

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

confess to some disappointment in recent days on both substantive and procedural grounds. We have heard threats by individual delegations that unless they get what they want in one article, they will hold up another article. Such tactical linkage which is devoid of substantive rationale only invites retaliation in kind.

At this stage in the negotiations, if we are to have a CW convention in 1992, we believe that all serious proposals, and especially proposals receiving broad support, should be reflected in appendix I of the "rolling text", if necessary with footnotes and/or brackets. The time has come to cease unfocused general discussions. If we are to find solutions to the issues, the best basis is actual language proposed for the convention. Let us cease arguing over the placement of papers in other appendices. Then we can focus our efforts on the proposed treaty text itself, seek compromises where possible and where not, clearly identify alternatives for political solution.

Let me add that we are disappointed that a small number of delegations are blocking agreement on a work programme to carry the CW Committee through till next January. My Government finds this difficult to understand, in view of the opportunity to wrap these negotiations up and achieve a convention next year. My delegation does not consider this matter closed, and will continue to press for CW work during the eight weeks of the BWC Review Conference and the disarmament portion of the First Committee. To that end we call on capitals represented here to augment their delegations as necessary.

In my statement today I have outlined the areas of which I believe work should focus, and the approach we should take. Let me leave the subject of chemical weapons with a cautionary note. I have heard it said that some in this chamber believe that following the Gulf War and operation "Desert Storm", the United States has less interest in a CW convention. This argument holds that we have demonstrated that for ourselves, chemical weapons capability on the part of an aggressor can be handled with weapons in our conventional inventory, and that we and the Soviet Union have taken care of the problem of our own large CW stocks and security requirements with our bilateral arrangements.

This line of argument is mistaken. United States security will be enhanced by the convention. Furthermore, the United States has allies and friends around the world whose security, including security from chemical attack, is vital to us. The United States-Soviet bilateral agreement signed by Presidents Bush and Gorbachev 1 June last year is integrally linked with achievement of a CW convention. So we will continue to work as hard as ever for agreement here. It would, however, be equally mistaken to believe that the United States and its allies are more interested in achieving a CW convention than other members of our Conference, and accordingly that an increasing number of provisions unrelated to chemical weapons can be added to the Treaty in the expectation we will continue to make concessions. We are not les demandeurs in this negotiation. Conclusion of a CW convention will enhance the security of each and every State that becomes a party. This is important, a worthy goal: Let's keep it in sight.