

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic of Germany)

working paper resides in the fact that it testifies in a particularly practical form to the possibility of effective international surveillance during the destruction process. It makes evident that control by international inspectors entails no undue burden for the signatories to the future convention. My delegation is therefore surprised that the views of Western countries on the destruction of stocks has drawn only critical and rather unhelpful comments from the representatives of socialist States, most recently in the statement of the distinguished delegate of Czechoslovakia, Ambassador Vejvoda, of 23 July 1963. These negative views are, however, developed without the benefit of any constructive counter-ideas on the part of the socialist representatives. This dilatory and superficial treatment of the topic of the destruction of stocks and its verification is in blatant contradiction with the urgency of eliminating those threats that stem from the existence of the present chemical arsenals. We must seriously deal with the issues of the international verification of the destruction of stocks. Here, more than elsewhere, it is totally insufficient to reiterate positions that harbour no consensus potential, and, for the rest, to remain motionless on established positions.

Advocating the concentration of our work on one key problem area of the future convention does not imply any less emphasis upon the important issues of, for example, the prohibition of transfer or other elements, such as, especially, the important issue of non-production and the details of a verification system relating to non-production. However, our position on these issues is well known, since my delegation has in working paper CD/326 submitted detailed suggestions for the verification of non-production. In particular, in these papers, my delegation has developed a control system of a low level of intrusiveness over the industrial production of organophosphorus compounds on the basis of random inspections. For its part, the United Kingdom delegation has shown a pragmatic path towards the verification of non-production in working paper CD/353.

My delegation would counsel seriously against any attempt to solve the problem of non-production by other means than a pragmatic approach. Obviously, a high degree of expert knowledge is required to avoid loopholes in the future convention. On the other hand, we should not unduly blow up the scientific complexities of non-production, thus building roadblocks on the way to the early conclusion of a convention. It appears highly advisable to conduct our discussion on non-production under the auspices of genuine relevance in arms control terms, and to structure our debate in a more goal-oriented fashion.

In contact group C, under the brilliant leadership of our Dutch colleague, Mr. Akkerman, a consensus on the inclusion of the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons in the future convention is imminent. There is now agreement in substance that the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons