

(Mr. Turbanski, Poland)

It is clear, however, that final agreement on articles IV and V depends on the outcome of work on such definitions as chemical weapons, chemical warfare agents, and chemical weapons production facilities.

Precise definitions of these terms will also be needed in the context of article VI. For these reasons we support the proposal made by the distinguished representative of China, Ambassador Fan, on 16 April, that an effort should be made to define more precisely what we mean by chemical weapons. To avoid ambiguities after the Convention enters into force, we should eliminate all conceptual imprecision in the text both of the convention proper and all its integral annexes.

In our opinion the situation is much more complex with regard to the area of non-production. It seems that the most crucial question bearing on the possibilities of tangible progress is an agreement on relevant threshold production quantities for facilities producing chemicals belonging to categories 2, 3 and 4. The first steps in this direction have already been made. Further progress depends now on an active and constructive approach by all the delegations, without exception.

One of the outstanding issues is that of model agreements between the International Authority and States parties concerned. The concept of such agreements was very usefully considered during this session, but a lot of strenuous work remains to be done. However, the solution of some problems associated with model agreements is hardly possible without precise knowledge of relevant facilities. Though the experience of IAEA might be used to some extent in working out a model agreement, we should not forget the very specific characteristics of the chemical industry.

The series of informal discussions on the concept and procedure of challenge inspection, organized by the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, was, we feel, a useful exercise. Together with some plenary statements, especially by the USSR and the United States delegations, it contributed to better comprehension of different positions and demonstrated more clearly points of common understanding.

Many proposals on this subject were put forward by the delegations. They have to be closely examined by the Committee or by the relevant working group. Many delegations, including my own, consider the United Kingdom proposals very interesting and useful, especially the idea of alternative measures. Like every new idea, it has to be developed and then evaluated again on the basis of its own merits.

That is why we would appeal to those delegations who at this stage are not prepared to engage in elaboration of possible alternative measures to join common efforts toward developing the idea, which we believe might help to identify a solution to the problem of challenge inspection.

With regard to the structure and functions of the Consultative Committee there is, in our opinion, a prevailing realistic approach on the part of the delegations.