

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

Stability and security at the time when the convention becomes effective also presuppose that the ban on the production, acquisition and use of chemical arms, as well as any other obligation undertaken, are valid, and compliance with them is reliably verified from the very first day on. If all stocks of chemical weapons were placed under "international arrest" until the accord takes effect, we would have a useful additional security measure. No State party will be able, in its storage facilities for chemical weapons, to engage in any activity prohibited under the treaty since those facilities will be subject to stringent international control. The fears of all the sides in question would thus be allayed, including the concerns of those who do not possess chemical weapons, as is the case with my own country.

Let me now talk about some of the aspects of the work to be done during the inter-sessional period. Progress on the jurisdiction and control issue would be instrumental in establishing the responsibilities of States parties, which will have to ensure, for example, that anyone under their jurisdiction and control refrains from activities prohibited under the convention. Furthermore, it would be their responsibility to take appropriate measures guaranteeing that all their natural and juridical persons, even if they are not in the territory of their home countries, abide by the accord. The question of what would be "appropriate" will have to be answered on the basis of the constitutional and legal systems of the various States parties. Once this is recognized as a principle, it ought to be possible to come up quickly with a formula acceptable to everyone.

Negotiations on a chemical-weapon ban have progressed this year to the point where verification has moved out of the realm of non-committal polemics -- hopefully for good -- into the area of serious professional work on constructive solutions. Detailed verification provisions have been drawn up for articles IV, V and VI. A text setting forth guidelines on the international inspectorate has been agreed after thorough deliberations. The most important thing to do now is to lay down the ground rules governing challenge inspection and, in so doing, to put the keystone into the verification edifice. I am sure everyone will appreciate the fundamental significance of the steps which the Soviet Union has taken in this respect, and on which Ambassador Nazarkin elaborated on 11 August. We hope this will induce other parties to make their positions more transparent. If this were the case, we would be considerably closer to a text on the challenge inspection procedure.

In our efforts to solve the on-site challenge verification issue in such a way that the legitimate interests of the receiving State are taken into account, while ruling out any misuse, the functions to be performed by the inspectors are increasingly becoming the focus of attention. It will be their duty to record the facts needed to clarify cases of suspicion. This is exactly what must guide their conduct. They will have to act on the basis of guidelines issued by the technical secretariat. The Canadian and Norwegian studies on inspections in the event of the alleged use of chemical weapons are very useful in this context.

Whenever the requesting and receiving States are locked in dispute over an alternative measure suggested, tried and tested procedures should be available to settle the argument. Thus, objective elements would be added to the procedure, leaving less room for arbitrariness.