

(Mr. Karhilo, Finland)

measures have no fixed time-limit. When approaching this issue one has to keep constantly in mind the purpose of the convention, which sets the limits to the verification measures. The main task is to verify non-production of chemical weapons. We have not undertaken to monitor the whole production of all the chemical industries of the world. Not even the production of dangerous or lethal chemicals as such. We are interested in the weaponizable chemicals, in weaponizable quantities, and, in making sure that they are not being used to produce weapons. Beyond that, the verification of non-production of minor quantities in a cost-effective way will become increasingly difficult. The best we can strive for is to create a régime that can be used to clear any doubts of non-compliance. If possible, that should be done even before such doubts become serious. In practical terms that would mean a régime that allows selective intrusiveness, includes a factor of surprise, and uses technically and scientifically sound methods. We are convinced that all the main elements required are already in existence. The technical methods have been developed to the extent that non-production of the named chemicals can be verified. The further tuning of these methods now depends on clear definitions of all parts of the régime.

The concept of mandatory short-notice on-site inspections and the details of that part of the verification régime should be taken up as a matter of priority during this summer session. The challenge inspections and the different proposals concerning ad hoc procedures should be moulded into a consistent régime which allows for a flexible application of measures to the variety of situations that may arise. Without going into the details of such a régime we feel that the inspections should always be conducted by the Technical Secretariat. There should also be a possibility for the Technical Secretariat to initiate the process. The most important feature, however, is that the inspections falling under this category should constitute a normal procedure under the convention. Their role should be regarded as preventive and not as offensive or as a last resort. Care should also be taken to create reasonable safeguards against abuse of the régime. The inspection activities should not decrease the confidence of the country being inspected or its industry in regard to the overall usefulness of the convention.

The third part is the relationship between the chemical weapons convention and the 1925 Geneva Protocol. In our opinion the convention will have to supersede the provisions of the Protocol, including the reservations made to it. The convention bans chemical weapons from the day it comes into force. The destruction period of 10 years is there to create a realistic timespan to get rid of the existing stocks safely. When the use of chemical weapons is prohibited by the convention there can be no excuses for circumventing that obligation. The maintenance in force of the reservations to the Geneva Protocol would maintain the option of the second use of chemical weapons. This would clearly undermine the convention.

Fourth comes the right of every nation to strive for the normal and legitimate development of its own industrial base including the chemical industries. The convention cannot compel the Governments of the States parties on behalf of the individual enterprises to transfer technology when it