

seems to be that, since the civilian chemical industries in some socialist countries are owned by the government, these facilities would be subject to article X, whereas the chemical industries in the United States or other western countries, since they are privately owned, would not be covered by article X. In passing I would like to note that the countries voicing this and other criticisms of the convention have done so without accepting the invitation of my delegation to meet with any interested delegation to explain fully our draft convention. If they had availed themselves of this opportunity to meet with us, this matter could have been clarified privately. Article X covers not only those locations and facilities that are owned by the government, but also those controlled by the government, whether through contract, other obligations, or regulatory requirements. The privately-owned chemical industries of the United States are so heavily regulated by the United States Government that this equates to the term "controlled" as used in the draft convention. Thus, the private chemical industry of the United States is fully subject to the inspection provisions of article X.

In addition, I will repeat a statement made many times by me and by other representatives of the United States Government. No imbalance in inspection obligation is either desired, intended, or contained in any provisions of the United States draft convention banning chemical weapons. My delegation welcomes any suggestions concerning ways to improve the procedures for the "open invitation" inspections, as long as an equivalent level of confidence is maintained. It is easy to criticize a proposal. It is much harder to work out mutually acceptable solutions to difficult problems. I hope that delegations that have concerns about the "open invitation" approach of article X will join with us in a constructive manner to seek effective solutions.

For locations and facilities not subject to article X, "ad hoc on-site inspections" are provided by article XI of the United States draft. A party may request the Consultative Committee, at any time, to conduct such inspections in order to resolve doubts and concerns. The fact-finding panel shall convene within 24 hours to determine whether such an inspection should be granted. The panel will make its decision based on guidelines contained in annex II. If the panel decides to request an inspection, the requested party shall, except in the most extraordinary circumstances, provide access to the inspectors. If a party refuses an inspection, it must fully explain its refusal and suggest concrete alternative methods for resolving the compliance concern. The fact-finding panel will review these explanations and suggestions to determine if they resolve the question raised. If the problem is not deemed to be resolved, the panel can again request an inspection. If it is refused again, the Chairman of the Consultative Commission shall immediately inform the Security Council of the United Nations.

As with systematic international on-site inspection, there are many detailed, technical procedures governing the conduct of special and ad hoc on-site inspections that need to be negotiated. Section H of annex II contains a list of the areas where the United States believes there must be an agreement on procedures. Some examples of these areas are: a requirement for definition of the area to be inspected, types of equipment to be used, and protection of proprietary or confidential information. These procedures should be negotiated in connection with our consideration of the inspection provisions contained in articles X and XI.

In two statements I have outlined in detail the provisions contained in the United States draft convention dealing with the verification issue. The regime of systematic international on-site inspection, and the compliance resolution system outlined today, combine to provide the confidence in compliance necessary for a comprehensive and effective ban on chemical-weapons. These provisions are central to the United States draft convention. No chemical weapons convention can be achieved without agreement on effective provisions for verification.