

(Mr. Ekéus, Sweden)

The same cannot be said about article II, another basic provision of our draft convention. Certainly, the inclusion of an agreed definition of chemical weapons production facilities this summer is a significant step forward. Other parts of the article, however, have not been addressed in substance for too long a period. The present text reflects an early stage of our negotiations and does not fully correspond to the present stage of chemical weapons technology. Definitions under article II must be basic and applicable to the future. However, the present language in article II has a provisional character; it has, on that basis, served us well up to a point, but it has not been of much help in the latest negotiations on article VI and its various régimes. Progress in those negotiations on activities not prohibited by the convention can bring us closer to a new set of definitions and methods of handling them. As a first step in dealing with the problem of definitions the Committee should, in our view, address article II and the schedules under article VI comprehensively in order to transfer relevant lists of chemicals together with some definitions, criteria and guidelines to a special annex on chemicals. Mechanisms for revision should ensure that this annex could be kept up to date. Article II itself should contain only fundamental and permanent definitions and criteria.

Article III, on declarations, does not seem to require any further work at this stage of the negotiations. The only outstanding issue is to fix a date as of which declarations should be made. In view of the comprehensiveness of the definitions of chemical weapons and chemical weapons production facilities, it would seem practical to choose the later date indicated in the text, i.e. 26 March 1975. This would help us to avoid unnecessary ambiguities in implementation, which could lead to irrelevant and potentially harmful challenge situations.

The main task remaining in articles IV and V is to agree on the order of destruction of chemical weapons stocks and chemical weapons production facilities. These articles and their annexes are of pivotal importance for the implementation of article I so as to ensure the undiminished security of all States, including minor possessors of chemical weapons. This problem has been under consideration for a number of years. Useful material with regard to the principles and order of destruction of chemical weapons is now included in appendix II and reflects a rather advanced stage of elaboration. It is, however, clear that differences on the subject remain.

Most States have never seen the need for chemical weapons in their arsenals and others, like the United Kingdom, have unilaterally decided to destroy their chemical weapons and production facilities, obviously without experiencing profound feelings of diminished security. Still, States evidently have concerns regarding the destruction period. The proposal by France in CD/CW/WP.199 and the difficult discussion on the Committee's report these last few weeks convey the message that there exists a problem which has to be solved. Sweden therefore welcomes the consensus that the issue must be addressed in full. In doing so, however, we maintain that any solution to the problem of undiminished security must be found through a balanced and asymmetrical levelling out of chemical weapons stocks and a balanced phasing out of chemical weapons production facilities.