule of humanitarian law: "It is prohibited to employ weapons....of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering". This rule is intended to protect combatants. It is understood to prohibit the infliction, by design, of more injury than is needed to take a soldier out of combat.

If a person steps on a buried anti-personnel mine, his or her foot or leg is blown off. The force of the blast drives earth, grass, the vaporized mine case and portions of the victim's shoe and foot upwards into the tissues of the other leg, buttocks, genitals, arms and sometimes the eyes. With those mines which have a larger volume of explosive, including some fragmentation mines, death may be inevitable. If the wounded person gets to a hospital with the necessary facilities and expertise (both of which are rare in mine affected countries) he or she will require several operations, will stay in hospital four weeks at least and will require a safe blood transfusion. Awaiting the survivor is permanent and severe disability with all the social, psychological and economic implications of being an amputee. Mines are designed to produce these effects.

Would not most people, including soldiers, describe the effects of mines just mentioned as superfluous and excessive to the military need?

The international response to the landmines crisis, the recent prohibition of blinding laser weapons, the well established bans on chemical and biological arms, and indeed the whole history of humanitarian law are proof that humanity is not impotent in the face of its worst

tendencies or the destructive uses of modern technology. Collectively the governments and organisations gathered here have the ability to ensure that anti-personnel landmines disappear from large parts of the world; that children in war torn lands no longer have to fear the ground they tread upon. In the name of the victims we insist that Ottawa must mark a watershed in eradicating forever the plague of anti-personnel mines.

CHECK AGAINST
DELIVERY

International Strategy Conference Ottawa, October 3-5, 1996

Towards a Global Ban on Anti-Personnel Mines

Statement

by

Ambassador Johan Molander, Sweden

Mr. Chairman,

Let me start by expressing my sincere gratitude to our hosts, the Canadian Government for this timely initiative. This conference will serve several important functions. It will further galvanize our efforts towards a total ban on antipersonnel mines, and it will help developing our thinking on how to find solutions to the landmine crisis. Canada continues a good tradition. In particular, I feel indebted to the Canadian delegation for its valuable and in some instances decisive contributions to the successful outcome of the CCW Review Conference.

Mr. Chairman,

It is gratifying to see how quickly the international community has moved on the landmine issue. Only two years have lapsed since Sweden - as the first country - formally proposed a total ban on antipersonnel mines. This occurred in August 1994, during the initial stages of the review of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. At that time, the Swedish proposal was met by many Governments with scepticism and even surprise. According to the conventional wisdom of 1994, antipersonnel mines were an integral and legitimate element of most armed forces. A total ban was totally unrealistic.

Today, some 50 countries have stated their support for an immediate total ban, and the number continues to increase.

The growing support for a total ban could not be reflected in the amended Landmine Protocol of the CCW. As a result, when the negotiations were concluded in Geneva in May, the outcome was dismissed by many observers as a failure. The new Landmine Protocol was described as an inadequate compromise.

I emphatically disagree.

Firstly, the amended Landmine Protocol sets a global minimum standard.

It is the best universally acceptable landmine régime that we are going to get for a foreseeable future.

Adherence to it and implementation of it are of paramount importance until such a day when all States accept a total ban and all antipersonnel mines are destroyed.

Secondly, the amended Protocol - if implemented - will make a major humanitarian difference. Let me list a few of our results from the Review Conference:

- an extension of the scope of application to cover internal conflicts. This constitutes a breakthrough in the development of international humanitarian law;
- a prohibition to use non-detectable antipersonnel mines, as well as remotely delivered antipersonnel mines that do not self-destruct and self-deactivate;
- a prohibition to transfer these two types of mine, with immediate effect as of 3 May 1996;
- a prohibition of anti-sensing devices on all kinds of mine;
- an obligation to impose individual penal sanctions on persons who violate the material provisions of the Protocol. Thus, violations of the Landmine Protocol will basically be treated as war crimes;
- a considerable strengthening of the rules to protect peace-keeping and other forces and missions of the UN, as well as humanitarian missions and missions of the ICRC, from the effects of landmines;
- a strengthening of the general restrictions on the use of all types of mine, particularly regarding marking and recording; the new Protocol also lays down a strict responsibility on the mine-laying party, either to clear or to maintain mine-fields that it has emplaced;

- a new Review Conference in 2001, and annual meetings of States Parties as soon as the amended Protocol enters into force.

These provisions are important.

If respected, they will save lives.

They break new ground in the development of humanitarian law.

Thirdly, the amended Protocol can serve as a stepping stone towards an ultimately global ban. It will, through its annual meetings, provide a forum for all States to discuss the landmine issue. These meetings will also serve to prepare further Review Conferences.

I sincerely hope that all States present here will, as a very minimum, ratify the Convention, its amended Protocol II and its new Protocol IV, within a year. I also hope that the present group of countries will take on the commitment to promote worldwide ratification of the CCW and its Protocols.

I am thus convinced of the paramount importance of the CCW to reduce and alleviate future landmine tragedies.

I am equally convinced that there is only one fully effective solution to the landmine problem - a comprehensive ban on antipersonnel mines.

How do we get there?

What can we do on the road to our goal?

Firstly, and obviously, increase our efforts in demining, mine clearance and victim rehabilitation.

Secondly, and of pivotal importance, curtail the availability of antipersonnel mines worldwide. The few producing countries which have not yet declared a moratorium on exports must be convinced, at the very least, to keep this particular commodity at home.

But moratoria are not enough.

We must increase our knowledge about production and transfer

Even the illegal black market must be eliminated. It should be possible. The volume-profit ratio in landmine trade cannot be high. If risk is increased that trade will cease.

Thirdly, I believe that think-tanks such as the International Institute for Strategic Studies, SIPRI, or the Common Security Forum could contribute in different ways, for example by tracking production and trade, and analysing the military utility of landmines.

The ICRC has laid the groundwork for such studies.

Fourthly, regional and national measures are important.

In Central America, a regional agreement to ban antipersonnel mines was signed in June. This concept of "mine-free zones" is worth pursuing in other regions, especially if a link is made between disarmament and mine clearance. It is only logical that countries receiving funds for mine-clearance should make every effort to prevent renewed deployment of mines, and should get rid of their stocks.

The Organization of American States and the European Parliament have called upon member countries to ban antipersonnel mines. Unilateral bans can prompt other countries to rethink their landmine policies. They illustrate our opprobrium of a weapon which we, upon reflection, feel is inherently indiscriminate.

My own Government, a few weeks ago, took the step of complementing the Swedish call for a global ban with a unilateral ban on all antipersonnel mines.

However useful all such measures may be - we still need a treaty.

A treaty banning antipersonnel mines would capitalize on the present groundswell of support.

It would serve to hold countries to their commitments.

It would be a rallying-point for further support.

It would confirm our wish to stigmatize antipersonnel mines as indiscriminate weapons, thereby contributing to the development of customary law.
It would be a vehicle for preventing transfers and increasing transparency.

A treaty banning antipersonnel mines will not be universal - if we want it within a foreseeable future. And I think we want it now.

It will still be meaningful if only one single potential mine-user - mine-abuser adheres and if it attracts broad and representative participation.

I submit it will.

There has been quite some discussion about the choice of a negotiating forum. But the choice of a forum is not the main issue.

The main issue remains a comprehensive ban on antipersonnel mines in legally binding form.

And our urgency to arrive at just that.

This is what should influence our choice of forum - not the other way round.

What should this treaty look like?

The treaty must, of course, recognize the universal character of the CCW but, at the same time, provide a legal framework for those of us who want to commit themselves even further.

