An important subject to which the Conference should address itself is that of adequate follow-up action to established violations of the convention. In this context, the question of sanctions to be taken against a State which has been found to have acted in violation of its obligations under the convention deserves serious examination. To withdraw from such a State its rights and privileges under the convention can hardly be regarded as a response commensurate with the gravity of an act posing a threat to the objectives of the convention. The States parties to the convention ought to go further and undertake collective action to remedy the situation.

My delegation has noticed a tendency to enter into too many technical and procedural details in drafting the convention. We feel that many of these details could be left to the international authority and its organs which will be established under the convention. In trying to settle all these matters at this stage by including them in the text of the convention or its annexes, we run the risk of unduly delaying its conclusion. There is also a more pragmatic reason why we feel this should not be attempted. It is quite likely that, after the entry into force of the convention and with the benefit of actual experience, a need might be felt to improve some of the technical and procedural details relating to implementation. If all these details are contained in the text of the convention, the necessary modification may be extremely difficult to bring about in view of the obvious difficulties in amending a multilateral international agreement. My delegation therefore does not favour introducing into the convention such an element of rigidity which may not be in the interest of its effective implementation.

Before I pass on to other items on our agenda, may I say that my delegation has been dismayed at the statement just made by the distinguished Ambassador of France. The proposal that parties to the Convention should be permitted to maintain secret security stockpiles of chemical weapons would negate the main objectives of the ban. It would also seriously undermine confidence in the observance of the convention, and only deepen mutual suspicion among States parties with all its perilous consequences. It comes at a particularly inopportune time in view of the progress that is being made in the negotiations taking place in this Conference.