

(Mr. Ekéus, Sweden)

our confidence, and thirdly that the costs are commensurate with the objective. We must establish what the objective of ad hoc checks is supposed to be. Are we looking for undeclared production of listed chemicals? Do we want to control unlisted chemicals that could have military uses? Do we want to check that production capacity is not misused? A purely random, almost accidental, selection for inspection from an enormous number of facilities, most of which could not even be transformed for CW-related production, would be neither efficient nor effective.

Trying to verify what is not verifiable does not create confidence. Verification must be applied to what is relevant and significant. Verification cannot be an aim in itself. A case in point is the area of early research and development of chemical weapons, an issue which has been intensively discussed this summer. My delegation is not convinced that certain proposals advanced during the discussion on this specific issue lead us in the right direction.

The first stages of research and development of chemicals for weapons use in laboratories are undistinguishable from legitimate research for protection purposes. As far as chemicals not included in schedule [1] are concerned, such research is undistinguishable from legitimate research regarding environmental protection, industrial safety, medical or agricultural purposes. We must choose a stage in the development process where verification becomes meaningful, that is a stage where it could conceivably be possible to demonstrate a violation of the convention, or at least a serious inexplicable anomaly. This would hardly be possible before research and development have left the laboratories and entered a pilot plant or weapons testing phase.

A very brief outline of the Swedish position on article VI would be the following. Production of schedule [1] chemicals must be confined to single small-scale production facilities, with the exception of laboratory-scale synthesis and production for medical purposes of up to 10 kg a year. As far as schedule [2] chemicals are concerned, the régime as it now stands seems practicable on paper. The trial inspections will hopefully give us enough experience to finalize that régime. The régime for schedule [3] will need further elaboration. A system of spot checks could usefully be explored. As regards the last, unnumbered schedule, which was also touched upon by Ambassador van Schaik in his speech today, it seems to my delegation that it is the capacity of a given facility that would justify its being subject to control arrangements, rather than the actual chemicals it may be producing. The schedule might even be deleted if we were able to devise another method for identifying and controlling potential (from the technical point of view) facilities for production of chemical warfare agents.

As I have already mentioned, all the lists should be revised and updated and transferred together with relevant criteria and guidelines to a separate annex on chemicals.

In article VII there still remains a heading regarding national technical means without any text. My delegation would consider any language that may be proposed under the heading with great interest. If no such text is forthcoming we would suggest that the heading should simply be dropped next session.