

problems that preoccupy someone who has responsibility in the foreign affairs field. Just to mention a few, there is, of course, the Middle East and its enormous potential for world peace and security, not only in the political sense but also, as we have learnt since the oil embargo, in the economic sense. Then there is southern Africa, with the issues of *apartheid* within South Africa itself, and the future of Rhodesia and Namibia. There is the Horn of Africa, which is causing very great concern to a great many knowledgeable people these days. (One could almost say that within all of the countries of Africa there is still a certain lack of stability, which is creating minor and major tensions.)

The United Nations embraces the whole of that circle and is coming under increasing challenge today both from its enemies and, since I have been one of its critics on occasion, from its friends. Let me emphasize that Canada continues to regard the United Nations as an essential instrument that must be retained as an effective means for the resolution of any number of international problems. But there is concern that the United Nations — and particularly certain elements of it — may be losing their efficacy. Canada is committed, and certainly I have undertaken it as a personal commitment, to seek to revitalize some of those elements in the United Nations that ought to be employed more effectively. Regrettably, some UN activities (and I'm thinking of the General Assembly) have deteriorated in recent years into what is often a debating society, which does not, in fact, produce very much by way of really significant results.

But the United Nations remains important to Canada because we believe it is the focal point for two debates that are either going on at the present time or about to begin in the near future. One is disarmament, on which there will be a special session of the United Nations beginning in May of this year. We are seeking to determine what is the most effective and progressive role that Canada can play to bring the world to a realization that the current arms race, not only in nuclear weapons but in defensive armaments as well, is not only something that has an enormous destabilizing effect but also tends to cause us to distort our priorities. Consider the expenditures we are making necessarily now on armaments, when, in fact, we ought to be spending a great deal more in terms of our developmental assistance and other forms of positive contributions to the developing world and to the search for greater peace and stability in the universe. In our own country, for example — just to show you the extent to which there is this distortion —, even though it is generally conceded that we ought to be perhaps spending more than at present on defence, the fact is that our expenditures within Canada, a relatively modest-sized country, on defence are four to five times what they are on foreign aid and related commitments. This gives you some idea of what it is like when you extend those figures out to embrace the world community. If we could reach the point where we could get a reasonable and assured level of disarmament, what we would be able to do with our own domestic economy and the economies of the developing world staggers the imagination. This is an effort we in Canada ought to continue and ought to accelerate.

The other side of the disarmament question involves nuclear technology. The months and the years immediately ahead are going to be of the utmost importance in terms of whether we can or cannot, to fall back on a stock expression, "put the genie back in

---