

*International Peace and Security*

figure, particularly in his work with physicians for social responsibility. In an article in *The Globe and Mail* on Friday, May 4, Dr. Bates said, referring to the proposed institute before us in this legislation, and I quote:

What is required is an institute, in Canada, supported morally and materially by the federal Government, but international in its orientation—

Although I believe it is very important to make the point that we have been concerned about the manner of appointment to the board, I am not going to dwell on that any further except to make the point that members of the board of directors ought to have an international as well as a Canadian representation. I believe there is sufficient reason for making that statement when we consider that Canada's Peace Institute will have to look at the world scene in an effort to establish beyond the shadow of a doubt the correctness of the figures which have been put before the public with respect to the current nuclear arms race.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know if the following figures are correct. These figures are published by "World Military and Social Expenditures, 1983". This is a document which is used by many groups. It has an international standing. As the first order of business, I would like the Canadian Peace Institute to ascertain whether this set of figures is correct.

The publication to which I referred states:

As of 1982, the U.S. had 29,000 nuclear weapons, the U.S.S.R., 17,400. The U.K. had 446; France, 263; China, 304. These numbers include strategic, intermediate, and tactical warheads and bombs.

In other words, these are global figures. The publication continues:

In strategic weapons, the U.S. had 9,999 to the Soviets' 7,388, with the Soviets holding the lead in the number of launchers 2,452 to 1,832. It is in European Theatre Nuclear Forces that the U.S.S.R. has built a considerable lead over the U.S.—6,339 weapons and 4,424 launchers to 1,439 weapons and 1,283 launchers. But if the intermediate systems of the U.K. and France are included, the gap closes; NATO, as a whole, has 6,148 weapons and 2,766 launchers in Europe.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that these are the figures which are published in "World Military and Social Expenditures, 1983". Are they the correct figures? I believe that it is reasonable to request the Canadian Peace Institute to provide us with authentic information as to whether or not one side is significantly ahead of the other side in the pursuit of deterrents, so that we can make our political judgments. The publication continues:

Since 1945—

**Mr. Speaker:** I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but the normal time allotted to him has expired. Is there a disposition to give unanimous consent to the Hon. Member to extend his remarks?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** There appears to be unanimous consent.

**Mr. Roche:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank my colleagues. I will take only a couple of moments in order not to delay the debate unduly. According to the document to which

I have referred which was published by "World Military and Social Expenditures":

Since 1945, the lead in the race for improved systems has always gone back and forth between the superpowers. The U.S. led with the atomic bomb, intercontinental bomber, and thermonuclear bomb. The U.S.S.R. caught up and plunged ahead with the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) and man-made satellite. The U.S. took the lead with the submarine-launched ballistic missile and multiple warhead. The U.S.S.R. countered with the antiballistic missile and caught up to the U.S. advance in multiple independently targeted warhead (MIRV). The U.S. went ahead again with the long-range cruise missile and neutron bomb.

Thus, we see, Mr. Speaker, that the arms race has been fueled by new technologies which have made nuclear weapons more powerful, more flexible, and shortened the time interval from launch to impact to only minutes. That, of course, is the great concern which is expressed by the public today. The time between launch and impact now, with the heightened technology which continues to go ahead, causes us increasing concern in many aspects of our lives.

● (1410)

Earlier in my speech I quoted from the speech of the President of Mexico to the joint assembly of the Houses of Parliament this week. He said we must understand that as we come into this new stage of technology we must find a way to put a cap on the arms race to preserve true security in the world. We must find a way to stop that security from being dependent upon a never-ending escalation of arms. I have said that it is the position of all responsible people that we must find a way to enhance the prospect for mutual, balanced and verifiable disarmament. It will be the task of the peace institute to consider Canada's special role in advancing verification for the monitoring of arms production and, indeed, arms control agreements.

We are not devoid of any opportunity of moving ahead, Mr. Speaker. Full documentation is provided in the Palme report which was signed by an international panel of officials from western, eastern and Third World countries including, I am glad to say, the distinguished former ambassador to the Soviet Union, Mr. Robert Ford. Time does not permit me to make an extensive analysis of or reference to that report here. I will only say that we are not devoid of answers. The peace institute must find a way of ensuring that Canada is able to make a contribution in a realistic way. Verifiability is a chief way in which we can make some progress.

From the beginning of its operation, the peace institute must be assured of its credibility by the manner of appointments to the board which has been suggested by earlier speakers. There must be full consultation with those groups which we have mentioned. The Committee on External Affairs and National Defence must be consulted at every stage from the inception of this institute. From the very moment of its beginning it must be assured that it will make a significant contribution to Canada's role in enhancing the prospects for true peace and security in the world. To make such a contribution would be a great moment for us.

I urge Members of the House, and particularly the Government, to establish this peace institute in such a way that no