

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

Some progress was also made in incorporating provisions in the convention on settlement of disputes and sanctions. The United States was initially sceptical. Consultations with delegations here, and review of your arguments in Washington, however, persuaded us that the chemical weapons convention might usefully include such provisions. Each sovereign party must, of course, make decisions for itself about whether others are complying with their obligations under the convention. The treaty organization might, however, recommend or suggest to States parties measures which could include sanctions in response to violations.

We have pressed further ahead on jurisdiction and control. We will all need to decide the extent to which each of us is able to enforce our laws with respect to activities in the private sector and outside the boundaries of our countries. The United States is confident that we will succeed in narrowing our differences.

The order of destruction for eliminating chemical weapons and chemical weapons production facilities was worked out and incorporated into the rolling text. This complex, technical section provides the framework for States' preparations and plans, and sets out a practical system which can accommodate the destruction requirements, not only of the two States that have already declared their chemical weapons but also of those that have yet to do so.

We also made important progress on a number of technical issues, including agreement on a common definition of production capacity and thresholds for monitoring the chemical industry, and on provisions for declaration of past transfers of chemical weapons. We also made some progress in the area of schedules and guidelines, where nearly all of us agree on the importance of covering toxins under this convention.

Another issue on which there has been movement is "old chemical weapons". No one disputes that under the convention chemical weapons will not be retained and will be declared and destroyed. All of us seem to accept that the presence of chemical weapons on the territory of a State party will trigger the obligation to declare their existence, regardless of whether they are that State party's or another country's chemical weapons. We all acknowledged this year, however, that the circumstances for chemical weapons being present on a country's territory differ. These differing circumstances give rise to the differences in approaches and attitudes concerning countries' responsibilities for the disposition of old chemical weapon stocks. The United States believes we will ultimately find a solution. We are confident that this can be done without opening up questions of reparation or debates about history.

The United States believes that this body has made remarkable progress toward the conclusion of a comprehensive and global chemical weapons ban since active negotiations got under way six years ago. If the pace has not met everyone's expectations recently, perhaps it is because the problem has changed since we first began. The primary goal then was to bring the United States and the USSR together to eliminate their chemical weapons capabilities. For a sizeable number of delegations around this room, a chemical weapons ban was an East-West, a United States/Soviet problem. CW is no longer primarily a United States/Soviet problem. The United States and the Soviet Union are the