

## Canada to Report Military Holdings

As part of its commitment to promoting transparency in military matters, Canada is thus far the only country to announce that it will include statistics on military holdings in the data submitted to the UN arms register for the 1992 period. The register was established by a 1991 UN resolution, co-sponsored by Canada. It calls for the reporting of exports and imports of seven categories of weapons and invites states to include information about their arms holdings and arms procurement. The 1992 reports are due by April 30, 1993. In addition, Canada will continue to issue its own annual report on military exports, which covers all categories of military equipment, not just the seven reported to the UN.

ups. We hope that all 17 Panel countries will co-sponsor the current resolution endorsing the Secretary-General's report. We now must work for universal participation in the register. Canada will report fully to the register by April 30, 1993, for the calendar year 1992. We call on all Member States to do likewise.

The Panel agreed on definitions of categories of equipment of which transfers are to be registered. It also developed a user-friendly, standardized form for reporting international transfers. Most importantly, the Panel focused on the question of the modalities for early expansion of the register. In this context, the Panel noted that the possibility of the addition of further categories of equipment and the elaboration of the register to include military holdings and procurement through national production will follow the examination of these issues by the group of governmental experts to be convened in 1994.

In Canada's view, the inclusion of military holdings and procurement through national production in 1994 is essential to making the register a meaningful instrument of transparency in armaments. In the interim period, we encourage all Member States to contribute fully to the register and to prepare their views, as requested in Paragraph 11(a) of Resolution 46/36L, on the operation of the register during its first

two years, and on the addition of further categories of equipment and the elaboration of the register to include military holdings and procurement through national production.

### ENMOD

Canada pledges its cooperation with respect to the resolution to be introduced by Australia as President of the Second Review Conference of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques (ENMOD). The environmental aggression by Iraq during the Gulf War catapulted this hitherto obscure treaty onto centre stage. The Review Conference held in September provided the opportunity to put in place a process for adapting ENMOD to contemporary relevance.

In Canada's view, the Review Conference made plain that all is not well with the ENMOD treaty, largely because of serious differences of interpretation of the treaty's scope among States Parties. The Final Declaration made a modest step towards clarifying those differences. Most notably, it was agreed that "any" and all environmental modification techniques are covered, regardless of the level of technology employed. Further, it was agreed that the use of herbicides is covered by the Convention.

However, the review also made clear that there is no basis for affirming the continuing effectiveness of this treaty without a more careful examination — by experts — of the interpretational problems. Canada is therefore one of the countries referred to in Paragraph 2 of the Final Declaration as desiring a Consultative Committee of Experts to be convened pursuant to Article V of the Treaty.

It is our hope that the First Committee will lend its support both to the resolution and to the efforts of many States Parties to ensure that there is a timely follow-up to the Review Conference. Like Finland, Canada will consult with other interested States Parties to this end. In our view, the ENMOD Convention must be liberated from its Cold War past and allowed to play a more meaningful role in curbing the obscenity of environmental warfare.

### Procedural Reform

The Cold War has left its mark not only in the immense quantity of weaponry that

must now be dismantled, but in an equal weight of mind-sets and work habits that are the direct result of the First Committee being reduced for 40-odd years to a mainly declaratory, rather than genuinely deliberative, body. The sheer logistics of keeping track of the resolutions are such that genuine dialogue within groups, let alone among them, is stymied. The impediment this situation creates to truly meaningful progress in this body cannot, in our view, be overestimated.

Since 1988, in a process begun under Canadian chairmanship of the First Committee, low-key but fairly consistent efforts have been underway to improve the efficiency of this body by encouraging delegations to dispense with outdated resolutions, merge related ones and to biennialize recurring issues. This process has had modest but steady results...

Last year's experience with the resolution establishing the UN arms register, in our view, directly contributed to the decreased number of resolutions. Delegations were engaged in an important negotiation involving a range of views that crossed traditional groupings and that had as its goal a concrete and important objective. In short, all of us were forced to set priorities and the result was less resolutions and more dialogue. In our view, this is a trend that must continue if we are to successfully adapt this body to the new challenges on the multilateral arms control agenda.

### An Agenda for Peace, Part Two

On the occasion of this general debate on disarmament and international security, we have all alluded in one way or another to the basic contradiction that confronts us. On the one hand, the end of the Cold War has opened the way to significant arms control and disarmament measures. On the other, it has unleashed an avalanche of local and regional conflicts.

*An Agenda for Peace* gives us both the broad framework for promoting global security and concrete recommendations with respect to many critical aspects of conflict prevention and peace-building. However, it does not deal at all with the role that arms control and disarmament *per se* can play in this overall process. Neither is this touched on in the first annual report by Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali.