

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

of a so-called self-verification. In calling for sound national procedures we start from a purely practical viewpoint, since a well-functioning national implementation and monitoring system is a sine qua non for international verification. Where should the consultative committee send the inspectors, if there is no point of contact at the national level which keeps track of national activities concerning the implementation of the convention? Who should keep the records to provide the consultative committee with the required information?

In this connection we would like to refer to the experience gathered by the International Atomic Energy Agency. The safeguards applied by this Agency are largely based on national systems of accounting and control.

Furthermore, I would like to mention the national experience of my country in the chemical field. The improved Law on the Handling of Poisons adopted five years ago, for example, provides for a full inventory of all poisonous substances, which applies to all branches of the national economy and covers the whole process, beginning with the production and ending with the disposal of poisons. A system of national agencies oversees the implementation of the law. To our knowledge, similar laws exist in other countries as well.

It is the intention of my delegation to express at a later stage of our work more detailed ideas with regard to the co-operation between the national and international bodies of the verification systems.

In our view it is exactly the co-operation aspect which counts, namely, activities based on mutual trust, not an atmosphere of distrust. Moreover, suspicions should be eliminated by verification activities. But how can this be achieved when even the declarations of parties who voluntarily entered the agreement are not trusted and should be verified?

In the course of the Committee's work on a chemical weapons convention we have seen, like many other delegations, that the problems connected with banning chemical weapons are, indeed, quite complicated. One particular reason is that it is sometimes rather difficult to draw a line between what is connected with chemical weapons and what does not belong to it. That is true of chemicals forming the basis for chemical weapons, as well as of facilities producing these chemicals.

Such difficulties arise not only with regard to the scope of a chemical weapons convention but also concerning verification of compliance. These problems are further complicated by differences in the organization of the chemical industry in various countries. The production of binary chemical weapons and their introduction into military arsenals will bring about serious additional problems. This "latest achievement" in chemical weaponry would be more closely connected with the commercial chemical industry than the so-called unitary chemical weapons. This applies both to the chemicals involved and to the facilities concerned.