

(Mr. Turbanski, Poland)

• • •

The situation with regard to the work of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons is much more optimistic than the overall picture of the Conference's activities, as can be seen from the new "rolling text" of the Convention, reflecting the current stage of negotiations, which has been submitted to the Committee by its Chairman. The new formula governing the work of the Ad hoc Committee -- a cluster formula, a flexible formula, one might say -- has proved its value, and at the same time demonstrated again the Chairman's competence and ability to lead us most efficiently toward our final goal -- a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. I wish to thank Ambassador Ekéus and the cluster co-ordinators for their efforts, for their contribution during the spring session of the Committee.

Owing to the active contribution of many delegations during the spring session, new important steps toward further progress were taken, especially in the areas where the Soviet Union came forward with fresh ideas and proposals. The work of the Committee and of the working groups, as we see it, was business-like and fruitful, though one can say that nothing is done until everything is done. That is why we should always have in mind that the ultimate task before us is not only to register progress but to finalize the text of the Convention. In this context, let me again draw your attention to the March 1987 statement of States parties to the Warsaw Treaty on the prohibition of chemical weapons, which reiterated their readiness to destroy these weapons of mass destruction irreversibly.

Looking at the present state of work of the Committee, one can say that almost all important elements of article IV (Chemical weapons) have been cleared up and resolved, the only exception being principles and the order of destruction of chemical weapons. However, in this field too, concrete and useful proposals were put forward by delegations. Finding a mutually acceptable solution seems at this stage to involve not conceptual study or a need to solve a disagreement of principle, but rather realism and necessary compromise.

In the view of my delegation, solving this issue would also have some psychological meaning, as it concerns the very core of the Convention.

The situation is quite similar with respect to article V (Chemical weapons production facilities).