

Mr. IMAI (Japan): I have to resort to rule 30, as you have mentioned, for I have asked for the floor today in order to take up the subject of chemical weapons, and in particular to elaborate on my statement of 14 February in which I placed special emphasis on agenda item 4. In my February statement, I talked about possible merits in trying to "first work out the basic framework of a draft convention ... then within such framework ... to work on the areas where there can be significant differences amongst the negotiating parties" in order to achieve greater efficiency.

We are all more than aware that the discussions in the Conference on Disarmament concerning a chemical weapons convention have been very active and detailed in recent years. At the same time, we realize that the report of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons in 1984, for example, contains many paragraphs in square brackets, indicating remaining areas where agreement is still to be worked out. In spite of strenuous efforts the parties have exerted, and I must add here the sincere appreciation of my delegation to the past and present chairmen and co-ordinators, nevertheless it is not necessarily clear how much real progress has been achieved towards the drafting of a chemical-weapons convention.

The work for a chemical weapons convention involves a myriad of political, military, technical and legal problems, and there is a danger that if priorities are mixed with regard to the various details, without a clear perception on the broad framework of the convention being first established, then continued discussions might merely lead to increased difficulties in finding a balance between the interests of the parties concerned. We therefore consider it worthwhile to stop every now and then to look back to where we have started from, and to reconfirm the basic objectives of the negotiations. This will enable us to have a clearer view regarding the over-all structure of the future chemical weapons convention.

(Cont'd)