

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

devoted to chemical weapons and it is only now that, having been able to familiarize myself with it, I would like to make a few comments. I am doing this not because I seek a confrontation with the United States delegation or with any other delegation, but because we have to continue next year work on the banning of chemical weapons. I am making my comments in a spirit of goodwill and I would like the United States delegation and a number of other delegations that share its approach to try to understand our position too.

Firstly, the United States representative said, in particular, "We note there has as yet been no detailed reaction by certain key delegations to either of the major papers we have put forward this year". Perhaps we have indeed not come forward with a detailed response or commentary to the document from the United States delegation. But permit me to ask the United States delegation and a number of other Western countries the following questions. Why have they what I would call such an ambitious attitude with regard to their own documents? Why are they silent for many years with regard to other delegations' proposals? Why, for example, have the delegations of the United States or of other Western Powers not commented in detail on the draft treaty on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons proposed by the delegation of India? Why have the delegations of Western States not commented on the draft international agreements on security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States proposed by a group of socialist countries and by Pakistan? I do not recall there having been any detailed commentary on those, not just working papers, but draft international agreements. The representatives of Western States said merely "en passant" that those initiatives were not acceptable to them, that they were inopportune, and so on. But when there appears a document from the United States delegation or from a number of other Western States, everybody must comment on it in detail. Why? What if our attitude to those documents was, on the whole, negative and we expressed that negative attitude in general form? Why should we be obliged to do it in detail? Are we in a court, that we should have to justify ourselves or submit factual evidence? For our part, we do not make such demands of others. Why, for example, did the United States delegation not present in plenary sessions a detailed opinion concerning the Soviet draft basic provisions of a treaty on the prohibition of chemical weapons? If my memory serves me right, our document was also referred to "en passant".

Another point:

"It must be remembered that we made this proposal over a year ago on the quota and questions about it have been on the table ever since. Only in the last week, when the work of the contact group on stockpiles had been completed, did the Soviet delegation begin to clarify for the Committee its proposal for verification of stockpile destruction by inspection on a quota basis. It must be remembered that they made this proposal a year ago, and questions about it have been on the table ever since."

Well, to begin with, that is inexact. We have explained our position on verification on a quota basis in quite some detail during bilateral consultations with numerous delegations. And it is especially surprising to us that the