

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

in a comprehensive chemical weapons convention". Such attempts should be resisted in order to establish a universally applicable convention with enhanced effectiveness.

The second issue is the question of "sanctions". This issue has not been dealt with in the past within the context of the chemical weapons convention. However, this year the Ad hoc Committee is going to take it up through its Working Group 2. Egypt, for its part, would like to see provisions containing specific sanctions should any State (party or non-party) violate the provisions of the convention. We would also like to have guarantees to ensure that sanctions are applied effectively and without discrimination or delay. Sanctions should not be construed as a mere device for punishment. In our view the reference to sanctions encompasses a more comprehensive approach that could provide requisite elements of security. We believe a clear distinction should be drawn between nuclear and chemical weapons. The nature and consequences of the use of chemical weapons are of more limited scope. Where chemical weapons are concerned, the international community should not in our view limit itself to negative assurances in the manner followed with respect to the NPT when the Security Council adopted resolution 255 in June 1968. The chemical weapons convention in our view, should aim much higher. Positive and credible assurances should be the ultimate objective.

Egypt does not subscribe to the view that the Conference on Disarmament should submit the convention directly to the General Assembly for adoption. Egypt prefers that an invitation be addressed to all States, members and non-members of the Conference on Disarmament alike, to attend a conference devoted to the consideration of the convention. We also believe that some form of preparatory work should be initiated as soon as possible to exchange views on all the dimensions and possible implications of the convention. We support the convening of an international conference under United Nations auspices open to all potential parties to the convention. In our view this procedure ensures direct participation and consequently would greatly contribute to the conclusion of a comprehensive document acceptable to all States.

Another pending issue is that of the settlement of disputes. There is no provision at present in the "rolling text" on this subject. Certain references exist, however, though scattered among some articles and specifying only one method, namely negotiation. What happens if a solution to a problem is not reached through negotiation? It should be expected that certain disputes may arise out of the application or interpretation of the convention. We must therefore provide adequate means for the resolution of such disputes.

With respect to reservations, it is the view of my delegation that there should be no reservations whatsoever attached to the chemical weapons convention. If, however, such a view is not accepted, my delegation believes that reservations should be confined to certain provisions only, and that they should be compatible with and not derogate from the scope and purpose of the convention itself.