(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

statement made to this Conference only recently by the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Mr. Burns, in which he reaffirmed his country's commitment to earnestly continue to work for a chemical weapons ban in the time to come, irrespective of the outcome of the presidential elections.

Let me now turn to some substantive issues of the draft convention. We welcome the fact that some headway has been made in the further elaboration of article II and the annex to article V. This was due to an agreement reached between the Soviet Union and the United States on the definition of production facilities for chemical weapons and the obligations to be undertaken by States in connection with their destruction. These provisions serve to ensure the security of all States in the 10-year phase after the convention enters into force. My delegation would like to reiterate the view that during this period any production of chemical weapons must be prohibited, and any exemption of CW stocks and production facilities from "international arrest" must be ruled out.

Great efforts have been made with a view to solving the outstanding problems in respect of article VI. It would certainly be of crucial importance to reach total agreement on a régime for schedule [1] chemicals. My delegation tried to promote an understanding by submitting working paper CD/CW/WP.195. A compromise solution could provide for the concentration of production of schedule [1] chemicals in a small-scale production facility. Two exceptions to this principle may be contemplated. The first concerns production for special pharmaceutical purposes. Evidence has been furnished in support citing one example, i.e. the production of nitrogen mustard. The production of this chemical in quantities corresponding to actual needs should be facilitated. The verification measures to be applied in this case would have to focus on guaranteeing the complete use of this chemical for pharmaceutical products. This régime would cease to apply once the chemical became an ingredient of the final product, i.e. medicine.

The second exceptional case could be synthesis for fundamental research or medical purposes. In this regard, we consider upper thresholds of 10 or 100 grams per year to be sufficient. Laboratories carrying out such synthesis ought to be specifically licensed by the Government concerned and should be required to submit a declaration to the technical secretariat. Furthermore, their number should be as limited as possible. Consultations on these questions should continue.

An answer also needs to be given to the question regarding the protection of confidential information in connection with article VI. As can be seen from our working paper CD/CW/WP.194, many passages in the draft convention testify to the fact that careful attention has been devoted to this matter for a long time. It has been suggested that information and data should be classified according to their degree of confidentiality. We support this proposal and are prepared to participate in the discussions on this subject. We would like to recall that the duties to be performed in this connection by the Director-General of the technical secretariat have already been set out in article VIII, which provides that a régime should be established governing the handling and protection of confidential data. The preparatory commission could work out a model for such a régime containing also a classification of information in different categories.