

(Mr. Bild, Canada)

accord on confidence- and security-building measures. Both agreements have been successfully implemented and fully complied with, a result, I would argue, to a large measure attributable to the possibility of such inspections.

Allow me to amplify these remarks by applying them to the draft chemical weapons convention. I find it difficult to imagine that any future disarmament treaties can be reached without the prospect of potentially intrusive international verification. Should this be alarming or a cause for disquiet? Not at all. We should always bear in mind that no verification measures will come into play without their being carefully tailored to the requirements of the treaty at hand. Moreover, co-operation and consensus over these details will make the intrusiveness of international on-site inspection into a means of assuring all concerned that the treaty is being fully complied with by the parties.

I have heard it suggested that in the case of the chemical weapons convention, requests for challenge inspections would generate political sensitivities and suggestions of guilt. This outlook misconstrues the objective of such inspections. They need not be regarded as provocative, but rather as confidence-inspiring. Until such time as experience and technology permit more systematic methods of inspection to carry the full load of verification, I submit that challenge inspections will be de rigueur in virtually all disarmament treaties, the chemical weapons convention being one of the more prominent. What we could be encountering is an "attitudinal" problem, a problem that can be overcome as long as we keep our eyes firmly on the following: first, an essential concern of the convention is to ensure that international inspectors have access to any facility where clandestine activities might be undertaken; second, the essential obligation is on the challenged State to demonstrate its compliance, and not on the requesting State to prove non-compliance. As we have all indicated an abiding interest in a global, comprehensive and effectively verifiable chemical weapons convention, this objective in regard to verification should be fully embraced, with the obligations willingly, indeed cheerfully, shouldered. There is thus no reason to shrink back in fear. Since we have already agreed with the UNDC conclusion that the request for inspection not carry with it implications of guilt but rather be considered a normal element of verification, let us put this "attitudinal" problem behind us and move to a more practical, less anxious understanding of what challenge inspections imply.

By the same token, we should not venerate challenge inspections as the "be-all and end-all" of chemical weapons verification. Careful thought should be given to elaborating a verification régime that would avoid unnecessary recourse to the challenge provision. Indeed, we can also explore other avenues, perhaps by making challenge inspections as "routine" as possible; by keeping them as multilateral as possible in execution and reporting of findings; and by allowing as much flexibility as possible in solving compliance problems to everybody's satisfaction through other means. These other means could include, inter alia, mutually agreed bilateral measures, fact-finding "clarification visits" or other means of demonstrating clarification short of invoking the challenge provisions. I have every confidence that, with ingenuity and perseverance, the Ad hoc Committee will find a way to accommodate the concern over intrusive on-site challenge inspection without jeopardizing the integrity of the "mandatory, short-notice" principle.