It should be comprehensive: it should ban the use, production, transfer and stockpiling of antipersonnel mines.

It should set a strict time-frame for the destruction of current stockpiles.

It should provide transparency regarding stockpiles and destruction.

It should envisage a simple fact-finding procedure for alleged-use situations. Verification measures beyond that would be doomed to failure and only discourage adherence.

I am certain this treaty could be quickly drafted.

Mr. Chairman.

We know the staggering figures.

The thousands and thousands of victims. The mothers, the children.

The thousands of acres of fertile soil - rendered useless.

The refugees - unable to return.

The forbidding cost of mine clearance, human as well as financial.

We have heard it so many times, in so many conferences.

As if by repeating the horrors in figures, we try to distance ourselves from the human tragedies they are meant to describe.

The pain, the hopelessness, the utter absurdity of all this suffering.

We know, that nothing we do, can undo the death and mutilation which has already been sown, and which will reap its harvest of victims, one by one, day by day, year after year.

But we can reverse the trend.

If adherence to a new treaty will bring in one or two countries, where antipersonnel mine warfare could break out in the future, or countries in conflict areas where mines have been abused and stocks still exist - our effort will be worth its while.

I hope and trust that this meeting will help to turn the tide.

Thank you Mr. Chairman

Towards a Global Ban on Anti-Personnel Mines

Declaration of the Ottawa Conference

Following consultations with relevant international agencies, international organizations and non-governmental organizations, the states represented at the Ottawa conference, the "Ottawa Group", have agreed to enhance cooperation and coordination of efforts on the basis of the following concerns and goals with respect to anti-personnel mines:

1. a recognition that the extreme humanitarian and socio-economic costs associated with the use of anti-personnel mines requires urgent action on the part of the international community to ban and eliminate this type of weapon.
2. a conviction that until such a ban is achieved, states must work to encourage universal adherence to the prohibitions or restrictions on anti-personnel mines as contained in the amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons.
3. an affirmation of the need to convince mine affected states to halt all new deployments of anti-personnel mines to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of mine-clearance operations.
4. a recognition that the international community must provide significantly greater resources to mine-awareness programs, mine-clearance operations and victim assistance.
5. a commitment to work together to ensure :
 - the earliest possible conclusion of a legally-binding international agreement to ban anti-personnel mines;
 - progressive reductions in new deployments of anti-personnel mines with the urgent objective of halting all new deployments of anti-personnel mines;
 - support for an UNGA 51 resolution calling upon member states, inter alia, to implement national moratoria, bans or other restrictions, particularly on the operational use and transfer of anti-personnel mines at the earliest possible date;
 - regional and sub-regional activities in support of a global ban on anti-personnel mines; and,
 - a follow-on conference hosted by Belgium in June 1997 to review the progress of the international community in achieving a global ban on anti-personnel mines.

TOWARDS A GLOBAL BAN ON ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES

**International Strategy Conference
Ottawa, October 3-5, 1996**

CHAIRMAN'S AGENDA FOR ACTION ON ANTI-PERSONNEL (AP) MINES

Participants in the Ottawa Conference have re-affirmed their commitment to seek the earliest possible conclusion of a legally binding agreement to ban the production, stockpiling, transfer and use of Anti-Personnel (AP) mines. This agreement will be achieved most rapidly through increased cooperation within the international community.

The purpose of the Ottawa Conference was to catalyze practical efforts to move toward a ban and create partnerships between states, international organizations and agencies and non-governmental organizations essential to building the necessary political will to achieve a global ban on AP mines.

The following Agenda for Action captures the dynamism of the discussions in Ottawa, the recognition that movement toward a global ban has already begun and details concrete activities to be undertaken by the international community - on an immediate and urgent basis - to build upon the Ottawa Declaration and to move this process ahead in preparation for the follow-up meeting which will be hosted by Belgium in 1997.

This Agenda for Action reflects the interrelationship of the global ban, mine clearance and victim assistance agendas. It highlights the need to reach out beyond the already committed to engage the broader international community in the global ban effort. It also recognises that action must be taken at the global, regional, sub-regional and national levels to achieve a rapid global ban on AP mines.

A. Global Action

Building the necessary political will for a new legally-binding international agreement banning AP mines will require more nations to adopt national bans or moratoria on the production, stockpiling, use and transfer of AP mines. Nations which are not AP mine producers should also consider adopting bans on the imports of AP mines.

These actions will also have the effect of reducing the total number of new deployments of AP mines - deployments which would create new victims and increase the costs of mine clearance operations.

Global actions suggested by participants in this conference include:

1. The passage of an **UNGA 51 Resolution** promoting an international agreement to ban AP mines.

Recognising that a key vehicle for building international support for a global ban will be the development of overwhelming support for the resolution being proposed by the United States at the current session of the General Assembly, the following activities were identified as key opportunities to develop political support for the resolution:

- * 'potential co-sponsors' meeting - 10 October, New York (4 pm, UN Conference Room 9)
- * Inter-Parliamentary Union Meeting at the UN - 22 October
- * Parliamentarians for Global Action - Annual General Meeting, October, New York
- * Landmine Panel, NGO Committee on Disarmament, 24 October, New York
- * Work in regional or sub-regional groupings, as well as bilaterally, to build support for the resolution

2. Building **public awareness and political will** for a global AP mine ban.

Building increased public awareness of the social, economic and human costs of AP mines is essential to develop and sustain the necessary political will for a global AP mine ban. Opportunities for building political will and public awareness include:

- * Launch of the Machel Study in response to Resolution A/RES/48/157 of the 48th session of UNGA on the Impact of Armed Conflict (and Land Mines) on Children, New York at the UN and by Archbishop Tutu in South Africa - 11 November, 1996
- * Adoption of the Machel Report by the UNGA and implementation of its recommendations
- * Reports on progress in the development of national AP mines policies in national reporting on the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child to the Geneva-based Committee on the Rights of the Child
- * Engaging military experts in the study of the military utility/humanitarian costs of AP mine use
- * Adding the AP mine issue to the agenda of appropriate United Nations fora

3. Encourage rapid entry into force and universal adherence to the prohibitions and restrictions on AP mines as contained in the amended **Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons**.

4. Increased **exchanges of information and data on AP mines** and national AP mine policies to build the confidence and transparency necessary for rapid progress towards a global AP mine ban, including:

- * The development and publication of a global data-base on national AP mine policies (to be circulated by Canada in the fall of 1996)

- * Studies by experts on the international production and legal and illicit trade of AP mines

5. To lay the necessary groundwork for a legally binding international agreement to ban AP mines, Austria will produce a first draft and Canada will produce a possible framework for the verification of such an agreement.

6. Suggested **follow-up conferences** to the Ottawa Conference include:

- * Belgium, June 1997
- * Norway, Germany, Switzerland

B. Regional Action

Actions at the sub-regional and regional levels will be instrumental in catalyzing the development of political will for a global ban on AP mines. To build upon the recent decision by the Central American Council of Ministers for Foreign Affairs to ban the production, use and trade in AP mines - thus creating the world's first regional AP mine-free zone - participants in the Conference suggested the following actions:

Increased funding for mine clearance and victim assistance for those regions and sub-regions which have taken concrete steps to create "AP mine-free zones".

