(Mr. Batsanov, USSR)

The issues of what should be the starting point for challenge inspections and what their scope should be are of fundamental importance. Of equal importance is what the end result of these inspections should be. In our opinion, for the sake of having an effectively functioning convention mechanism there is everything to be said for taking no decisions as to compliance by a State with the convention when reports on challenge inspection results are discussed in the bodies of an international organization established under the convention. Instead, where necessary, recommendations would be adopted on measures to ensure compliance with the convention. Among such measures certain sanctions could also be considered. We believe that a similar procedure could also be applied to the consideration of reports on routine inspection results.

Recently, there have also been signs of progress in working out a régime of systematic verification, in particular within the framework of article VI of the draft convention. In this context we take note with satisfaction of the support given by the distinguished representative of the United States, Ambassador Friedersdorf to the idea of including Schedule 2B in the convention.

We also support the idea that in addition to the so-called "régime" schedules of chemicals, on the basis of which certain measures of limitation or verification would be taken, a "marker" list - or as it is called - a "waiting and warning" list should be envisaged for substances capable of posing a risk for the purposes of the convention. The scientific and consultative council which would be established within the framework of an international organization unde· the future convention and which would perform the function of keeping track c innovations in chemistry would also participate in drawing up the list. A part of the council's membership could be elected from candidates proposed by international scientific organizations.

Taking into account the view of a number of States that laboratory synthesis of Schedule I chemicals should be permitted not only for medical and research purposes, but also for the purposes of protection, we would be prepared to agree to such synthesis being carried out at a State's discretion either at a small-scale facility or at one laboratory synthesizing not more than 100 g of Schedule I chemicals, with its location and the names of the chemicals synthesized being declared. We do not propose that either this laboratory or any other laboratory synthesizing Schedule I chemicals should be subject to systematic international verification. At the same time we believe it is important to envisage approval and declaration by States parties of all laboratories synthesizing Schedule I chemicals for permitted purposes. A positive solution to this problem would considerably facilitate agreement on this section of the convention in general. As for production of Schedule I chemicals for pharmaceutical purposes outside a small-scale facility, we would be prepared to agree to the proposal that their annual quantity should not exceed 10 kg for each facility in question.

A number of delegations have recently expressed concern that with the verification systems under article VI as they now stand, multi-purpose facilities, as well as facilities which are not producing chemicals posing a