

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

weapons has its own -- although peculiar -- logic. But if the plan is still to conclude it as early as possible, which means that all chemical weapons will be destroyed, then why expand their production? Why waste money and material resources?

Assessing the situation at the chemical weapons negotiations we note not only the encouraging progress recently achieved, in particular at this year's spring session, but also the disturbing fact that at present the negotiations are clearly marking time. The discussion of a number of questions resembles walking in circles rather than moving ahead. Take, for example, article VI (Activities not prohibited by the Convention). When we were leaving in April, a number of participants promised to analyse their positions and come back with concrete answers. But we continue to hear from them nothing but questions. Moreover, attempts are beginning to be made to disavow compromises achieved through arduous efforts, to delay agreement on the convention. Can we not see behind all this a fear of the possible early conclusion of the convention, that has become so obvious of late?

We may be told that, now that a number of major questions of principle have been settled, the time has come for meticulous technical work on certain details. This, I agree, is also necessary. But here too, not all the opportunities are used. For example, a start could already have been made on drafting a concrete text for annex IV, section V, on verification of the elimination of chemical weapons stocks, as was agreed upon in the Group on Cluster I at the very beginning of the session. Unfortunately, there has been no progress here either.

At the same time the main task at the current session of the Conference as far as chemical weapons are concerned would seem to consist in finding solutions of principle to those few issues where there is as yet no general political agreement, and above all the problem of challenge inspections and non-production of chemical weapons by commercial industries. In this context we note with satisfaction the efforts made by the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, Ambassador Ekéus, who during the spring session organized working meetings and consultations on some of these questions.

The present advanced stage of negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons imposes on the participants yet another responsibility. The consensus parts of the "rolling text" -- which, by the way, make up the bulk of it -- are the result of complex, prolonged negotiations and represent a package of delicate interrelated compromises. They lay down the conceptual basis of the future ban on chemical weapons which must be comprehensive and include not only all stocks but also the development and production of such weapons; this ban must be observed in the process of "non-prohibited" activities and must be guaranteed by the most effective controls, ranging from systematic verification to the challenge inspection mechanism.

For these reasons the results of many years of efforts should be approached with care, if, of course, one's basic starting-point is the need for the rapid conclusion of the convention. A very alarming situation has arisen, in our opinion, as regards reaching agreement on the order of