Within Africa:

- * Efforts to enhance the de-mining capacities of African countries with priority given to heavily mine-affected countries. This will include a Conference of African Experts in Demining and Assistance to Victims of Landmines (1997)
- * Meetings to engage military/national security experts on AP mines issues at the sub-regional level - including an ICRC seminar in Southern Africa (1997)

- * 4th ICBL Conference on Landmines: Toward a Mine-Free [Southern] Africa Feb 25-28, 1997 Maputo, Mozambique
- * Work towards the implementation of the three-part program of the Union Inter-african des droits de l'homme

Within Asia:

- * Meetings to engage military/national security experts on AP mines issues at the sub-regional level - including a planned ICRC/Philippines seminar (proposed for the first half of 1997)
- * ICBL Conference, 1998
- * Work toward consideration of AP mine issues within the ARF framework, including an ARF intersessional meeting on Demining for UN Peacekeepers, to be held in New Zealand in March/April 1997

Within the Americas:

- * Defence Ministerial of the Americas, Bariloche, Argentina, October 6-9 -- seek support for follow-up to the OAS resolution on "The Western Hemisphere as an Antipersonnel Land Mine-free Zone"
- * Special meeting at the end of October or early November 1996 of the Organization of American States' Committee on Hemispheric Security to promote implementation of OAS General Assembly Resolution "The Western Hemisphere as an Anti-personnel Land Mine-Free Zone" including:
 - information exchanges on national AP mine policies
 - provision of information to establish a hemispheric AP mine registry
- * Regional ICBL Conference - Fall 1997

- * Possible discussion in the Rio Group on AP mines under the topic of conventional arms control
- * Meetings to engage military authorities on AP mines issues at the regional and sub-regional level
- * Include anti-personnel land mines trade in discussions on illicit traffic in arms
- * Encourage development of CBM regimes to replace AP mines in border areas.

Within Europe:

- * Implementation by the European Union (EU) of the joint action on AP mines adopted by the EU on 1 October 1996, in which the EU clearly asserts its determination to pursue the total elimination of AP mines. To this end:
 - the EU will pursue efforts to ensure full implementation of the results of the Review Conference of the 1980 Convention on the one hand, and support for international efforts to ban AP mines on the other hand;
 - the EU is committed to the goal of the total elimination of AP mines and shall work actively towards the achievement at the earliest possible date of an effective international agreement to ban these weapons worldwide;
 - the EU shall seek to raise without delay the issue of a total ban in the most appropriate international forum;
 - the Member States of the EU shall implement a common moratorium on the export of all AP mines to all destinations and shall refrain from issuing new licences for the transfer of technology to enable the manufacture of AP mines in third countries;

- EU Member States shall endeavour to implement national restrictions or bans additional to those contained in Protocol II of the CCW Convention;

- the EU will reinforce its contribution to international mine clearance. A budget of 7 million ECU is to be provided for initiatives to be launched in the period up to the end of 1997, in the form of contributions to the UN Voluntary Trust Fund for assistance in mine clearance and/or specific EU actions providing assistance for mine clearance in response to the request of a regional organisation or a third country's authorities. In addition, the Commission of the European Communities intends to continue the Community's support for activity in the field of mine clearance in the context of humanitarian aid, reconstruction and development cooperation.

- * The EU will invite the Associate countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the Associate countries Cyprus and Malta and the EFTA countries members of the European Economic Area to align themselves with initiatives taken in pursuit of the aims of its joint action.

- * Support will be sought within the OSCE for participating States to work towards a ban on all AP mines as soon as possible.

- * In addition, other European countries

- have taken concrete steps in terms of destroying their stocks of AP mines or have made decisions to do so within a specific timeframe,

- are introducing national legal regulations prohibiting exports and imports of AP mines and their components,

- are strengthening their capacity to carry out demining activities,

- are making contributions to strengthen the ability of the UN to initiate and coordinate demining activities in other regions, and
- in the field of developing demining technology, Norway has started a pilot mine clearance programme in the former Yugoslavia utilizing a new mechanical mine clearance machine

C. Land Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Victim Assistance

Delegates highlighted the need to take special action to deal with the humanitarian crisis caused by AP mines, while recognizing that without a ban, mine clearance and victim assistance programs will always be insufficient to deal with the crisis.

In this regard, in addition to the announcement of many states of increased financial commitments to clearance, awareness and assistance efforts, the following specific initiatives and ideas were discussed to foster international technical cooperation and to make further progress to improve and share mine clearance technology, equipment and expertise; to improve mine awareness efforts and to enhance victim assistance programmes. These initiatives include:

- * Meeting of Technical Experts on De-mining Technology in preparation for the Tokyo meeting - Germany, early 1997
- * Development of Canadian capacities in humanitarian demining and assistance to victims - Winnipeg, Canada - early 1997
- * Demining and victim assistance - Tokyo, March 1997
- * Cooperation on victim assistance (Canada-Mexico and Cuban, South African offer of their expertise)
- * Increased international cooperation in AP mine stockpile destruction

- * Efforts to develop standard procedures for mines awareness education
- * Include consideration of humanitarian mine clearance within peace accords
- * Strengthening the efforts by Central America to achieve a land-mine free zone by the year 2000
- * Establishment of a centre at James Madison University to act as a database to assist in coordinating international demining efforts
- * Submission by the Presidency of the European Union of an UNGA 51 Resolution on assistance with mine clearance

In addition to the above, a number of countries indicated that other events are being planned and that appropriate details will soon be forthcoming.

FINAL VERSION OTTAWA CONFERENCE DOC./1 05OCT96 13:30 PM

Statement

96/41

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

**NOTES FOR AN ADDRESS BY
THE HONOURABLE LLOYD AXWORTHY
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
AT THE CLOSING SESSION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY CONFERENCE
TOWARDS A GLOBAL BAN ON ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES**

OTTAWA, Ontario
OCTOBER 5, 1996



Government
of Canada

Gouvernement
du Canada

Good afternoon and congratulations on what I understand was a very productive meeting.

The Ottawa Declaration is a strong and clear call for urgent action toward a global ban. This declaration is now the common vision and collective commitment of 50 countries, numerous NGOs [non-governmental organizations] and international agencies representing a wide and important cross section of the world's peoples. The action plan you have developed demonstrates that we are willing to go beyond grand statements of principle and that we are now ready to take concrete steps. I particularly welcome the fact that the plan is comprehensive in scope. We will all be going to the United Nations to ensure that a resolution is passed, with as many supporters as possible, to add to the momentum. We will continue our efforts in de-mining and victim assistance. I point again to Canada's upcoming conference in Winnipeg on these issues, the meeting of technical experts on de-mining to be held in Germany, and the very important conference to be hosted by Japan in March. The meeting that Belgium has agreed to host in June to follow up on our work will be another important milestone. Germany, Norway and Switzerland have also indicated their readiness to take a lead role in moving our work forward.

What this forum has also made clear to me is that we now have the necessary momentum to move forward. You have identified an agenda, and you have discussed a clear process to a ban. The states around this table and elsewhere in the world community who share our goal can make this a powerful global force if we are prepared to channel it.

I am proud that you consider this meeting to have been a success, even an historic one. I believe, like many of you, that the time has come to go further.

I am convinced that we cannot wait for a universal treaty. I am convinced that we can start now, even though we may have to proceed with a treaty that does not, in the first instance, include all of the states of the world. Such a treaty can be a powerful force that establishes the moral norm — that the production, use, stockpiling and transfer of anti-personnel mines is to be banned forever. And I believe it will have a broad-based range of adherents. Making it universal will be the ongoing challenge for each of us.

And so Mr. Chairman, I have one final point to add to your action plan. That point comes in the form of both an invitation and a challenge. The challenge is to see a treaty signed no later than the end of 1997. In the coming days, I will be writing to your ministers and to others not represented here to seek their views on how we can move ahead together. I will tell them that if the will is there, Canada is prepared to convene a meeting in December 1997 to sign such a treaty.

