

context. Even though this concept was firmly implanted in Europe, its value had never been fully tested outside the continent. Now it has become obvious that this concept is even harder to implement outside Europe. More serious still, the tensions arising from the failure of détente in Third World countries have had an impact on the main scene of the action between East and West, namely Europe. It has become clear that East-West relations cannot follow certain rules in some areas of the world and totally different rules elsewhere.

Is there no way out? There are some conditions more conducive to improved East-West relations that come to mind. The role of superpowers cannot be denied, but it must not be exclusive. To survive, détente must be recognized as indivisible, yet it is a fact that it is interpreted differently in the western and in the eastern allied countries, as well as the developing and non-aligned countries, which, of course, has been a constant source of misunderstanding. The policy to be followed is to refuse to involve developing countries in the military rivalry between East and West, as this would only aggravate tensions in this no-win situation in which neither North nor South would win.

It is in the best interests of the Third World that developing countries not become involved in the competition between East and West. That is exactly what Tito and Nehru were trying to achieve through non-alignment, and we can only hope that the movement of non-aligned countries will return to its basic philosophy. Western countries must re-examine their relations with the U.S.S.R. in order to promote stability throughout the world. A strong military alliance is essential to the achievement of this goal.

We must also recognize that a good *sine qua non* condition of stability would be a basic agreement between the superpowers. In this respect, the superpowers must reactivate the best arrangements between the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the early seventies, when the "red phones" were installed and when the world could rely on a basic compatibility of interests between the two countries.

We will also witness an increased number of crises which, should the worst come to the worst, could degenerate into an all-out confrontation between the superpowers. Moreover it seems that a large proportion of these crises will arise in the undeveloped areas of the world, where the West has provided no set of arrangements to protect its own interests such as those between North America and Japan or Western Europe. We would be well advised, therefore, to ascertain what are the means at our disposal to meet crises everywhere and especially in Third World countries, where the interest of the Western world would be at stake.

As far as Europe, the principal theatre of confrontation between East and West, is concerned, we are in a position today to reply to this question with more confidence than we were a year ago. This is not due so much to a lack of tension in Europe, but rather to the fact that at least the political

North-South Relations

consultation process within the NATO allies has greatly improved to meet the challenges of the future. The willingness of the allies to develop a concerted strategy to deal with East-West relations in Europe has increased. The policy of reinforcing NATO defence preparedness, while proposing again to the Soviet Union to negotiate the arms limitation agreements, is supported by the whole organization, as confirmed by a recent meeting of NATO ministers. Thus, NATO remains an indispensable instrument to the maintenance of cohesion and strength which ensure stability and balance in Europe, which is clearly in the interest of the West. And the Soviet Union, in spite of its open criticism of the organization, would undoubtedly concede that stability and balance in Europe rank among its higher priorities.

It is more difficult, Madam Speaker, to feel confident about emergency arrangements made for situations that arise outside Europe. Neither East nor West is on its own territory there. The rules of the game have not been established. While a few firm lines have been drawn, such as in the Gulf area, the situation remains ambiguous, and this ambiguity can be dangerous. Western leaders must continue to ask themselves what is the best way to protect western interests in these areas while respecting the sovereignty of the countries involved. East and West must try to redefine a mutually acceptable code of behaviour for international relationships, but before this can be done, an answer must be found to the crisis in Afghanistan, whose invasion goes against everything that the western world as well as the Third World consider acceptable.

The Ottawa Summit should provide the opportunity for western leaders to bring into line their general views on this matter. This is undeniably a concern which should come foremost on the agenda of any meeting on international affairs. The prospect of a new arms race when billions of people are starving to death is truly shocking. If we decided to use for peaceful purposes the amounts we spend in two weeks for military purposes, we could provide drinking water and basic health care to the population of the entire world. However, people feel the need for even more protection, and an increase in our military spending to offset the increased amounts allocated to armament by the U.S.S.R. seems inevitable for the moment. It is up to the western world to find an answer to this serious problem, if possible in consultation with the Soviet Union.

Moreover, SALT negotiations should resume as soon as both parties have enough confidence in each other to conduct such talks effectively, and I must say that the sooner, the better. Putting an end to the nuclear arms race involves tremendous difficulties. However, the Government of Canada still believes that as discouraging as these difficulties might be and as small as any immediate chance of progress might seem, the superpowers must be urged to reflect with all due gravity on the consequences of a resumption of nuclear escalation. The government still firmly believes that the nuclear arms race