

withdrawal from the convention will also increase, since it will possess not only reactivated stocks but also the capability for effecting their rapid build-up, renewal and upgrading.

5. The convention should eliminate the real difference between chemical-weapon and non-chemical-weapon States, and should do so immediately after it enters into force. The French proposal, however, is based on the premise that the status quo existing before the convention enters into force can be changed to the advantage of those States that do not possess chemical weapons or would like to increase their stocks.

The French proposal runs counter to the essence and spirit of the convention. A scheme for the legitimizing of chemical weapons industries - and the most dangerous aspects of them - is placed in opposition to the concept of consistent elimination of chemical weapons and the facilities for their production. The French proposal would also seriously complicate monitoring of chemical weapon stocks. As a result, not only will there not be an increase in confidence among the parties to the convention, but new sources of concern will appear which may divide the States that have signed the convention. This cannot either ensure security for the parties to the convention, or encourage them to accede to it on a large scale.