

(Mr. Asif Ezdi, Pakistan)

My delegation made some proposals this summer in Group B to make article X truly meaningful, including a proposal that States parties should conclude agreements with the Organization, on the basis of a model agreement, on the provision of assistance in protective measures. Certain delegations, however, would prefer to keep the provisions of article X nebulous and ill-defined. Such an approach is not likely to enhance the credibility or viability of the convention or to attract wide adherence to it. I should like here to express our appreciation for the statement made by Ambassador Nazarkin of the Soviet Union on 11 August 1988, in which he expressed support for provisions on collective measures by States parties under article X and for special agreements between States parties and the technical secretariat on this subject.

In Working Group C tangible progress was made in two specific areas connected with challenge inspection, i.e. the procedure after the submission of the report and guidelines for the conduct of challenge inspections. Many of the key problems in article IX remain, however. These should be resolved on the basis of a multilateral approach which recognizes the interest of each State party in the clarification of doubts which have given rise to a challenge inspection. For this purpose, the executive council should be given the power to resolve contentious issues.

Discussions on the final clauses of the convention under the guidance of the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee have served to clarify different aspects of the issues involved. We hope this will be a first step towards a solution of the problems. In our view, the convention should contain explicit provisions to preclude any reservations. Furthermore, any reservations made under the Geneva Protocol with regard to the prohibition of use would clearly be inconsistent with article I, and would therefore stand annulled for States parties to the convention.

We would like to express appreciation to those delegations which have provided information to the Conference on their chemical weapons stockpiles and production facilities, as well as on other chemicals of relevance to the convention produced by them. This information will enhance mutual confidence and facilitate the task of developing effective procedures for verification.

Ambassador Elaraby of Egypt in his statement last week drew our attention to an important issue which has so far not been considered fully in our deliberations. I refer to the question of measures to be taken by States parties collectively against another country, whether a party to the convention or not, which uses chemical weapons or otherwise poses a chemical weapons threat to a State party. As recent instances of the use of chemical weapons have shown, a reprimand or condemnation by the international community is not an effective deterrent against their use. It is essential in addition that the international community should have a mechanism at its disposal to make the recalcitrant State desist from its acts, or at least to raise the costs for that State of pursuing such a course. The present "rolling text" already envisages the establishment of a multilateral institutional structure for the implementation of the convention. The question of which one or more