

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Mr. Adelman cited facts relating to the use of chemical weapons in a historical review, so to speak. He committed many inaccuracies, to put it lightly. In our statement in right of reply to the Vice-President of the United States, Mr. Bush, in February 1983 we already cited all the events concerning the use of chemical weapons from the time of the signing of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, and I shall not return to this question. But it is very surprising that he forgot to mention the use of toxic chemicals during a decade by the United States in their aggression in Viet Nam. At the same time, he repeated more than once the lie about the Soviet Union's use of chemical weapons in Afghanistan and South East Asia. We have rejected and we reject this lie. In his statement, and I must confess this is the first time that I encounter such a declaration by a representative of the United States —

Mr. Adelman said:

[Spoke in English] "thankfully, there have been no confirmed attacks with lethal chemical or toxic weapons in Kampuchea, Laos or Afghanistan in 1984."

[Spoke in Russian] Naturally so, inasmuch as neither in 1984 nor at any earlier time has the Soviet Union used chemical weapons. The fact that last year the United States decided to discontinue its campaign of insinuations on this score is explained solely by the fact that the American administration began its pseudo-peacemaking rhetoric in pursuit of a definite goal: to improve its political image in the international arena.

A few words on the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons. Mr. Adelman expressed the hope that 1985 will be the year of the prohibition of chemical weapons. We will strive to achieve this goal. But what has the United States itself done to this end? The talks on this issue have already been underway for a long time. The Soviet Union has repeatedly advanced its own constructive proposals on this issue. In April 1984 the United States submitted its draft convention. Did this help the negotiations? Did it narrow the differences? No. On the contrary. Clearly it was intended to make the achievement of an agreement on chemical weapons more difficult.