

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

of the convention, there will be general eagerness to look for such measures and to make them as effective as possible. Unfortunately, this eagerness is, to say the least, not general. One of the fundamental obligations under the convention will be the obligation not to develop chemical weapons. For the time being nothing in the present "rolling text" tells us how compliance with this fundamental obligation will be verified. We consider that this represents a loophole which should be remedied. Occasionally arguments are raised that some kinds of activities are not verifiable, and hence no verification can be applied to them. If such reasoning is also used with regard to fundamental obligations, then we consider this a methodological drawback. By verification we understand a comprehensive process starting with data reporting, proceeding to data assessment and finally to the choice of an appropriate inspection régime. If the right balance of monitoring and verification procedures is established, one can expect a certain effect from verification even in facilities where it is unlikely that a flask full of a schedule [1] chemical will be unexpectedly discovered. A realistic view seems to prevail that we cannot expect 100 per cent reliable verification, especially with regard to such a complicated matter as the verification of non-production of chemical weapons. Indeed, in all régimes of monitoring and verification both confidence-building and deterrence are present together with the inspection process itself. We therefore fail to understand the categorical rejection of any monitoring and verification in some cases based on mere assertion that inspections at some facilities cannot always bring immediate results.

To complete the list of negative aspects of our work in the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, let me mention briefly that in our opinion we are faced with excessively detailed discussion on many questions. Perhaps it would be useful to bear in mind that before the convention enters into force a preparatory organ will be functioning which may settle a number of technical and organizational aspects with a much better overview of likely initial participation in the convention and the conditions of its entry into force than we have now. Besides, the organization to be set up under the chemical weapons convention and its individual bodies, especially the Technical Secretariat, will be continuously solving a number of technical problems which, it seems to us, need not be discussed exhaustively before the final drafting of the convention.

Although the negative tendencies I have mentioned above slow down the progress of our work, we are satisfied that there are also some positive developments contributing to its advancement. The principal of such development is a tendency towards greater openness in military affairs, not least with regard to chemical weapons. A number of seminars and workshops organized in recent years, and international visits to important military facilities in some countries, have given us a better understanding of the problems we are confronted with. Some practical knowledge and experience is of great importance. We therefore welcomed the initiative of the Soviet Union for the organization of trial inspections of chemical industry facilities at both the national and the international level. Czechoslovakia is interested in this experiment and intends to participate in it. We followed with attention the first preparatory consultations on the experiment under the guidance of Ambassador Ekéus of Sweden. We agree that the drawing up of check-lists as well as a format for reporting might be useful. At the same