The challenge is to the governments assembled here to put our rhetoric into action. Indeed, we know that several of you, like

Austria, have already started work on a treaty. Canada wants to work with you and to sign a treaty with those countries that are genuinely committed to this cause, whatever the number: 50, 70, or 100.

The challenge is also to the International Campaign to ensure that governments around the world are prepared to work with us to ensure that a treaty is developed and signed next year. This is not far-fetched. You are largely responsible for our being here today. The same effective arguments you used to get us here must now be put to work to get foreign ministers here to sign the treaty.

And so, today, I commit Canada to this goal, to work with our global partners to prepare a treaty that can be signed by December 1997 and implemented by the year 2000. I invite and challenge all of you to join with us to attain that goal.

As many of you have noted, such a treaty need not be complex. It is at its core a simple matter. We cannot allow negotiations to fall into traditional habits and approaches. These are not strategic offensive weapons. Anti-personnel mines are essentially defensive. That is why this is not a traditional arms-control negotiation. It is a humanitarian issue. These weapons kill daily.

We will work to elaborate a text of such a treaty with any and every other like-minded country. All of the events and opportunities identified in the action plan can complement these efforts. We are prepared to begin work now, to be ready to discuss a text the next time we meet in Belgium, and to finalize that text later in the year in Canada. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, phoned this morning. When he learned the outcome of the conference and my invitation to sign in Canada in December 1997 a treaty banning anti-personnel mines, he expressed his full support.

I am convinced that the real possibility of a treaty by a fixed date — not some far-off hope for an agreement at some date in an uncertain future — will exploit the unprecedented momentum that we now enjoy, and will make it easier for countries to take the necessary national decisions that will make our group larger. It will make our movement stronger and the chances of success better.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have a straightforward choice. We can, as Senator Leahy said, remove 100 million mines, "an arm and a leg at a time." Or we can act. There is momentum, there is political commitment, and, most importantly, the peoples of the world support what we are trying to do.

For all of these reasons, we believe that a global ban is within our reach. Each of us can reach out together, as Mr. Lewis has said, to "civilize the human condition." Much work needs to be done, but my country will do everything it can and will work with all of you so that we can return here in 1997 to make our common goal a reality.

Closing Statement to the Ottawa Conference

5 October 1996

delivered by Jody Williams, VVAF
Coordinator, ICBL

Minister Axworthy, I am speaking on behalf of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, the coalition of more than 650 non-governmental organizations in over three dozen nations, which has called for the total elimination of AP mines since 1992 as well as for greatly increased resources for humanitarian mine clearance, mine awareness, and victim assistance programs. When we began this Campaign, our call for a comprehensive international ban was considered utopian.

This conference in Ottawa is the clear sign of the sea-change in the international attitude toward removing the scourge of AP mines from the world. Our goal -- the complete elimination of AP mines-- is now clearly an attainable goal. There will be a ban when countries take up Minister Axworthy's challenge to sign a treaty here in Ottawa next December.

Many countries have taken impressive steps unilaterally --critical elements in the movement toward a ban. But the Campaign believes that this first pro-ban conference convened under the visionary leadership of Canada is the most important step so far in the effort to rid the world of this inherently indiscriminate weapon that kills or maims a man, woman or child every twenty minutes. This conference in Ottawa has undeniably accelerated progress toward a ban. The day on which we can claim victory on behalf of the millions of people around the world who must live in the midst of landmines is drawing nearer.

In our opening statement to this conference, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines issued the challenge to the world community to achieve the goal of no production, trade or use of antipersonnel mines before the year 2000. With the leadership shown by the Canadian government, we believe that it is possible to achieve the goal of a ban before the year 2000 -- Canada's just announced willingness to hold a treaty conference in December of 1997 offers that promise to the world. And the International Campaign to Ban Landmines will do its part to fulfill that promise.

In our opening statement, we also called for a partnership of states that have already taken meaningful unilateral steps to work with the ICBL, ICRC and UN agencies to fulfill a concrete action plan issuing from this Conference that will lead the world to the ban. This conference has issued such a plan and the Campaign will work in partnership with pro-ban nations that have taken meaningful national steps toward a ban, the ICRC and UN agencies to ensure that the Agenda for Action issued from Ottawa will result in a treaty before the year 2000.

The ICBL also would like to issue a renewed challenge. We challenge those countries that have called for a ban to put their words into action. Nice words are no longer enough. It is no longer enough for nations to say they want to see an immediate ban, it is time to implement national policies to ban the use, production, trade and stockpiling of AP mines. We challenge countries to do so with the utmost urgency so that they can return to Ottawa in December 1997 as full partners in the preparation of a treaty that will ban AP mines -- the only possible solution to the global humanitarian crisis of landmine contamination.

On behalf of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, I would like to thank Minister Axworthy and the Government of Canada for being willing to take the risk of stepping outside of conventional processes to move the world meaningfully toward the total elimination of antipersonnel landmines.

While it is civil society that has pressed for a ban of AP mines, such a ban can only be achieved through government action. Governments have had to make difficult decisions in taking unilateral steps to ban landmines. Change is not easy. Not for individuals and probably even less so for governments.

But we are here today because a critical mass of governments has had the courage to defy convention and make change. Because countries like Austria, Belgium, Norway, Germany, the Philippines, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden and Switzerland have unilaterally banned AP mines. Because many other countries have taken steps to suspend or ban mine use, trade and/or production. And because others have gone so far as to destroy their stocks.

While often civil society is at odds with government, in this case many governments have had the courage to respond to the cry of the world to ban AP mines. And Canada has taken it one step further. It has had the courage to bring countries together. To call the question. To ensure that the momentum to ban AP mines will not abate. In our view, Minister Axworthy, it was a decision of vision. A decision of leadership -- both to call this meeting and to offer to host the treaty signing conference in December 1997. For that -- for your leadership and for your vision -- the International Campaign to Ban Landmines thanks you. As we are sure the millions around the world who live with landmines would also thank you if they had the opportunity to step out of the minefield and be here with us at this historic moment in Ottawa.

Thank you, Minister Axworthy.

Thank you.

News Release

October 5, 1996

No. 183

CANADA OFFERS TO HOST TREATY CONFERENCE TO SIGN BAN ON ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES

Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy today announced that he has invited government representatives at a major strategy conference on anti-personnel (AP) mines in Ottawa to confer with their foreign ministers on the possibility of attending an AP mines ban treaty-signing conference to be hosted by Canada in December 1997.

"Over the last few days, representatives of 70 governments, non-governmental organizations, and multilateral agencies, and private citizens, have told us that this gathering has added greatly to the momentum to ban AP mines," said Minister Axworthy. "If the will is there, and we believe it is, we are offering to host an AP mine ban treaty-signing conference in December 1997 as a sign of our commitment to the ban."

The Minister noted that the Ottawa Conference had brought together a wide range of participants. "We have all been struck by the dedication and dynamism brought to the discussions by those whose lives have been directly affected by AP mines. They have reminded us that the issue of AP mines is one of human, not military, security. Their compelling stories challenge our sense of collective responsibility to eliminate these terrible weapons."

The Ottawa conference concluded with the adoption of the "Ottawa Declaration" and a Chairman's "Agenda for Action," which lists a number of global, regional and national activities designed to advance a global ban on AP mines.

To begin, the consensus reached in Ottawa will contribute directly to a resolution promoting an international agreement to ban AP mines at the 51st Session of the United Nations General Assembly. Other events listed include a meeting of the Organization of American States (OAS) at the end of October and a conference on developing Canadian capacities in demining and providing humanitarian assistance to victims, to be held in Winnipeg early next year. As well, there will be a Fourth International Conference on Land Mines, to be held in Maputo, Mozambique, February 1997, and a meeting on improving AP mine clearance technology in Tokyo in March 1997. Belgium will host a follow-up to the Ottawa conference in June 1997.

