

worse?

CD/PV.271 p.19 Czechoslovakia/Vejvoda 10.7.84 RW

As for the position of my delegation on the problem, it proceeds from the fact that the prohibition of radiological weapons is a question of a basically different nature than that of the protection of nuclear facilities. These two important problems differ as far as technical nature as well as military and legal background are concerned. Within the prohibition of radiological weapons we shall take into account the possibility of creating concrete weapons in the full sense of the word. They would comprise radioactive material with an optimum half-life of decay, which has to be produced and stored, as well as the necessary munitions, devices and equipment which would also have to be produced and stored. The final weapons could hypothetically be prepared for use, transported and used. All these characteristics render the question of the prohibition of radiological weapons a typical disarmament problem with a possibility for appropriate verification measures.

On the other hand, the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities is of a different nature, since it amounts only to a problem of non-use of force against certain objects or installations. Since there is no possibility of applying the same measures of compliance and verification to the prohibition of radiological weapons as well as to the material and technical pre-conditions of a possible attack against nuclear facilities, the latter problem should be treated with a completely different approach.

CD/PV.271 pp.21-23 Australia/Rowe 10.7.84 CW

Thus far we are in agreement. However, the countries of the world need to be assured that the purpose of the convention has been fulfilled, and to this end each stage of the destruction process must be verified.

As we have said the measure of agreement that exists already is quite considerable. This could be extended if thought were given to what may be called the interdependence of all aspects of the destruction of chemical warfare stocks and facilities.

Destruction must be: verifiable; balanced; complete; and it must be carried out in a manner that is visible to the countries of the world.

This will only be possible if declarations and plans for destruction are detailed as to quantity, type, location, etc. Time-tables for destruction cannot be worked out in vacuo but must be based on detailed knowledge of what exists, where it is, and how it will be destroyed.

Provisional plans for destruction will be deposited with the Consultative Committee soon after entry into force. It would seem logical, however, for these plans to be revised by the Consultative Committee, in order to fulfil the requirement for a verifiable, balanced, complete and visible destruction to take place. Thus, States possessing chemical weapons should expect the Consultative Committee or its executive body to revise time-tables, and specify verification procedures. This type of revision will only be possible after entry into force, when all details of stocks and facilities are available to the Consultative Committee.

General principles relating to a phased and balanced destruction can be negotiated and laid down in the convention. However, detailed plans and time-tables must be achieved by consultation between the Consultative Committee and those States which possess chemical weapons. Detailed plans must be based on a detailed knowledge of what is to be destroyed.