

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): Mr. President, we sometimes hear statements to the effect that the negotiation of a chemical weapon convention is not moving ahead as we would like it to. I agree. But I disapproved of the conclusions usually drawn from statements like that, namely, that one or several delegations are to blame. The very existence of problems, be they political, military or technical, is an expression of relevant and serious concerns of one or more delegations. We must learn to respect the problems of our negotiating partners, all of them, and to address those problems in a serious manner.

During this session much useful work has been done in the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. It has been especially useful in the sense that positions and views on the subject matter have been more clearly crystallized, so that it is now easier to identify both the problems and concerns involved and the areas where a basis for agreements does exist.

Some of the problems in the Committee are not only technical in nature but have arisen because the negotiators do not have a full picture of how different aspects of the future convention will interrelate. There is a tendency to get stuck on a single aspect of an issue because it is closely related to another aspect of the same issue and neither of the aspects can be solved without the other. To take one example: we have difficulties when dealing with the question of what measures to take as regards CW production facilities, because we have not been able to agree on what constitutes such facilities. And we cannot agree on what constitutes such facilities partly because we have not agreed upon how to approach facilities producing the same chemicals in the civilian industrial context. In short, we cannot agree on the basic measures to be taken in one part of the Convention because we lack an overall view of the measures that will be prescribed in other parts of the Convention.

Another example: we have spent month after month, even years, on how definitions and criterias for identifying certain categories of chemicals should be arranged. This is not because the eminent chemists, whose participation we do benefit from, consider it a technically or chemically insurmountable problem, but because we know that the measures to be devised will relate to how the chemicals are classified. The crux of the matter is that we have no agreement on the measures to be taken since the chemicals concerned, although well defined, have not been organized in a way conducive for the application of measures. And we will continue to have difficulties in how to organize them for the purpose of the Convention since we have no common agreement on the measures to be applied.

In the Committee we have, as outlined in CD/539, Annex I, divided relevant chemicals into five basic categories: i.e. supertoxic lethal, other lethal, and other harmful chemicals as well as key precursors and precursors. This has been very useful to our work and should be the foundation on which we must try to formulate some approaches to cope with the contradictions mentioned.

There is, however, a growing concern that all chemicals within one and the same category are not dealt with according to the same principles in every part of the Convention, and that even one and the same chemical might be subject to qualitatively different measures depending upon the purpose of its production. At the same time there is a concern that one and the same level of measure is applied to a whole category of chemicals, notwithstanding the diversity within