

(Mr. El Reedy, Egypt)

of enforcing compliance with its provisions. This necessitates the establishment of an effective system to verify the occurrence of any violations, to counter such violations when they occur, and to deal with any situation in which a State finds itself endangered as a result of its accession to the convention and its fulfilment of its obligations in good faith.

At meetings of the Working Group and meetings of experts, Egypt has consistently stressed the need for the convention to incorporate an effective verification system, including the possibility of on-site inspection. It is gratifying to note that the Committee on Disarmament currently appears to be more aware of this requirement.

However, we do not believe that the establishment of an effective verification system would, in itself, be sufficient to inspire the requisite degree of confidence in the credibility of the convention. Provision should also be made, therefore, to deal with situations in which a State party refuses to co-operate with the bodies responsible for verification, or in which a violation of the provisions of the convention is ascertained through the verification procedure.

It might be said that, in such a situation, any injured State could call upon the Security Council to discuss the matter and take the appropriate action. However, with all deference to the Security Council, which plays a commendable and significant role in disarmament conventions, we do not believe that recourse to its authority is sufficient for dealing with situations such as those to which we have referred. Resort to the Security Council is not, in itself, sufficient to inspire the requisite degree of confidence in the credibility of the convention and would not, therefore, encourage the largest possible number of States to accede to the Convention.

I do not believe that we need to elaborate on our reasons for taking this view. In effect, under the Charter of the United Nations, any Member State has the right of recourse to the Security Council and no special convention is needed for this purpose. Moreover, resort to the Security Council is regulated by the provisions of the Charter which cannot be amended by a convention such as the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. The right of veto or objection granted to the five superpowers is laid down in the provisions of the Charter governing the work of the Security Council.

We are all aware of the problems encountered in the adoption of resolutions in the Security Council as a result of political considerations and current circumstances. Consequently, we can envisage a situation in which a single State, possibly not even a party to the convention, might be able to obstruct the work of the entire Council and prevent the adoption of a resolution. For this reason, we do not believe that the possibility of resort to the Security Council would, in itself, inspire the requisite degree of confidence in the convention.

In making this assessment, we have taken into account the special nature of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, together with our past experience of the work of the Security Council.