

the first nations to sign the non-proliferation treaty and the nuclear testing ban treaty.

Considering this record how can Canada lend itself to allowing the testing of a weapon which could be used to deliver nuclear warheads? In addition, now that the cold war is over the question must be asked who is the enemy, as I asked earlier the member for Beaver River. Why should such a weapon be used?

It is somehow ironic this debate should take place today when last night President Clinton said in his speech: "Russia's strategic nuclear missiles soon will no longer be pointed at the United States. Nor will we point ours at them". He went on to say: "Instead of building weapons in space Russian scientists will help us build the international space station". Mr. Clinton stressed last night that ultimately the best strategy to ensure security and to build a durable peace was to support the advance of democracy elsewhere.

● (1815)

I submit that cruise missile testing is a relic of the past. It is a relic of the cold war. It is from the days when there were potential threats to security from nuclear weapons in other countries, when Canada's terrain was considered a facsimile of Soviet Union geography. However today the political situation has changed considerably as other speakers have said before me.

My second reason relates to security in the nineties. The concept of security must change from an exclusive stress on national security to a much greater stress on the concept of people security as was indicated in the 1993 UNDP report on human development.

I suggest the real threat to security comes from other quarters. It comes from unsustainable management of natural resources, fisheries, forestry, water shortages, desertification, climate change, ozone layer deterioration, decrease of arable land and reduction of forest covers.

It comes from population explosion in some parts of the world at the total rate of 92 million people per year, with resulting pressures on finite resources coupled with increased insecurity of food production. It comes from lack of support for international proposed legislation such as the Law of the Sea. It comes from megaprojects in parts of the world which are launched without proper environmental impact assessment. Last but not least, it comes from chronic poverty in Africa, Central America, South America and so on.

It seems that rather than spending time and resources on testing missiles in 1994 national governments should devote energies to the agenda of our times, namely how to apply our energies against hunger, ignorance and poverty on planet earth.

Government Orders

Peace is not threatened by the lack of cruise missiles. Today global peace is threatened when governments pay attention to the wrong agenda, and this item today is part of that wrong agenda.

The agenda we should be paying attention to consists of how to achieve food security, how to achieve family planning in the developing world, how to achieve sustainable natural resources exploitation, how to achieve safe management of toxic waste, how to achieve the prevention of climate change and the concomitant consequences in many regions of the world, how to achieve the restoration of water quality, how to achieve the protection of biodiversity, and how to achieve the elimination of poverty in many nations of the world community and a better distribution of wealth. All these factors together could lead or contribute to global insecurity, to global instability, and possibly to conflict.

I repeat that global peace is not threatened by the lack of updated cruise missiles. That is not the issue. We must worry about the threats I mentioned a moment ago. In that report on human development of 1993 by the UNDP, you will find a quotation which I think is quite relevant to this overall discussion: "That preventive diplomacy is needed to defuse tensions around the globe before there are blow-ups".

● (1820)

It means that instead of lending support to archaic solutions and outdated agendas, the developed industrial world should instead invest its time and energies in eradicating the causes of potential conflict.

Therefore, in conclusion, I urge the Government of Canada to deal with the potential threats to peace. They have nothing to do with military hardware, but everything to do with environmental damage and social economic disorders which stem from increasing poverty, increasing dislocation and which could lead increasingly to threats to global security.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat): Madam Speaker, I commend the hon. member for the passion with which he spoke. He talked a lot about the environment and certainly his goals are admirable. I commend him for that.

I would like to touch on some of the points he made respecting the possibility of nuclear war. Who is the enemy? Why should we be testing a weapon that can carry a nuclear warhead? Is it not better to support the advance of democracy than it is to prepare for war? In many respects I believe the gentleman is right. Certainly liberal democracies do not fight wars against one another.

It is also a sad truth that many of the countries in the world are not liberal democracies. We still have many countries that are ruled by men who have no compunction about killing people and invading other countries.