

(Mr. McPhail, Canada)

of these weapons for all time. More precisely, our substantive task in 1983 was to achieve further consensus, if not full agreement, on the issues that still divided delegations. Procedurally, our task was to reach agreement on the structure of a convention and on the elaboration of provisions in their proper order so that the process of negotiation could be brought to an early conclusion.

The report of the Working Group reflects the method designed to meet these objectives. Apart from the standard introductory parts, the report does innovate: the Working Group agreed to set out, as it has in an annex, in one single document, the substance of provisions for a chemical weapons convention. This document indicates the consensus reached earlier and during this session, and sets out remaining differences clearly, where further work is needed, so as to reveal how best the Committee can proceed to the final elaboration of a convention. We thus developed an integrated or internally consistent procedure whereby each provision is intended to be presented in a logical hierarchy, progressing from the general to the particular; and whereby each provision is accompanied by an indication of the control or verification measures appropriate to it.

This record, as it now appears in the annex to the Working Group report, is a distillation of the highest common factor of agreement and the lowest necessary index of disagreement; throughout the annex, areas where positions have yet to be reconciled are indicated by indentation.

The text, an integrated and systematic document structured according to a uniform format, thus allows others, in capitals or elsewhere, to see precisely what the situation is. It is, of course, a document to which all in the Working Group have agreed. This gives it particular significance in a negotiating context for our further work. It hardly need be said that, since this document records the provisions of the convention in terms of their concepts, the language it contains is not directly transportable to the final text of the convention itself.

However, simultaneously with the process I have just described, and complementary to it, four contact groups were charged with addressing selected principal areas where consensus was lacking. These groups were as follows:

Contact Group A: Co-ordinator, Mr. J. Cialowicz, Poland, on the monitoring of the destruction of stocks and basic content of declarations required;

Contact Group B: Co-ordinator, Mr. S. Duarte of Brazil dealing with issues related to the resolution of compliance questions;

Contact Group C: Co-ordinator, Mr. J. Akkerman of the Netherlands on the prohibition of Use;

and Contact Group D: Co-ordinator, Mr. J. Lundin of Sweder on definitions.

The reports that these contact groups produced, along with the groups' terms of reference, are also appended to the Working Group's report as annex II. Not only is the substance in the conclusions of those reports reflected in annex I recording the provisions of the convention to which I referred, but the