- 30 -



Government
of Canada

Gouvernement
du Canada

Canada

Press Statement

International Campaign to Ban Landmines Statement:
Closing Press Conference. Ottawa Conference
5 October 1996

by Jody Williams, Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation,
Coordinator, ICBL

Steering Committee:

**Vietnam Veterans of
America Foundation**
Coordinator
RR 1, Box 871
Putney, VT 05346 USA
Ph: +802-387-2080
Fax: +802-387-2081
Email: banmines@sover.net

**Afghan Campaign to
Ban Landmines**
Islamabad, Pakistan

**Cambodia Campaign to
Ban Landmines**
Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Handicap International
Paris, France

Human Rights Watch
Washington, DC, USA

Medico International
Frankfurt, Germany

Mines Advisory Group
Cockermouth, Cumbria, UK

**Physicians for
Human Rights**
Boston, MA, USA

Radda Barnen
Stockholm, Sweden

I am speaking on behalf of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, the coalition of more than 650 non-governmental organizations in over three dozen nations, which has called for the total elimination of AP mines since 1992, as well as for greatly increased resources for humanitarian mine clearance, mine awareness, and victim assistance programs. When we began this Campaign, our call for a comprehensive international ban was considered utopian.

This conference in Ottawa is the clear sign of the sea-change in the international attitude toward removing the scourge of AP mines from the world. Our goal -- the complete elimination of AP mines -- is now clearly an attainable goal. There will be a ban, it is only a question of when. The impressive number of governments here in Ottawa for the past three days -- almost as many as participated in the CCW review -- is a sure indicator of this new reality.

Many countries have taken impressive steps unilaterally -- critical elements in the movement toward a ban. But the Campaign believes that this first pro-ban conference convened under the visionary leadership of Canada is the most important step so far in the effort to rid the world of this inherently indiscriminate weapon that kills or maims a man, woman or child every twenty minutes. This conference in Ottawa has undeniably accelerated progress toward a ban. The day on which we can claim victory on behalf of the millions of people around the world who must live in the midst of landmines is drawing nearer.

In our opening statement to this conference, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines issued the challenge to the world community to achieve the goal of no production, trade or use of antipersonnel mines before the year 2000. With the leadership shown by the Canadian government, we believe that it is possible to achieve the goal of a ban before the year 2000 -- Canada's just announced willingness to hold a treaty conference in December of 1997 offers that promise to the world. And the International Campaign to Ban Landmines will do its part to fulfill that promise.

In our opening statement, we also called for a partnership of states that have already taken meaningful unilateral steps to work with the ICBL, ICRC and UN

agencies to fulfill a concrete action plan issuing from this Conference that will lead the world to the ban. This conference has issued such a plan and the Campaign will work in partnership with pro-ban nations that have taken meaningful national steps toward a ban, the ICRC and UN agencies to ensure that the Agenda for Action issued from Ottawa will result in a treaty before the year 2000.

I would end now with a renewed challenge. We challenge those countries that have called for a ban to put their words into action. It is no longer enough for nations to say they want to see an immediate ban, it is time to implement national policies to ban the use, production, trade and stockpiles of AP mines. We challenge countries to do so with the utmost urgency so that they can return to Ottawa in December 1997 as full partners in the preparation of a treaty that will ban AP mines -- the only possible solution to the global humanitarian crisis of landmine contamination.

And a final thank you to the Government of Canada for being willing to take the risk of stepping outside of conventional processes to move the world meaningfully toward the total elimination of antipersonnel landmines.

While it is civil society that has pressed for a ban of AP mines, such a ban can only be achieved through government action. Governments have had to make difficult decisions in taking unilateral steps to ban landmines. Change is not easy. Not for individuals and probably even less so for governments.

But we are here today because a critical mass of governments has had the courage to defy convention and make change. Because countries like Belgium, Norway, Germany, the Philippines, Sweden and Switzerland have unilaterally banned AP mines. Because many other countries have taken steps to suspend or ban mine use, trade and/or production. And because others have gone so far as to destroy their stocks.

While often the civil society is at odds with government, in this case many governments have had the courage to respond to the cry of the world to ban AP mines. And Canada has taken it one step further. It has had the courage to call countries together. To call the question. To ensure that the momentum to ban AP mines will not abate. In our view, it was a decision of vision. A decision of leadership. For that, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines thanks you. As we are sure the millions who live with landmines would also thank you if they had the opportunity to step out of the minefield.

The Ottawa Citizen
Wednesday, October 2, 1996

Media Clippings - Ottawa Conference



—Chris Mikula, Citizen

As part of a Living with Landmines simulation at the experimental farm, students from St. Raymonds school clear a minefield using only small breadknives the same way peasants in war-torn countries would have to. A three-day international landmines conference began Tuesday in Ottawa.

Sharp cuts coming in land-mine reserves

Canada 12th country to reduce stockpile

DIANNE RINEHART
The Canadian Press

Ottawa

Canada will reduce its stockpile of anti-personnel mines to 30,000 from 90,000 to encourage other countries to ban them.

The announcement Wednesday by Defence Minister David Colenette came as 300 representatives from 70 countries gathered for a conference on mines, estimated to maim and kill 26,000 people every year worldwide.

Canada announced a moratorium on the use, production and export of anti-personnel mines in January. At that time, Ottawa insisted it needed remaining stockpiles for training.

The announcements do not include the production and use of anti-tank mines.

"By immediately removing two-thirds of our stocks, Canada has sent a powerful message to the world that we are committed to the eradication of these weapons," Colenette said at a display of the weapons at the National War Museum.

He also announced that seven Canadian Forces mine experts will spend another six months in Cambodia to help clear land-mines left over from the civil war.

The conference is the first time countries prepared to work for a ban have met to draw up a strategy, said Peter Herby, a legal expert with the International Committee of the Red Cross.

"We're quite hopeful this should mark a turning point."

Canada is the 12th country to announce it will reduce stockpiles.

Of the 11 other countries, five are destroying all anti-personnel mines. Another four will keep what they need for training. The United States and the United Kingdom will

"We're rather cowardly and disingenuous saying on one hand we think the world should have a ban on land-mines, but we won't do the same thing unless everybody else does."

— Reform MP Keith Martin

reduce stockpiles.

Momentum for a ban comes after a Red Cross commissioned study found the humanitarian cost far outweighs the military utility of the weapons. The study was backed by retired Maj.-Gen. Lewis MacKenzie.

MacKenzie said Wednesday he is "extremely happy" with Colenette's announcement.

"Two-thirds is something to brag about and it appeases the folks in National Defence Headquarters who still see these, quite understandably, as a useful weapon if we're asked to go somewhere like the (Persian) Gulf," he said.

MacKenzie says Canada can use its position as the "eternal compromiser" to press other countries into a ban.

"Now that we're starting to be one of the most significant nations to destroy (stockpiles), I think that is very, very significant."

Reform MP Keith Martin, a doctor who worked with mine victims in Mozambique, says Canada is being hypocritical.

"We're rather cowardly and disingenuous saying on one hand we think the world should have a ban on land-mines, but we won't do the same thing unless everybody else does," he said.

The conference runs until Saturday and includes discussions from experts such as Stephen Lewis, executive director of UNICEF.

Global ban on land mines proposed

Axworthy hopes agreement to rid world of untended weapons can be in place by 2000

BY MURRAY CAMPBELL
The Globe and Mail

OTTAWA — Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy says he is hopeful that a global agreement to ban anti-personnel land mines will be in place by the turn of the century.

