

delegation regrets the political debate on verification which has blocked progress on more than one disarmament agreement. Refusal to accept nothing less than total intrusiveness or rejection of that optimum degree of the intrusiveness necessary for the viability of the agreement, would not be compatible with the declared commitment to outlaw these weapons in the interest of all States. We should also bear in mind the necessity of not burdening prospective States parties with cumbersome and expensive verification procedures relating to monitoring of production for permitted purposes. Similarly verification must be protected against misuse through irresponsible, mischievous and provocative challenges which could lead to counter-challenges and a consequent over-burdening of the verification machinery as well as a jeopardizing of the stability of the Convention. If the Convention is to be of a truly multilateral character, it should not give rise to additional investments on the part of the developing countries for the setting up of institutional mechanisms to monitor the civilian chemical industry. The common denominator of verification should be found not only among the possessors of chemical weapons but also among the possessors and non-possessors. With regard to the Consultative Committee and the institutional arrangements envisaged for verification, my delegation would like to see the principle of universality maintained with democratized decision-making procedures. We cannot subscribe to the view, that has been disproved over and over again, that power begets responsibility, justifying a weighted scheme of decision-making. Peace and security is the common right of mankind. It is too important to be put in charge of a few countries who happen to monopolize weapons of mass destruction.

CD/PV.279

pp.18-19

Romania/Datcu

7.8.84

CW

In my delegation's opinion, efforts to prohibit the development production and stockpiling of chemical means of warfare should be placed within the setting of the general concern of States to outlaw all weapons of mass destruction, above all nuclear weapons. The convention on chemical weapons should therefore be global in character, covering all toxic warfare substances, including non-lethal ones, the means of using them and production facilities, even those which at present are not operational but may become so within a very short time. We believe that the basic undertakings of the future convention should cover the prohibition of the use and the threat of use of chemical weapons. At the same time, the convention should encourage the broadest exchange possible of technical information as well as co-operation in the peaceful use of the chemical industry, above all for the benefit of developing countries. Special provision should be made to guarantee open and free access for all States parties to the processes and licences required both for the destruction of stockpiles of chemical weapons and for the verification and monitoring of the obligations undertaken, the starting point being, naturally, the experience already acquired by some countries in this field. At the same time, the convention should permit the production, transfer and storage of toxic substances and their precursors, in strictly specified quantities, for protection, as well as for industrial, agricultural and medical uses, etc. It may be assumed that the chemical agents in this category should not exceed 1,000 kilos per year and that the national authority responsible for implementing the convention will inform the Consultative Committee in writing each year of these activities. The production of these agents should be carried out within a single industrial unit, designated by each State and subject to verification.

It is in this light that we have appreciated the Working Paper submitted by the United Kingdom delegation (document CD/514, of 1984) on the verification of non-production of chemical weapons, as a suggestion for ensuring that such activities do not