

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

disarmament, as historical experience shows. Besides, paragraph 31 of the Final Document states clearly that the forms and modalities of verification depend upon and should be determined by the purposes, scope and nature of the agreement. Moreover, should we now in the field of chemical weapons take the same dangerous approach as we were asked to do last year with regard to a comprehensive test ban? Should it be a rule from now on, first to agree on a verification system which would be acceptable to one delegation, and then, perhaps, start working on the disarmament agreement?

Experience has shown that it is not a serious approach to expect one side to accept the demands of the other side on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Here again we should bear in mind paragraph 31 of the Final Document which provides that verification measures should be satisfactory to all parties concerned. So, our aim cannot be absolute verification or a verification system which might be perfect and not leave any doubts or risks. It is common knowledge that taking into account the complexity of the modern chemical industry, we have to live with certain risks. What is necessary, however, is a system which creates the necessary confidence and ensures that the relevant agreement is observed by all parties.

In this we share the view, expressed two years ago in the Committee on Disarmament by the Indian delegation: "Let us not pursue verification procedures which may be 'intrusive' but not necessarily effective in ensuring compliance. There is a tendency in the Working Group to assume that on-site inspection or other intrusive methods of verification necessarily ensure compliance. When we are dealing with as complex a field as chemicals, we cannot be so sure. Our debate should not concentrate merely on whether or not to have on-site inspection. Rather we should try to determine what methods of verification are (i) feasible and (ii) optimal in ensuring compliance." (CD/PV.142, p. 31).

On several occasions my delegation has outlined its basic approach to verification. In the Working Group we have expressed our viewpoint about a verification system consisting of a combination of national and international procedures, including different kinds of systematic international on-site inspections and inspections by challenge.

It is the aspect of combination that we miss in the United States document. Virtually nothing is said concerning implementation and monitoring at the national level, that is, on the level of the States parties which, after all, would be responsible for carrying out the obligations of the convention and overseeing national enterprises and other bodies in order to guarantee compliance. This is common practice in international law and has been recognized by many delegations in this Committee. I would only like to refer to working papers CD/205 tabled by the Netherlands, CD/167 and CD/313 by Canada, CD/CW/CRP.35 by Australia and CD/326 by the Federal Republic of Germany. Our approach does not imply a "confrontation" of national and international verification. They should be considered two sides of the same medal. It certainly does not mean the establishment