

industrialists argue that because depleted uranium is plentiful and inexpensive, the US does not need a Canadian supply for their nuclear arsenal.

To strengthen non-proliferation efforts, further measures have been suggested to limit the supply of products for nuclear use. Recently, Canada supported the US initiative at the LSG to establish a list of dual-use products (nuclear and non-nuclear applications), the transfer of which would require export permits. These products would include certain types of computers, robots, equipment related to nuclear-generated electricity, and equipment to produce heavy water. The Group of Seven supported this proposal at the London Economic Summit in July 1991. However, it is not yet known whether the list will be administered by the LSG or by the IAEA.

Regulations on Arms Sales

Canada's diplomatic initiatives during the war in the Persian Gulf, and the recent adoption of Bill C-6 have stimulated debate on the criteria used in the development of this country's arms sale policy and its administration. The hearings of Legislative Committee "E", which studied the question in June 1991, provided a forum for a variety of views.¹⁰ It can be seen from the statements of MPs and witnesses that the Canadian public seems to approve of the four major principles established by cabinet regarding arms sales. However, many think that their application does not go far enough. John Lamb of the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament believes that Canada's policy on arms sales has eroded since the 1970s. He considers that Canada is too ready to sell products to Third World countries whose strategic situation is unstable and/or which do not respect human rights. He cited the recent sale of armoured vehicles to Saudi Arabia as an example.

Several measures have been proposed to oblige the government to maintain a firm line on arms exports. One is to include guidelines on arms sales in Canadian legislation. Another is to involve Parliament in decisions on arms exports, at least as regards the establishment of lists of countries to which such exports are banned. The Canadian government, through the Minister of Trade Michael Wilson, has objected to these reforms on the grounds that involving Parliament in the debate over which states should be banned from receiving arms exports would result in policy paralysis. It is also argued that parliamentary involvement is not necessary since arms exports are closely monitored by cabinet.

Openness and accountability are at the core of the current debate on arms sales policy. To some extent, recent Canadian policies do address these issues. This

year, the government published its first annual report on Canadian arms sales. In addition, Canada will participate in the international arms sales register, an initiative endorsed by the G-7 states at the 1991 London Economic Summit. However, there are still grounds for concern: for example, cabinet is still the only body which makes and applies arms sales policy. In addition, sales to the United States are not declared and do not require an export permit.

Ernie Regehr of Project Ploughshares has proposed that Canada's policy on arms exports should be directive rather than simply restrictive.¹¹ In other words, instead of restricting exports on the basis of criteria such as actual or imminent conflict, Canada should authorize arms sales on the basis of political and moral grounds. Canada would therefore use positive rather than negative criteria to determine the countries which could receive its exports. Furthermore, arms sales should be conducted only on a government-to-government basis, as part of official agreements subject to public debate. Regehr also proposes that military goods be defined according to their destination (e.g., the armed forces) rather than their nature. He thus rejects the distinction between the sale of arms and the sale of non-military items intended for the armed forces since many products, such as trucks or radios exported by Canada, are not weapons but are still essential to modern warfare. All transactions, including those with the US, should be public knowledge, and Canada should demand a guarantee regarding end use for all exports, including components. Lastly, Parliament would establish a list of acceptable customers and those to whom exports would be forbidden.

Many people in industry and government oppose these views. They believe that government-to-government agreements, non-retransfer clauses, and the disclosure of contracts would be harmful to an industry which employs thousands of people and is important to national security. Requiring authorization for all goods intended for the armed forces would entail a vast number of permits and create some ridiculous situations where the most trivial items would require permits. The imposition of government-to-government agreements and close parliamentary control would reduce the flexibility the government needs to promote the national interest. Disclosing the lists of countries to which arms exports are prohibited could harm Canada's diplomatic relations.

However, the debate seems to be turning in favour of the advocates of reform. The hopes raised by the end of the Cold War, the very distressing example of the over-arming of Iraq, the weakness of Canada's military industry, and the changing public attitude toward arms sales are all factors contributing to demands for a stricter arms export regime and more openness in the