

(Mr. Hansen, United States)

position that all chemical weapons stocks, including harmless precursors stored for chemical weapons purposes, should be destroyed. There should now be full agreement in this area.

With respect to chemical weapons production facilities, my delegation has suggested that work in Cluster II focus initially in areas where there is broad agreement. We believe it is appropriate for the Committee to examine how a verification system for eliminating such facilities would function. My delegation has introduced an informal outline to assist in this examination. To help these discussions move forward, we are circulating today a paper containing more detailed suggestions for a step-by-step approach to verifying the elimination of CW production facilities.

A clear idea of the verification steps necessary for international assurance that parties are eliminating their chemical weapons production facilities is essential from the beginning. For an effective verification system, we must ensure that the measures for declarations, inspections and on-site monitoring with instruments are carefully integrated with specific verification objectives. Before one can decide what to declare, the purpose of declarations must be clear. Before one can write procedures or determine the frequency of inspection, one must know the objectives of an inspection. Before one can decide on what types of instruments may be needed, one must know what objectives instrument monitoring must satisfy. In our outline, we propose such objectives for each facet of the verification system for chemical weapons production facilities.

In article V we also note that there are still fundamental issues to be resolved about how chemical weapons production facilities are to be eliminated. However, we believe that broad agreement in principle already exists on the general approach to verification in this regard. In our view much important work can be done toward converting this agreement in principle into provisions for a verification without prejudging the remaining issues.

The final issue on which I would like to comment today is challenge inspection. This subject remains one of the key negotiating problems, although by no means the only one. There seems to be broad agreement that quick action is needed to carry out inspections and that in at least two cases inspection will be mandatory. While we regard the evolution of the Soviet approach in a positive light, we view the new Soviet position announced on 17 February as being internally inconsistent and falling far short of what is needed for an effective challenge provision.

Allow me to give two examples of why the Soviet position is internally inconsistent.

In his statement of 17 February the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union said that the Soviet Union will be pressing for the most stringent system of supervision and verification. The USSR has argued for strict routine inspection provisions for the chemical industry. Yet it continues to oppose mandatory challenge inspection, the most stringent system proposed, for the vast majority of plants in the chemical industry that it is ostensibly so concerned about. For under the Soviet approach, only the relatively few plants already subject to declaration would be open to