Mr. Axworthy said there has been "enormous momentum" within the international community in recent months to rid the world of the 110-million land mines left over from various conflicts and to stop the production of new ones.

"I'm quite optimistic at this point that this is an attainable goal, but it doesn't happen by itself," Mr. Axworthy told reporters after opening a Canadian-sponsored three-day international conference on anti-personnel land mines. "It's going to happen by an enormous effort by a lot of countries and a lot of people."

The challenge to implement a global ban was issued yesterday by Chris Moon, who as a worker for a British humanitarian organization lost his right hand and part of his right leg in a land mine explosion in Mozambique 13 months ago.

Speaking on behalf of the International Campaign to Ban Land Mines, a coalition of 650 non-governmental organizations in three dozen countries, Mr. Moon noted that the number of countries supporting a ban has risen to the 47 participating in the Ottawa conference from 14 a year ago.

"The world is calling for a ban," he said. "There will be a ban, it is only a question of when."

Mr. Axworthy said he, too, has reached the same conclusion.

"I would suggest that the trend is pretty clear," he said in his opening address to representatives of more than 70 states, international agencies and non-governmental agencies.

"Can we sustain and build this momentum? I believe we can, I believe we are firmly on our way to a ban."

Countries were lining up during yesterday's opening session, like students eager to impress their teacher on the first day of school, to support the elimination of a weapon that kills or maims 500 people — mostly civilians — every week.

For example, France and Italy

announced similar measures to stop producing, using and exporting land mines and to begin eliminating their arsenals of the weapon. The fact that both countries have been major producers of land mines in the past added clout to their commitments.

The United States, on the other hand, stuck with a four-month-old policy — ancient history in this fast-evolving policy area — that qualifies its own support of a global ban. The U.S. government is continuing to reserve the right to use anti-personnel land mines in the demilitarized zone between North and South Korea and also to continue to use mines with a limited lifespan.

The United States will be a sponsor of a resolution at the United Nations next month calling for support for a global land-mine ban. But its position in Ottawa this week may be critical to any hopes that a ban will be in place by 2000. There are unsubstantiated rumours that the United States is opposed to any timetable.

U.S. Senator Patrick Leahy, a congressional leader against land mines, said his government's position, first articulated by President

Bill Clinton last May, is a vast improvement over what it was, but that it still falls short of his expectations.

"If the most powerful nation on earth can't say unequivocally 'we do not need to use land mines' it is difficult to get other countries to do that," Sen. Leahy said.

One country that will need to be brought on board is China, which has made as many as a dozen different types of land mines, including the ubiquitous — with 20 million deployed — \$3 plastic Type 72A mine that is virtually undetectable. China has no representatives at the Ottawa conference.

Mr. Axworthy said if the UN resolution calling for a ban is passed, many countries will "have to decide which side of the ledger they're on."

Sen. Leahy admitted he is perplexed about devising a strategy to bring China on side on the land-mine issue and on other human-rights issues. He said the example of other non-Western countries supporting the ban would have an effect on China. "I hope for the best from China," he added.

But even as delegates struggled with the fine points of devising a

strategy for a global ban, there was universal praise for Canada's initiative to hold this conference in the wake of disappointing progress within traditional UN organizations.

"The steps that Canada has taken at the national and regional levels, and now internationally by convening this meeting, have served as concrete examples to other governments," Mr. Moon said.

Yesterday, Minister for International Co-operation Pierre Pettigrew announced Canada will contribute an additional \$2-million to aid in clearing land mines in countries such as Cambodia and Mozambique. Canada has spent \$6-million in such initiatives since 1993.

In 1993, the UN spent \$67 million on mine clearing and awareness programs, but the problem of mines has continued to worsen. According to estimates, it would cost \$200-billion to \$300-billion to clear all mines worldwide. In 1995, as many as 2.5 million mines were laid with only about 100,000 removed from the ground in the 64 countries in which they are found.

U.S. shuns deadline for ban on mines

Alternative weapon not developed yet

BY MURRAY CAMPBELL
The Globe and Mail

OTTAWA — The United States refused to commit itself yesterday to securing a global ban on antipersonnel land mines by the turn of the century.

Thomas McNamara, the head of the U.S. delegation at an international strategy conference on the land-mine issue, said his government does not believe that setting a deadline is the best way to achieve a ban.

"We are not prepared at this point to set a certain or fixed date for these positions," Mr. McNamara, an assistant secretary of state, said at a news conference. "Our position is that we do it as soon as possible."

But he rejected the suggestion that the United States does not have a target date for ridding the world of the 110 million land mines left over from various conflicts and for stopping the production of new ones.

"We do have a target — it's as soon as possible," he said.

The challenge to implement a global ban by 2000 was issued on Thursday by a non-governmental organization, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines.

Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy said he is optimistic that a ban can be secured by that time, and it is believed that other countries want to have a timetable spelled out in a declaration issued when the Ottawa conference ends today.

Establishing a timetable is seen by antimine activists as essential in maintaining the momentum on an issue that has zoomed to the top of the priority list in dozens of countries in the past few years.

These nations have responded to lobbying by non-governmental organizations that has highlighted the devastating impact on civilians of land mines left behind in fields after various conflicts. An estimated 500 people a week are killed or maimed by land mines.

The number of nations enlisting in the effort, spearheaded in recent months by Canada, to do something about what a United Nations official called "an affront to the human conscience" has been growing quickly.

A year ago, 14 countries supported the idea of a total land-mine ban, but nearly 50 countries have come to Ottawa pledging support for the policy. Yesterday, Iran and Bolivia were the latest to sign on.

The United States is sponsor of a UN resolution to be debated next month that would urge a ban on the use, stockpiling, production and export of antipersonnel mines.

But it became clear yesterday that the United States will not join some of its North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies, notably Germany, in imposing a total unilateral moratorium on land-mine use.

Mr. McNamara, reiterating a policy announced in May by President Bill Clinton, said the United States is committed to a land-mine ban, but it reserves the right to deploy certain types of these weapons in the Korean peninsula or if U.S. lives were at risk in military hostilities anywhere.

Another U.S. official, Karl Inderfurth, said the government's position is a "work in progress" that would be improved. Mr. McNamara said the concern now is that an immediate total ban would hinder the effectiveness of the U.S. military.

Stephen Goose, an official with the U.S. Campaign to Ban Landmines, said he was disappointed but not surprised over the U.S. stand. He said the majority opinion in the Pentagon is clearly still opposed to an early deadline for a ban.

He noted that domestic political considerations — that Mr. Clinton wants to be seen as a supporter of the military — might have played a part in formulating a policy that sets no timetable for a ban. "We think a goal without a time frame is not a goal."

Other U.S. commentators have noted that the insistence on using the demilitarized zone between North and South Korea as an exception sends a message to other countries with tense borders — India and Pakistan, Ecuador and Peru, or Israel and Syria, for example — to follow suit.

The Pentagon initially wanted to declare that the United States would renounce the use of antipersonnel land mines by 2010, by which time lethal alternatives would be available. In their original use, land mines have been deployed to protect a country's troops from attack and channel the movements of enemy soldiers.

Mr. McNamara said yesterday that intense efforts are under way to find alternatives, including, improbably enough, sticky foam, as quickly as possible.

In April, however, a group of retired senior U.S. officers, including Norman Schwarzkopf, signed an open letter to Mr. Clinton in which they argued that antipersonnel mines are not essential to the military. "Banning them would not undermine the military effectiveness or safety of our forces," they wrote.

