

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

of the destruction of stocks at converted or specialized facilities. If such a provision for inclusion in the convention were agreed on in principle, which unfortunately is not the case at present, that would constitute a great step forward and we could then consider methods of implementing that agreement -- and I repeat, agreement. Such an agreement does not yet exist.

The same applies to verification that the permitted production of supertoxic lethal chemicals at specialized facilities does not exceed the upper limit of one tonne. We propose that such a facility should operate under national verification with very strict registration of amounts of initial products consumed and chemicals produced, that its location should be declared and that provision should be made for the carrying out of international on-site inspections (for example, on the basis of an agreed quota) to verify the production of supertoxic lethal chemicals for permitted purposes at such a facility. But it may be asked, have we reached agreement in principle on this question too? I think not although there would not seem to be any obvious insuperable obstacles to our doing that.

We are also in agreement with those delegations which, judging by their questions, are concerned about how verification can be conducted with respect to the possible production of the precursors of supertoxic substances and, in truth, of binary weapons, at commercial enterprises. As for arguments that binary weapons and their production can be dealt with in the same way as other types of chemical weapons, we do not find them very convincing. Such arguments do not eliminate the problem of verifying that precursors for binary weapons are not being produced, in particular at commercial enterprises.

I should also like to stress one other point. Whatever types of activity we may consider and whatever obligations under the Convention may be involved, in practice, according to the Soviet draft basic provisions international verification in the form of on-site inspection upon request would in general be applicable. We were asked about the procedure for carrying out this form of verification. In this connection I should like to point out that such a procedure has been worked out in detail in the course of negotiations on other international agreements and treaties and the experience gained in the course of those negotiations, in particular the Soviet-Anglo-American negotiations on the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, could obviously be applied also to the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

I should like to take the opportunity to make a few brief comments on the course of the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons in the Committee. There is no doubt that the Ad Hoc Working Group under the experienced guidance of Ambassador Sujka has done a great deal of useful work: mutual understanding has widened on many important aspects of the convention; differences of views have in many instances been reduced or minimized, and possible agreed formulations are even beginning to emerge. At the same time, however, in the Soviet delegation's view, there have appeared certain undesirable tendencies diverting us from the speediest possible conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. These tendencies are evident in the fact that, instead of consolidating the basic provisions of the future convention, on which consensus is in sight, some delegations have been trying to divert the discussion to secondary and at times purely technical matters. And the number of these matters is constantly growing.