

It hardly requires very keen insight to understand that what is involved here is not verification which is really necessary for confidence in strict compliance with agreements, in which, incidentally, the USSR is no less interested than the United States. The main point is the following — putting forward demands on unimpeded access to the territories of other States to continue to block the achievement of agreement on a chemical-weapon ban.

In reality, the United States draft can only throw the negotiations on a chemical-weapons ban many years back. It not only suffers from extremism, it not only cancels the efforts of many years made by many States with a view to elaborating realistic solutions to verification problems, but it is built on a blatantly discriminatory basis, and places States with different social systems in unequal situations. This was also recognized in today's statement by the representative of the United States. Its implementation would inflict damage to the economic and defence interests of a number of States, first of all those of the socialist States, but not only theirs.

Today the representative of the United States referred to the statement of the Soviet delegation of 21 February. I should like to recall what was said in that statement. I quote from the English translation. "In declaring today our readiness in principle to consider in a positive manner the proposal for the permanent presence of the representatives of international control at the special facilities for the destruction of stocks, we would like particularly to stress that our premise is that our partners at negotiations will also for their part prove their readiness, not in words but in deeds, to seek mutually acceptable solutions." And now we have before us the United States draft, which should have taken into account, as we hoped, the viewpoint of the Soviet Union as well, which is very well known to the United States inasmuch as we have been carrying on negotiations with the United States for eight years at least on both a bilateral and multilateral basis.

The question must be asked: Why was it necessary for the United States to put forward such a proposal which is deliberately unacceptable for the Soviet Union and many other States? Incidentally, many high United States officials have said that it is deliberately unacceptable. In fact, they could not expect that agreement could be achieved on the basis of it. No, of course, nobody expected that. And the achievement of an agreement was hardly the goal of the authors of the draft. We are deeply convinced that the draft was submitted merely in order to try to cover by the noisy publicity around the United States draft the reality of what the American administration is engaging in — the intensive preparation of the implementation of the 10 billion dollar "United States chemical rearmament" programme proclaimed by President Reagan.

CD/PV.262

pp.25, 27

UK/Middleton

26.4.84

CW,CTB

The tabling last week of the draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons by the Vice-President of the United States, Mr. George Bush, was an event of the highest significance. The British Government warmly supports this latest initiative by the United States, which will mark a milestone on the long path towards a total ban on these appalling weapons. My Government shares the United States view that strict verification is needed to assure all States that the prohibitions of any future convention are being observed. My delegation was glad to note from the statement of 18 April by the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union that his delegation was prepared to agree, in negotiations on this subject, to a whole range of different verification methods, including mandatory systematic or permanent international on-site inspection, as well as inspections by challenge. My delegation believes that a combination of these two types of verification will be needed, both to give confidence that all chemical