

(Mr. Morel, France)

a security stock as from the very entry into force of the convention. This undoubtedly offers an advantage with regard to verification. But at the same time, we must appreciate the real and serious drawback as regards security, since declaring the location might also encourage a pre-emptive attack in the event of a crisis. That is why our preference falls on the option under which the location would not be declared publicly, but recorded in a sealed envelope which would be opened in the event of a challenge inspection. The possibility of transfer to another location would naturally have to be kept open, but this would then be subjected to the same conditions; that is to say, with the new location indicated in a sealed envelope.

The second question concerns the number of locations for security stocks, whether the location is declared or not. Here again, security considerations would lead us to believe that several locations would be preferable; but if the monitoring is to be effective, agreed limits are required, which we would suggest be set at five locations.

The third difficulty which should be pointed out here is the question of direct access in the case of challenge inspection. I raise this matter here for the record; the solution to be chosen with regard to security stocks will in the final analysis be the same as that decided on for the general régime.

Whatever the final balance determined for the monitoring of security stocks, we must recall that this will be carried out within a strictly defined framework, which will place heavy burdens on all the parties to the convention:

Initial declaration within 30 days of the entry into force of the convention, specifying the volume, composition and location of the place of storage, either publicly or in a sealed envelope;

During the first eight years, régime of challenge inspection which varies according to whether the location is known or not;

At the end of the eighth year, opening of the sealed envelopes where appropriate, and in any case placing of stocks under international control preparatory to phased destruction. The challenge inspection régime thus remains the indispensable instrument for verification.

This very brief recapitulation of the verification mechanisms enables us to emphasize that we do not intend to leave any escape clause in drawing up the régime which will be finally adopted.

There is still one point which can be linked to verification. This is what has been presented -- wrongly -- as the risk of CW proliferation which it is claimed would stem from the approach adopted by France. Some have stated that, by providing for the possibility of constituting a limited security stock for a period of 10 years, this would at least indirectly sanction CW proliferation. This is a complete misunderstanding. The risk of CW proliferation can be defined only in relation to a ban; it necessarily exists in any convention arrangement simply because sovereign States cannot be forced to accede to a convention. Everything which, like the security stocks, will help to enhance the effectiveness, the non-discriminatory character and the equality of all parties in the course of the 10-year period, will