

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

of the convention. At least this is not our position. What we do believe is that challenge inspection requires a particular sense of responsibility and political realism on the part of States. It must be understood that compliance with the convention will be based primarily on the goodwill of the States parties to it, on their wish for a peaceful world less burdened by arms race, and on their desire to eliminate the very means of waging chemical war. It will also be based on the fact that States, which usually set a high value on their political prestige, will not allow it to be damaged through their own fault.

This is the only approach that can help us place challenge inspection in a proper perspective within the convention and correctly formulate the relevant provisions without eroding the very purpose of such inspection or undermining the sovereign rights of States. It should be well understood in Washington that efforts to make challenge inspection mandatory and automatic will only waste our time in working out the convention. Our response to such proposals is unambiguously negative.

In this connection I would like to make the following point of principle which does not concern only the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons. As is well known, the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament indicates that the form and the terms of verification provided for in any particular agreement depend on the purposes, the scope and the nature of that agreement. Applied to the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons which is now being drawn up, this obviously means that the form and the terms of verification must be such as to reliably ascertain whether the convention is being complied with, on the one hand, and not to go beyond its scope, on the other. Hence we cannot but object to forms of verification that could be used for purposes beyond those of the convention.

Prohibition of chemical weapons by no means requires such things as providing access to facilities which produce the types of weapons not affected by the agreement in question. It is therefore only natural that if we are to approach the task of banning chemical weapons seriously, verification procedures have to be drawn up that could not be abused to interfere in the activities of States not covered by the convention which bans one specific type of weapon of mass destruction.

We have repeatedly emphasized that general and complete verification can be discussed only at the stage of general and complete disarmament, whereas attempts to impose general and complete verification as part of a limited agreement banning one specific, although important, type of weapon of mass destruction -- namely chemical weapons -- is to raise artificial obstacles in the way of working out such an agreement.

In conclusion I would like to reiterate that the Soviet delegation stands ready to continue serious and constructive negotiations with a view to the earliest conclusion of a convention banning chemical weapons. As is well known, we were among those who advanced the proposal to make a more rational use of our time for negotiations and we remain firmly committed to the Conference decision or recommendation at its previous session to hold an extended session of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons in the autumn of 1985.

For the USSR, the prohibition of chemical weapons has been and remains a priority task set out in the most important documents of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet Government. The Soviet delegation will do everything in its power to solve this task as rapidly as possible.