10/05 2153 Fifty nations support land mine ban

OTTAWA, Oct. 5 (UPI) -- Fifty countries threw their support behind a declaration calling for an international ban on the manufacture and use of anti-personnel land mines, as a three-day conference on the weapons ended in Ottawa on Saturday.

Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy told the 300 delegates at the closing session that Canada was prepared to host another conference in December 1997 to sign a international ban treaty.

Some 110 million land mines, planted during recent wars, are still in place in several countries, posing a serious threat to thousands of civilians across the globe. Axworthy told the delegates the 70 countries attending the conference had the "straightforward choice" of either removing "100 million mines an arm and leg at a time," as U.S. Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Ver., expressed it, "or we can act now to sign a treaty" to do it more quickly, effectively and humanely.

Axworthy said he would shortly be writing to the 70 governments represented at the conference, as well as other nations not represented, to seek their views on how all nations around the globe can move ahead together to ban the weapons.

The 50 countries that had already thrown their support behind a declaration calling for an international ban want it to be implemented by the year 2000, he said. Several countries, including Austria "have already started to work on such a treaty," Axworthy said.

Axworthy said follow-up moves to the Ottawa conference included a meeting of technical land mine experts, scheduled to be held in Germany, an international conference to be hosted by Japan in March, and a meeting in Belgium in June. "Germany, Norway and Switzerland have already indicated their readiness to take a lead role in moving work forward and keeping the momentum under way," he said.

Cambodia and Iran, which attended the Ottawa conference as observers, crossed the floor to become full participants in support of an international ban.

By SIDNEY HICKS

Copyright 1996

The Ottawa Sun
Sunday, October 6, 1996

Page 6 ••

The Ottawa Sunday Sun, October 6, 1996

World moves closer to banning land mines

Fifty countries yesterday adopted a declaration calling for the earliest possible agreement on a global ban on anti-personnel land mines.

The declaration doesn't mention a timetable for a global ban but Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy said Canada was willing to host a treaty-signing conference in December 1997 "as a

sign of our commitment to the ban."

"I am convinced that we can start now, even though we may have to proceed with a treaty that does not, in the first instance, include all the states of the world," Axworthy said in written pre speech comments.

"Such a treaty can be a powerful force that establishes the moral norm

that the production, use, stockpiling and transfer of anti-personnel mines is to be banned forever."

There are an estimated 110 million anti-personnel land mines buried in 70 countries, which kill or maim about 26,000 people a year; mainly civilians.

The three-day conference ended yesterday with adoption of the so-

called Ottawa Declaration, a set of general principles including a commitment to work toward "the earliest possible conclusion of a legally binding international agreement to ban anti-personnel mines."

Among those agreeing to the principles were the U.S., Britain, France, Japan, Germany and Iran.

But Russia didn't sign the declaration and China didn't even attend the conference.

On Friday, the head of the U.S. delegation to the conference said the United States is committed to a ban but would continue to use the weapons until an international agreement can be reached.

— CP

Canada will offer treaty on landmines by next year

BY CRAIG TURNER
SPECIAL TO THE STAR

OTTAWA — Canada said yesterday it will put forward an international treaty to ban landmines by the year 2000 and invite other nations to sign it here next year.

The initiative was announced by Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy at the end of a three-day conference on landmines attended by representatives of 70 nations in the Canadian capital.

Axworthy acted after the participating governments failed to agree on a date for enforcing a ban. Nearly 50 countries have endorsed banning mines, but there are serious differences over how extensive the prohibition should be and whether there should be any exemptions.

The United States opposed a deadline for enacting a treaty, and U.S. officials reacted cautiously to Axworthy's initiative.

"We're not prepared to set a date, but we are prepared to start work immediately on an international agreement to ban landmines. If this can take place within that time frame and if our concerns can be met, we'll be very supportive," said Karl F. Inderfurth, the deputy U.S. ambassador to the United Nations and a member of the American delegation here.

The Clinton administration has placed a moratorium on the export of mines, has begun destroying 3 million mines in the U.S. stockpile and is sponsoring a U.N. resolution calling for a worldwide ban. But the United States wants the Demilitarized Zone between North and South Korea to be exempt from any ban on the grounds that mines are needed to protect South Korea from attack.

LOS ANGELES TIMES

OTTAWA, Ontario (AP) -- Fifty countries agreed to support drafting a global ban on anti-personnel land mines, wrapping up a three-day conference aimed at ultimately halting their production, trade and use.

The conference, attended by representatives of more than 60 countries and dozens of non-governmental groups, ended Saturday with the adoption of the so-called Ottawa Declaration.

The declaration is a set of general principles that includes a commitment to work toward "the earliest possible conclusion of a legally binding international agreement to ban anti-personnel mines."

Among those agreeing to the principles were the United States, Britain, France, Japan, Germany and Iran. Russia didn't sign the declaration and China didn't attend the conference.

On Friday, the head of the U.S. delegation to the conference, Thomas McNamara, said the United States is committed to a ban but would continue to use the weapons until an international agreement could be reached.

He said a call by the International Campaign to Ban Land Mines to stop using the devices by the year 2000 was unrealistic.

The International Red Cross, a leader in the campaign against land mines, hailed the conference's actions as signaling "the beginning of the end of the global epidemic of anti-personnel land mines."

Cornelio Sommaruga, president of the International Red Cross, issued a statement from Geneva saying the entire Red Cross movement "warmly welcomes the historic political commitments undertaken by 50 countries in the Ottawa declaration."

"We leave this Ottawa conference with the confidence that the unspeakable suffering of mine victims has finally touched the conscience of leaders of governments," Sommaruga said.

An estimated 110 million mines are buried in more than 60 countries. Nations with the worst problems include Cambodia, Angola, Afghanistan, Mozambique, Iraq, Kuwait, Sudan, Somalia and Bosnia.

Separate from the Ottawa Declaration, the conference agreed on a follow-up meeting to be hosted by Belgium in June 1997 to review progress toward a treaty ban.

Copyright 1996 The Associated Press. The information contained in the AP news report may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or otherwise distributed without prior written authority of The Associated Press.

Axworthy sets land-mine treaty date

Surprise move challenges countries that are reluctant to endorse timetable on banning the explosives

BY MURRAY CAMPBELL
The Globe and Mail

OTTAWA — Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy has sidestepped traditional diplomacy and challenged other countries to sign a treaty next year that would ban antipersonnel land mines.

Mr. Axworthy surprised delegates at an international conference here by announcing on Saturday that Canada will convene another meeting in December of 1997 to conclude a pact to forbid the use, production or export of land mines.

The unexpected move was a direct challenge to the United States and several other countries that have refused to endorse a timetable. Karl Inderfurth, the deputy leader of the U.S. delegation, said immediately after Mr. Axworthy's announcement that the United States is not prepared to set a target date for a ban.

Mr. Axworthy said he decided to introduce unilaterally a timetable for a global ban when it became clear the momentum on the issue would be lost if the Ottawa conference ended with no target date. A treaty signed next year

would come into effect by 2000.

"If you don't give yourself a standard to measure, you don't make progress," he told reporters. "You can bury it under rules and all kinds of discussions."

He was hailed by antimine activists and by many delegates, particularly those representing non-governmental organizations, who gave him a standing ovation and praised him for his leadership.

"You had the courage to call the question," said Jody Williams, coordinator of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines.

"This is a very, very big forward step for humanity," added Chris Moon, who lost his right hand and part of his right leg 18 months ago while clearing mines for a British humanitarian organization in Mozambique.

But not every country at the conference seemed set to respond to Canada's challenge.

