

(Mr. von Stülpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

collection and processing is to be done at a national level; the international authority obtains an overview, which it can supplement as necessary by asking for clarification. At the same time, we are aware that verification is invariably an international task and that the national authority can therefore only be an instrument with which the individual contracting parties implement the convention.

Let me on this occasion comment on a few speeches made recently in this forum. My delegation recognizes the positive and constructive approach the Soviet delegation has displayed in its latest statements concerning the crucial questions of declaration and elimination of CW stocks and revision of lists of chemicals which are under careful consideration.

In other areas, such as on-challenge inspections, the Soviet view of no refusal of on-site inspections still has to be enlarged in our view to all facilities and sites where violations could occur in order to guarantee a degree of effective verification of compliance acceptable to all.

The constructive spirit of Stockholm should be adapted to our negotiations -- as the delegations of Romania and the Netherlands suggest -- with respect to its support for the obligation to accept on-site inspections and not to its particular restrictions concerning certain areas and sensitive points, because -- as the delegation of the Netherlands rightly acknowledged -- in Stockholm the objective was to build confidence whereas we are faced with the more encompassing task of abolishing an entire category of weapons. Consequently, our solution has to be a more far-reaching one to be effective and generally acceptable.

My delegation welcomes also the constructive approach taken by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on 17 March 1987, towards the verification of alleged use of CW by developing procedures for identification of the contaminated area, sampling, field analysis, transportation and final analysis in a laboratory. We are looking forward to the announced working paper incorporating the new research report.

My delegation shared the detailed assessment given by the Netherlands delegation on 12 March 1987. This applies, firstly, to the notion of risk to the convention as a determining factor for the verification of non-production, building on the division of relevant CW substances into three categories with the appropriate régimes. Unless a list of commercially produced super-toxic lethal chemicals of CW relevance is produced, their inclusion in any of these established categories cannot be justified. Secondly, as was pointed out by the Netherlands delegation, the threshold, still has to be fixed for the exclusion of small quantities which do not pose a military threat and which therefore are irrelevant for CW verification purposes.

My delegation, together with many others, remains convinced that essential elements of a global ban on development, production, acquisition, stockpiling, transfer and use of CW as well as in the field of verification can be achieved during this year. It is in this light that my delegation is