

*The Address—Mr. Roche*

ties", I want to tell him the answers are at hand. There is no need to grope in the dark. The global problems that have produced a suffering humanity in the developing nations have been analysed by the international experts. The United Nations has told us what must be done. What is required is strong political leadership by Canada and the other developed countries—a leadership that recognizes the moral, economic and social responsibilities of our technological power.

I want to propose two specific steps to help Canada more adequately to meet our responsibilities: first, recognize the new international economic order advocated by the United Nations; second, develop a comprehensive national population policy. These two steps go together. Let me explain. In the spring of 1974, the sixth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, dealing with the distribution of raw resources, pointed out that the bulk of the profit from the whole vast expansion of trade and wealth in two decades had, to an overwhelming degree, ended up in the pockets of the rich. The "trickle down" theory, by which the poor are supposed to be better off when the rich get richer, has not worked even in the context of the most rapid economic expansion in human history.

As the outstanding economist-environmentalist Barbara Ward puts it, the world economic system is proving unable to deal with two fundamental disruptions. She said:

On the side of demand, it does not enfranchise the mass of the people. On the side of supply, it may not be able to mobilize sufficient resources at a tolerable environmental cost in order to check inflation and preserve the biosphere.

World debate is sharpening on what are called the two limits: the limit of endurance of human beings deprived of the essentials of life, and the limit of the planet's endurance of the rising claims made upon it. The way out of this dilemma is the systematic acceptance of distributive justice. This, of course, has long been talked about by a small minority of people within politics, religion and the social sciences.

Now the gravity of events has propelled the United Nations to take concrete steps to obtain it. The most significant of these is the General Assembly's adoption of the new international economic order. The new order is needed because the poor nations are falling farther behind in the development struggle. They are caught in the present crisis which is itself the outcome of all the problems that have accumulated over the years in the field of trade, in monetary reform, world-wide inflation and inadequate financial assistance for development. The new order thus attempts to resolve these outstanding problems through "a fundamental restructuring of the world economic system."

The capacity of the developing countries to produce and earn more must be expanded. Expanded emergency assistance and forgiveness of outstanding debts on the part of the developed countries are initial moves. This would prepare the way for structural changes in international relationships that would include such efforts as these—now I am going to make a very brief digest of what is proposed by what I call "international order"—first, to evolve a just and equitable relationship between the price of raw materials, primary commodities and manufactured goods exported and imported by developing countries; in

other words, to work for a link between the prices of exports of developing countries and the prices of their imports from developed countries.

Second, to reverse the continued trend of stagnation or decline in the real price of several commodities exported by developing countries—for example, cocoa from Ghana—despite a general rise in commodity prices, resulting in a decline in the export earnings of the developing countries. Third, to ensure that developing countries can import the necessary quantities of food without undue strain on their foreign exchange resources and balance of payments, to ensure essential imports, including fertilizers, from developed countries on favourable terms. Fourth, to improve access to markets in developed countries through the progressive removal of tariff and non-tariff barriers and of restrictive business practices.

● (1540)

Fifth, to increase participation by developing countries in the decision-making process of world monetary organizations, so that the international financing of development can be speeded up. Sixth, to formulate an international code of conduct for the transfer of technology corresponding to needs and conditions in developing countries. Seventh, to regulate the activities of multinational corporations so that they conform to national development plans in host countries, to prevent their collaboration with racist regimes and colonial administrations.

These and other steps are regarded by the United Nations as necessary for the establishment of a new system of international economic relations based on equity, sovereign equality and interdependence of the interests of developed and developing countries. In short, the new order provides an instrument for a world-wide partnership for economic and social development. There is a long way, however, between the United Nations advocating a new international economic order and its acceptance by the developed countries. There is no hint about this in the Speech from the Throne.

At the World Population Conference in Bucharest, Canada carefully avoided even mentioning the new order, even though many nations called for the World Population Plan of Action to be constructed within the framework of the new order. For example, Finland stated unequivocally that it supported the new order as "a prerequisite for the realization of the Plan of Action." This brings us to the need for a comprehensive national population policy, which in turn requires an understanding of the world population problem. The problem has a double thrust: rapidly expanding numbers of people in the developing regions of the world, and the high standard of living in the developed regions.

It took from mankind's first evolution until about 1800 to reach the one billion mark. We reached two billion in about 1928, and three billion in 1961, with four billion expected next year. Thus, the intervals for accommodating an additional billion human beings have fallen from 128, to 33, to 14 years. The time span continues to shrink. Demographers can now say with certainty that there will be seven billion people by the year 2000—nearly double the amount today. In 1972, world population increased by 71 million, the difference between 120 million births and 49 million deaths.

[Mr. Roche.]