

(Mr. Evans, Australia)

The remaining specific issue I want to mention is commercial confidentiality. How can we protect the chemical industry from the risks of industrial espionage? Those industries have often made huge investments in research, development, enhanced processes and state-of-the-art equipment. For them the concern to keep confidential information on novel production processes, and on research and development in relation to new chemicals and pharmaceuticals, is fundamental to commercial viability. I have discussed this problem with leading representatives of major chemical companies in the period leading up to the Canberra Conference and subsequently. Although there is no simple solution to this problem, we believe the provisions set forth in the confidentiality annex to the draft tabled today provide an adequate formal answer. As well, there are proposals within the industry that there should be a system of private insurance established by chemical corporations which would help them deal with the risks I have described. The combination of formal treaty positions and such informal arrangements is likely, we believe, to be adequate and acceptable to industry.

I have already made clear that Australia is not advancing its work at this time on a "take it or leave it" basis. We understand very well that further refinement will undoubtedly be possible and may be desirable. I have no doubt that the consultations amongst you which I know are already occurring will produce suggestions for further refinement with which Australia, for one, could readily agree.

I have described the exercise we are attempting as one of "accelerated refinement" of the "rolling text". It has been our objective to provide a very solid basis for the rapid development of a final text. I cannot emphasize too strongly that our point at this time is as much one about process as it is about substantive language. We have taken the view that only with such an accelerated process can we quickly get to a final text.

The very deliberate and detailed negotiating process of the CD over what has been almost 20 years has served us well in the production of the 80 per cent of the language which is already agreed. But the dramatic changes in the international environment demand new thinking about old problems, as well as fresh initiatives to take advantage of the new circumstances in which we find ourselves. The mechanisms of political negotiations in the CD which have served us well in the past will not necessarily meet the challenges of the present. Let me just add something by putting it this way. We already have a vehicle for achieving a chemical weapons convention; it is called the Conference on Disarmament. We already have fuel for that vehicle - it is all the inputs which are reflected in the "rolling text" and in the known positions of participants in the negotiations. What we do not have is an accelerator for the vehicle, and it is that which, if you like, the Australian text is trying now to provide.

I say, very frankly and directly, to you the negotiators, on whom the responsibility will fall for achieving or not achieving a convention this year, that you really must now redouble your efforts. If we are to achieve a result you must, with the same seriousness of purpose that has marked your work up until now, look at new mechanisms for negotiation. Complex