

(Mr. Ramaker, Netherlands)

certain delegations. It is therefore with great interest that we have taken note of the positions developed today by the distinguished head of the delegation of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Issraelyan. We will study them carefully.

If it is realized that stockpile destruction constitutes, together with assured non-production, the main goal of the convention, the seriousness of the situation just outlined is brought to light in all clarity. Furthermore, lack of progress in one area apparently has a spill-over effect on other areas of the future convention. So this lack of progress on stockpile destruction seems to have had an adverse effect on progress in the field of assured non-production.

In an important brochure of the International Federation of Chemical Energy and General Workers' Unions (ICEF) entitled "The Chemical Workers Report on Chemical Warfare", we are once again reminded that chemical weapons were originally derived from civilian industrial research. Chemical warfare agents can be produced without difficulty in the non-dedicated civilian industry. This very fact led, in the early discussions on a chemical weapons treaty, to the rejection of the idea of establishing a list of chemical warfare agents to be banned, since such a list could be easily circumvented and might indeed promote research on non-listed chemical warfare agents. We therefore do not think that the chemical warfare agents approach is a very promising one. It is obvious that some form of assurance by the civilian chemical industry that commercial chemical operations do not conceal the production of outlawed chemicals (which would be a qualitative check) and that they do not produce more than the permitted quantities of dual purpose agents (quantitative check) is necessary.

For these purposes, an obligation to exchange production statistics should be within reach, since, inter alia for environmental reasons, most countries already require that the industry submit such data on the national level. This, however, can only be part of an effective verification system. More intrusive control measures cannot be dispensed with, first and foremost to control the civilian chemical industry that produces key precursors. The United Kingdom, in submitting document CD/353, has rendered us a highly valuable service by dispelling the myth that this is an impossible task because of the sheer size of the chemical industry involved. More difficult is the problem of the verification of non-production in commercial chemical plants that are not declared as producing key precursors but nevertheless can be considered capable of making them. During next year's session, work on these problems should continue and be intensified.

As to the acceptability of the particular measures of inspection of the civilian industry on the territory of the inspected party, the delegations of Australia, Finland and the Netherlands have in past years made proposals that would allow for a lower degree of intrusiveness than often feared. With regard to countries with a traditionally high degree of secrecy, we found it interesting in this respect to note that the ICEF report argues that such secrecy is de facto gradually disappearing, as a consequence of the technology- and products-exchange barter-agreements nowadays existing between the Western world and the Soviet Union. This phenomenon already necessitates vast numbers of foreign personnel to be directly engaged in Soviet industry, and shows that the Soviet concern with secrecy can be accommodated. In so far as on-site inspection will be necessary in the context of a future convention, this may therefore turn out to be likewise manageable and acceptable.

It is the sincere hope of my delegation that after a year in which matters of a procedural nature often seemed to predominate over substance, none the less the stage has been set for fruitful work in 1984 when we will see each other again here in Geneva.