

spiritual, depends increasingly on the capacity of the developing nations to provide economic and social opportunity to the one billion people who now live in misery. I would have excused the government for saying that all this is too much to solve within the confines of one throne speech. I cannot excuse it for blithely ignoring the real interests of Canada in a new, interdependent global community.

● (1522)

On September 26, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson) went to the United Nations General Assembly to make his annual speech. Tired of the customary platitudes, the minister attacked the UN for its poor performance and warned that the world body was heading for oblivion unless it showed itself to be more effective. This attack may have given vent to the frustrations of the minister about the UN, but his speech would have been much more helpful had he encouraged, rather than scolded, the UN.

The chief value of the UN is that it is gradually building the framework for a legal system to preserve world order. This is a long process, exacerbated by the long confrontation between east and west, and now between north and south. We have the UN's specialized agencies and a string of world conferences on food, population, human settlements, industrialization, the deserts and water—to name just a few—to thank for our new understanding of the limits and constraints on human life and behaviour on this planet. National governments are learning that they must co-operate because of the physical and economic interdependence of the whole planet. But it is a hard lesson and it calls for patience, not short tempers.

The UN cannot force governments to adopt global strategies. It can only use its power of moral persuasion. That is why international consensus is so vital, and why Canada ought to be more aggressive in working to build a consensus which will lead directly to a safer, more just world.

When he was at the UN, the minister announced that, subject to parliamentary approval, Canada would donate \$7.5 million in food grain—roughly 50,000 tons—to an emergency grain reserve. The throne speech does not even refer to this commitment. Similarly, the minister chided the UN for not discharging fully or effectively its responsibilities in the field of human rights. Could the government not give the human rights issue its proper priority by raising its voice in the chorus of international concern? The government limits its concern about human rights to the very real cases of family reunification, but that is too narrow an interpretation of this deep, deep issue.

Rather than criticizing the UN, the Canadian government ought to be building world opinion to support the UN Special Session on Disarmament to be held next May and June in New York. The spectre of nuclear war, insists UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim, “is unquestionably the most terrifying potential threat to us and to future ages”. At least six nations now have atomic capability, and two dozen or more are at the threshold, producing as a by-product of their energy

programs the starting kit for several thousand atomic bombs, if they so wish.

Arms spending has now reached \$350 billion a year. This magnitude is almost impossible to grasp, but it can be expressed as two-fifths of the combined gross product of all Third World countries. Military uses of science now consume the research work of 400,000 highly qualified scientists and engineers. Exotic names are attached to each new invention and they are always presented as a further consolidation of deterrence. But a single-minded attachment to deterrence has trapped both nuclear powers, the United States and Russia, in a vicious cycle. Each side is now engaged in a technological race for the maximum improvement or perfection of its deterrents.

Bad as the present situation is, it is bound to become worse as nuclear capacity spreads. The possibilities of accident, misinterpretation of orders, theft of nuclear weapons, nuclear terrorism and blackmail would be greatly multiplied in a proliferated nuclear world, the kind of world we are heading into. Whatever value the doctrine of mutual deterrence might have in a bipolar world or in a world of many nuclear powers with great differences in their geopolitical, military and technological positions, those values are now changing. Our world is becoming a more dangerous place because of the spreading military technology which has led the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute to conclude: “The probability of a nuclear world war is steadily increasing”.

The scandal of arms is not confined to the nuclear threat. Although the superpowers and the other major industrial nations are the big spenders, the number of Third World countries with highly sophisticated conventional weapons is growing. The Third World's share of world military expenditure has risen from 5 per cent in 1955 to 17 per cent now, but much more dramatic has been the increase in the Third World's share of the international arms trade. About three-quarters of the current global trade in arms is now with the Third World. In fact, military spending of Third World countries in the past decade—I think this is probably the most shameful fact which can be brought before the House today—has increased twice as fast as their economic base and now exceeds the total amount they spend on education and health combined.

The international arms trade links eager sellers and eager buyers, as revealed by the 18-month Lebanese civil war which killed 40,000 people. Arms were smuggled and purchased by both sides, from all factions: east and west, communist and capitalist, idealistic and greedy. The lucrative arms trade around the world not only undermines disarmament talks but is also a direct threat to development because it is an invitation to coups, grotesque overspending on imported weapons, and misplaced priorities. In both a nuclear and conventional sense we are on a path to destruction.

We know what needs to be done to avert a calamity. Efforts to achieve progressive worldwide disarmament must be aimed primarily at balanced mutual arms reductions on three levels: first, on the level of the superpowers where the goal is to