

- the provisions of law of the States parties concerned;
- secondly, correspondence of the verification system with the principle of the inviolability of security interest of the States parties concerned;
  - thirdly, the intrusiveness of the verification system should be reduced to minimum and justified only by the nature and the dimensions of the scope;
  - fourthly, the verification system should be reasonable in the sense of costs involved which are to be covered by the future signatories.

We are of the opinion that the most appropriate verification system is one which ensures in practice the effectiveness of verification on one hand and is acceptable to the interested parties on the other. It seems, in this connection, that the intrusiveness of the system proposed by the United States is incommensurable with real needs. Some proposed methods of verification overlap, although that does not double the control effects and does not increase the volume of information achieved. As an example I quote from the statement of Ambassador Fields on 12 July. What is proposed is "...systematic international on-site verification of chemical weapons, from the moment they were declared, to the moment they were destroyed...". In a system thus proposed there should be: immediate verification of the initial declarations, verification of the declared stocks between the declarations and elimination, and the verification of the destruction of stocks. In fact, such a system could allegedly reduce to a minimum the eventual cases of violation of the convention but, on the other hand, it may bring distrust among States parties as to the real intentions for conducting at least some on-site inspections. What can be achieved as a result might be the reluctance on the part of certain States to participate in the convention. This result would be exactly the opposite of what I believe we want to achieve.

In another statement, namely that of 19 July, the distinguished Ambassador Fields tried to answer some criticisms and dispel some legitimate questions and doubts many delegations, including mine, have with regard to article X of the United States draft convention by saying, *inter alia*, that "...the private chemical industry of the United States is fully subject to the inspection provisions of article X...". I must say, however, that our doubts have not been dispelled. They are further strengthened by the opinions of some United States experts; for example, in a serious work on the subject entitled "Arms Control and Inspection in American Law", an American author, Louis Henkin, suggests that the question of on-site inspections in case of private industry, and that would of course pertain also to chemical industry, may go even as far as to require amendment of the United States Constitution.

During the last plenary meetings we have listened with great attention also to several other statements devoted to chemical weapons. Some of them, containing interesting ideas, are subject to careful study by my delegation. Today, without going into details, I would like to dwell on two of these thoughts. We have no doubt that chemical weapons must be destroyed, and this should be done as soon as possible, without any artificial complications. Thus we sympathized very much with the idea voiced by the delegation of Australia that obsolete stocks of chemical weapons, which sooner or later will have to be disposed of, could be destroyed as an act of goodwill, before entry into force of the Convention.

Such a step could not only reduce the burden to be carried by verification but would also build up the confidence necessary for the early elaboration and implementation of the convention banning the chemical weapons.