

the year on what items they should be collecting data). Others wanted further study of the concept before implementation.

- inclusion of procurement and holdings. Many countries, including Canada, argued that arms procurement from domestic sources and arms holdings should be reported to the

Register should build confidence, promote arms transfer restraint and assist identification of excessive arms build-ups.

register from the outset, along with arms transfers. This would make the register non-discriminatory to states that rely on arms imports for their defence needs, and would provide a more accurate picture of arms accumulation than would a register of transfers alone. Others argued that the desirability of expanding the register's scope beyond arms transfers should be considered at a later stage, in light of experience with the register.

- inclusion of technology transfers. Some countries wanted the register to include transfers of technology with military applications. Other countries thought this impractical. Canada was not, in principle, opposed to the inclusion of technology transfers, but did not want to see implementation of the register delayed by the difficulties inherent in defining and tracking such transfers.
- inclusion of weapons of mass destruction (i.e., chemical, biological and nuclear weapons). Some countries argued that the register should include weapons of mass destruction — particularly holdings thereof — to avoid being discriminatory to states that possess only conventional weapons. Canada and others opposed such a move on the grounds that other, separate processes already exist or are under negotiation to monitor and control the acquisition of non-conventional weapons. In addition, including such weapons in the register would appear to legitimize their possession.

According to the terms of the resolution ultimately adopted, the register — which will be maintained at UN Headquarters in New York — will initially cover conventional arms transfers only. Member States are called upon to annually provide the register with data on their imports and exports of the following categories of weapons: battle tanks; armoured combat vehicles; large-calibre artillery systems; combat aircraft; attack helicopters; warships; and missiles or missile systems. First reports are required by April 30, 1993 in respect of calendar year 1992.

However, recognition of the relevance of procurement and holdings to the exercise, and their de facto inclusion, is assured by a clause inviting Member States to provide the register with information about their military holdings, their military procurement through national production, and relevant policies.

In addition, the resolution sets in motion a multi-pronged review process to examine possibilities for early expansion of the register's scope, and to look at issues related to technology transfers and weapons of mass destruction.

As a first step, the Secretary-General will establish a panel of governmental experts to:

- 1) elaborate the register's technical procedures, such as the form in which data should be reported; and
- 2) prepare a report on procedures for early expansion of the register to (a) include further categories of equipment and (b) formally include data on military holdings and procurement. The report will be presented to the General Assembly at its 47th session (fall 1992).

In addition, the Conference on Disarmament (CD) will address, as soon as possible, questions related to excessive and destabilizing arms build-ups, including military holdings and procurement, and will elaborate means to increase openness and transparency in this field. The CD will also look at ways to increase transparency related to the transfer of high technology with military ap-

plications and to weapons of mass destruction.

The resolution further invites Member States to provide the Secretary-General with their views, no later than April 30, 1994, on:

- 1) the operation of the register during its first two years; and
- 2) the addition of other categories of equipment, military holdings and procurement to the register.

Finally, the Secretary-General will convene another group of governmental experts in 1994 to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the register and its further development, taking into account the work of the CD and the views expressed by Member States. The report will be submitted to the General Assembly with a view to a decision at its 49th session (fall 1994).

Once it is fully operational, the arms register is expected to do three things:

- build confidence among states by reducing uncertainties about their military capabilities and intentions;
- promote restraint in arms procurement and transfers by exposing states to international scrutiny; and
- assist the identification of cases where arms are being acquired beyond reasonable defence needs.

The degree to which the register fulfils these ends will depend on the degree to which it is supported by Member States. All reporting to the register will be voluntary, but given the large number of votes in favour of the resolution and the many high-level political statements of commitment to the register, there should be a high degree of reporting to it, particularly by Western arms suppliers. Reporting by some less-developed countries may be delayed as they develop the technical means necessary to collect and process the requested data.

Canada was instrumental in developing the register resolution and in gathering widespread support for it. We will continue to participate keenly in all aspects of its follow-through. The Secretary-General has already invited Canada to provide a member for the first panel of governmental experts, which begins its work in January. Canada will report to the register as requested for 1992, providing data on