tional weapons must be destroyed first. The operational utility of a chemical agent is greater if weapons have been filled with it and such weapons pose a greater risk than those stored in bulk. Also the percentage which a particular category constitutes of the total over-all stockpile of a State should be taken into account when determining its relative danger.

As to the second criterion — the proportionate reduction for each party — this appears to be important, in order to leave to each possessor State a proportional share of its stocks during the interim period. Declarations and verifications should, moreover, in each phase precede destruction. Thus the location of a party's entire chemical-weapon stockpile would not have to be declared at once and would therefore not be exposed to the risk of attack, in case of a breakdown of the convention, unexpected delay in the implementation of its provisions or other unforeseen adverse developments.

In short, we think that we should seek formulas for destruction schemes through which the most dangerous weapons will first be destroyed and which, on the other hand, ensure that the mutual security of possessor States will not be reduced.

Parties should, of course, be assured that declared stockpiles are actually being destroyed. Here again agreement seems to emerge on obtaining such assurance by a combination of permanent on-site inspection by international inspectors during the entire destruction operation and the use of monitoring instruments for the most dangerous chemical weapons. The question remains whether an equally stringent monitoring of chemical weapons in a lower risk category is necessary. We on our side believe that a reasonable solution to that question can be found without too much difficulty.

More complex, however, is the question under what conditions a diversion of certain chemical warfare agents outside the supertoxic range can be accepted for permitted purposes. On this the representative of France, Mr. Montassier, made some pertinent remarks. Two types of approach to this issue are under discussion. The regime for diversion could be generally applicable to all non-supertoxic agents, in which case the quantities involved and the operations carried out would be declared and verified in accordance with the relevant regime to verify non-production. Alternatively, diversion should rather be treated as an exception and be verified according to the arrangements applicable to the verification of destruction of the same agents.

We believe that already for economic reasons (high costs) diversion to civilian purposes will remain an exception. We suggest that a specific regime should be established by the relevant States possessing chemical weapons for categories of specific agents for which diversion could exceptionally be envisaged. In our view a stricter regime would apply to agents that pose the greater risk, also in the manner in which they are stored, in other words, those placed in munitions. Agents in bulk pose the same risk, irrespective of their ultimate purpose. In that case the same verification regime could apply, namely the less strict regime for the verification of non-production.

Besides the stocks of chemical weapons, the capacity to produce chemical weapons poses a major risk. The significance of the destruction of stockpiles would severely be reduced if readily available production capacities are left untouched. Therefore, destruction of stockpiles should be seen in combination with measures to prevent production.

We believe we all share the view that facilities for the production of chemical weapons should be closed down and eliminated after entry into force of the Convention. A list of specific types of facilities should be drawn up including indications of the modalities of elimination that seem to be appropriate for each type of facility (e.g. total physical destruction, partial physical destruction, re-use of components for permitted purposes, etc.). In this context the feasibility of temporary conversion of production facilities into destruction facilities could and should be further studied.

There is still a lot of work to be done in this field and abundant material to be