Fifty countries attended the Ottawa gathering, called by Canada when it became clear in the spring that the traditional United Nations institutions were not responding quickly to the fierce lobbying of non-governmental antimine

groups that have sprung up in three dozen countries in the past five years.

More than 100 million land mines left over from various conflicts remain in the soil of 64 countries, and more than two million are added every year. About 500 people a week — mostly civilians — are killed or maimed by mines.

All the countries at the conference had to pledge themselves to the ultimate goal of a global ban on antipersonnel mines. Russia, which has used mines in Chechnya, attended as an observer, while China, Iraq and Israel stayed away.

But many countries would not have sent delegations to Ottawa if they believed the final declaration was going to include a timetable for establishing a global ban.

The United States in particular supports a ban and is sponsoring a resolution to that effect in the UN next month, but it has resisted setting an implementation timetable.

In addition, President Bill Clinton has reserved the right of the U.S. military to deploy mines in the Korean peninsula until it is satisfied that lethal alternatives

exist or that hostilities between North and South Korea have lessened.

Mr. Inderfurth said the United States was not told in advance of Canada's move, but, in the best traditions of diplomacy, he did not give any hint that it might be considered grandstanding.

"Clearly all of us attending this conference feel strongly about the subject, and this initiative put on the table by the Canadian Foreign Minister is one that we will look at," he said.

"We want to begin these negotiations right away, so that is not inconsistent with saying how fast they can be concluded."

However, he said, December of 1997 "may be optimistic."

Mr. Axworthy decided on a target date during a meeting on Friday night with Foreign Affairs officials, who argued that there was a "critical mass" of countries that would support Canada.

"What became clear during the conference was that there was an impatience to get going by an awful lot of participants," said Canadian diplomat Ralph Lysyshyn, who chaired the meeting.

In a speech that concluded the conference, Mr. Axworthy went beyond the generalities of the agenda for action agreed upon by the diplomats. He said he felt he had to act or people would leave Ottawa thinking that nothing had been done.

"The challenge is to the governments assembled here to put our rhetoric into action," he told the conference. "We have a straightforward choice. We can . . . remove 100 million mines an arm and a leg at a time, or we can act."

Canada will be launching a full-court press to persuade countries to send their foreign ministers to Ottawa in 14 months. An interim follow-up meeting to the Ottawa gathering of the past few days is scheduled for Belgium next June.

A draft treaty produced by Austria would likely provide the framework for the ban, and Mr. Axworthy said Canada would deal with any nation that wished to attend.

He said it was too early to consider whether a treaty would allow the U.S. to deploy land mines in the demilitarized zone in Korea.

RESOLUTION

COUNCIL OF CENTRAL AMERICAN FOREIGN MINISTERS

Concerned about the existence of vast areas of Central America planted with antipersonnel landmines, which have affected and continue to affect the civilian population living in or traveling through these areas;

Noting that antipersonnel landmines are contrary to International Humanitarian Law and in violation of its basic principles;

Considering that the task of demining should be part of a political decision directly involving governments, civil society and affected communities in the region;

Recalling the Resolution of the Central American Parliament No. AP/2-LX-96 on demining and deactivation of other explosive devices;

Taking into account the Resolutions on "Support for Demining in Central America" and "The Central American Continent, Antipersonnel Landmine-Free Zone," adopted by the Organization of American States' XXVI General Assembly in Panama;

Mindful of the recommendations approved at the "Regional Seminar on Antipersonnel Landmines, Demining and Rehabilitation," organized by the International Committee of the Red Cross under the auspices of the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Nicaragua;

Considering also the important work undertaken by the [Central American] Security Commission on this matter;

RESOLVES:

1. To **constitute** the region as an Antipersonnel Landmine-Free Zone, in which the production, acquisition, transfer and use of antipersonnel landmines is prohibited and sanctioned.

2. To **initiate** the necessary constitutional procedures for rapid ratification of all countries in the region to the 1980 United Nations Convention on Prohibitions and Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons and its protocols.

3. To call upon extraregional governments that have not already done so to undertake similar initiatives, with the objective of avoiding new victims of these excessively injurious and indiscriminate weapons.

4. To reiterate its call for the international community to continue to provide its decisive and invaluable cooperation in demining efforts in Central America.

5. To offer its full support to the "Stop Landmines" campaign of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Signed in Guatemala City on September 12, 1996.

Ernesto Leal Sanchez
Minister of Foreign Relations
of the Republic of Nicaragua

Eduardo Stein Barillas
Minister of Foreign
Relations of the Republic
of Guatemala

Delmer Urbizo Panting
Minister of Foreign Relations
of the Republic of Honduras

Fernando Naranjo Villalobos
Minister of Foreign
Relations of the Republic
of Costa Rica

Ramon Gonzalez Giner
Minister of Foreign Relations
of the Republic of El Salvador

Alejandro Ferrer
Minister in Charge of
Foreign Relations of the
Republic of Panama

Text of U.S.- Proposed UNGA Resolution

AN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT TO BAN ANTI-PERSONNEL LANDMINES

The General Assembly,

Recalling with satisfaction its resolutions 48/75 K of 16 December 1993, 49/75 D of December 15, 1994 and 50/70 0 of 12 December 1995, in which it, inter alia, urged States to implement moratoria on the export of anti-personnel landmines,

Also recalling with satisfaction its resolutions 49/75 D and 50/70 0, in which it, inter alia, established as a goal of the international community the eventual elimination of anti-personnel landmines, Noting that, according to the 1995 report of the Secretary-General entitled Assistance in Mine Clearance, it is estimated that there are ___ landmines in the ground in more than sixty countries throughout the world,

Noting also that, according to the same report, the global landmine crisis continues to worsen as an estimated ___ new landmines are laid each year, while only an estimated ___ were cleared in 1995,

Expressing deep concern that anti-personnel land-mines kill or maim hundreds of people every week, mostly innocent and defenseless civilians, obstruct economic development and reconstruction, inhibit the repatriation of refugees and the return of internally displaced persons, and have other severe consequences for years after emplacement,

Gravely concerned about the suffering and casualties caused to non-combatants as a result of the proliferation, as well as the indiscriminate and irresponsible use, of anti-personnel landmines,

Recalling with satisfaction its resolutions 48/7 of 19 October 1993, 49/215 A of 23 December 1994 and 50/82 of 14 December 1995 calling for assistance in mine clearance,

Welcoming the recent decisions taken at the Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, particularly with respect to the Convention's Protocol II, and



Believing that such measures are an essential part of the global effort to address problems caused by the proliferation, as well as the indiscriminate and irresponsible use, of anti-personnel landmines,

Welcoming also the recent decisions taken by States to adopt various moratoria on the use, stockpiling, production, and transfer of anti-personnel landmines, and other efforts taken multilaterally as well,

Recognizing the need to conclude an international agreement to ban all anti-personnel landmines as soon as possible,

1. Urges States to begin work on an international agreement to ban use, stockpiling, production, and transfer of anti-personnel landmines with a view to completing the negotiation as soon as possible.
2. Urges the widest possible accession to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and Protocol II as amended on 3, May 1996, and urges all States immediately to comply to the fullest extent possible with the applicable rules of Protocol II as amended on 3 May 1996,
3. Welcomes the various moratoria already declared by States on anti-personnel landmines;
4. Calls upon States that have not yet done so to declare and implement such moratoria, bans, or other restrictions -- particularly on operational use and transfer -- at the earliest date possible;
5. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare a report on steps taken by Member States to implement such moratoria, bans, or other restrictions and to submit it to the General Assembly at its fifty-second session under the item entitled General and Complete Disarmament.