

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

a facility which many other CD delegation members visited during our 1983 workshop. I believe that, when Secretary of State Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze agreed in April to an exchange of visits to the American and Soviet facilities, they saw this as an opportunity for the United States and the Soviet Union to build mutual confidence by exchanging information on the subject of the destruction of chemical weapons. This is, after all, a vital part of a chemical weapons convention. I hope that the Soviet Union will soon respond positively to the United States invitation.

Ambassador Nazarkin's statement also indicated that he felt that the United States position on challenge inspection remains unclear. The United States view that challenge inspection should cover all relevant locations and facilities of a State party without distinction between private property or government ownership was correctly noted. The United States specifically amended its draft convention in April 1986 to make this position even clearer, in response to Soviet concerns. If the Soviet delegation continues to have difficulties, I would suggest that they propose alternative language for consideration.

The Soviet statement of 2 July characterized the Ad hoc Committee's work on Cluster III, concerning the non-production of chemical weapons, as "walking in circles". I cannot agree with this characterization. The Committee has made advances in this area this summer under the leadership of Ambassador Ekéus and Mr. Pablo Macedo of Mexico. As examples, a successful chemical industry experts' meeting clarified a number of issues and identified areas of general consensus and areas needing further work. Another example: discussions on commercial supertoxic lethal chemicals resulted in a text that will serve as a basis for further discussions. Another example: for its part, the United States tabled a well-received working paper on production capacity.

In the Soviet statement of 2 July, the United States was criticized for planning to produce chemical weapons while negotiations are under way in Geneva. The recently announced cessation of Soviet production of chemical weapons suggests that their production continued during the eighteen-year period since the United States stopped production unilaterally in 1969. Our delegation sees no reason why the long-overdue modernization of the small United States stockpile is an obstacle to successful completion of the negotiations under way here. Chemical weapons negotiations in fact began and continued throughout the period of the large Soviet build-up of chemical weapons stocks. There is no good reason why the negotiations should not continue to progress as the United States responds to the large imbalance that has been created since the United States ceased the production of chemical weapons eighteen years ago. The massive Soviet stockpile of chemical weapons, unmatched by any other nation, puts all our security at risk and requires remedial action until the storage of chemical weapons can be eliminated from all military arsenals by an effective, comprehensive, global ban.

Also on 2 July, the problem of activities taking place on the territory of States not parties to the convention was raised. This is a serious issue that is much broader than the narrow question of multinational corporations. In fact, the United States does not believe that production of chemical