

Food Aid

amounted to about two-fifths of the gross domestic product of all developing countries and some 25 times the amount spent by all the member countries of the OECD on official development assistance. It is estimated that some 400,000 scientists and engineers are engaged in weapons related research and that this accounts for two-fifths of total world research and development expenditures. In short, it is reasonable to conclude that we devote more intellectual effort and money to the problem of how to kill each other than to any other subject. Presumably this is why we are called homo sapiens, or "sap" for short. It seems we live in a world that is rational in small things and absolutely mad in major issues.

The lion's share of this expenditure is still spent by the wealthier countries, in particular the two super powers. Between 1957 and 1976, 80 per cent of the \$5.5 trillion spent on military expenditure came out of NATO and Warsaw countries; and two-thirds of that was spent by the United States and the Soviet Union. By comparison, during that period the developing countries spent only 7 per cent of the total. One of the more depressing aspects of increasing military expenditures is that whereas in 1957 their share was only 4 per cent in global terms, by 1977 military expenditures in developing countries had risen to 18 per cent. The rate of increase of military expenditures by developing countries over the past decade was 10 per cent annually compared to the world average of a 3 per cent increase. Some types of development have obviously caught fire and development spending has increasingly meant defence spending.

● (1612)

This militarization of our global community has been accomplished in no small part through the international arms trade. In 1976, 95 countries imported major weapons systems. The development countries, in another manifestation of dependency, accounted for 75 per cent of total imports. The major suppliers were the United States, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom and France, with the two superpowers again away out in front.

Canada is not just a minor player in this game and we should resist the temptation to heap scorn on other countries which engage in it. Since 1961 we have sold over \$3 billion worth of arms internationally. On an annual basis, through the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce we sell \$300 million worth of arms, not to mention nuclear sales which are increasingly questionable in terms of their totally peaceful utilization. Canada ranks about eighth or ninth among all countries of the world in terms of continuing arms sales.

Given the absurdity of this situation and the terror it spawns, one might have anticipated a more lively debate in most western countries. In fact, the silence has been deafening. Except for certain small groups, disarmament has been, to use Alva Myrdal's description, a dead issue. It seems to me there are two main reasons for this. Until recently the public has pretty much accepted the official line that massive strategic and conventional armaments are essential to peace. At the same time, the fact that no great war has directly threatened

us seemed to render the system useful in providing us with a certain amount of protection. In the third world, the increasing arms expenditures express the tensions and instability of the countries concerned.

When we look at the situation in the developing countries we realize that in far too many of them the over-all degree of militarization is disturbing. Beset by difficulties and attracted by the apparent simplicity of militarism, one third world country after another has been taken over by the generals. Not surprisingly, one of the priorities of such governments is the expenditure of increasing sums of arms. I shall not put the figures on record this afternoon but I would recommend to hon. members the annual report "World Military and Social Expenditures" published each year by Ruth Leger Sivard which documents the case I have been making.

I have raised this motion because I hope the issue is coming to a crunch. Later this spring there is to be a special assembly of the United Nations to deal with the issue of disarmament. For the first time in the history of the United Nations a special assembly is to focus specifically on this issue. There have been a series of special UN sessions, for instance, on food, on water, on the law of the sea, on habitation, on the environment and so on. There have been two special sessions dealing with the international economic order.

It is interesting that dislocation of social priorities brought about by national arms expenditures has not so far been dealt with even though this has been seen as an increasingly urgent problem by the developing nations. Hon. members may recall that when the fifth conference of the heads of state of non-aligned countries met in Colombo in 1976 the communiqué stated:

The conference believes the arms race is inconsistent with the efforts aimed at achieving a new international economic order in view of the urgent need to divert the resources utilized for the acceleration of the arms race toward socio-economic development, particularly in the developing countries.

Undoubtedly both developed and developing countries alike realize, to quote the words of Alva Myrdal from an excellent book called *The Game of Disarmament*, that all countries are now "buying greater and greater insecurity at higher and higher cost".

Steps must be taken now to deal with the number one issue which is distracting us from the opportunity to feed ourselves and provide ourselves with real security and a peaceful relationship both internally and between nations. There is growing concern in the world about the trend of rising military expenditures, about the vast human and technological resources which are now desperately needed for economic and social development but which are being spent on arms. Hopefully at this upcoming session of the UN the international community will attempt to halt this trend and agree on approaches and measures designed to initiate a real process of disarmament, not a counterproductive one such as has been discussed from time to time over the last 20 years.

One of the more interesting motions to be discussed will be put forward by the Scandinavian countries; it relates to disarmament and development. It is my hope that our own govern-