

*Statements by Ministers*

Defence Initiative, star wars, is indeed in breach of the first paragraph of Article V of the ABM Treaty.

The best approach for the Government to take would be to insist on compliance with paragraph 1 of Article V of the Treaty which, as you know, Mr. Speaker, has previously been cited in the House. It provides that each Party undertakes not to develop tests or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea based, air based or mobile land based.

We believe the SDI initiative is in breach of that treaty. The Minister may argue that under the letter of the law, as interpreted in some quarters, it is not in breach. However, the role of the widely respected statesman, I say, compels him to speak to the spirit of the treaty, if not to the letter. In fact, I think there is a good argument on the letter itself. This is not a job for Philadelphia lawyers. This is a job for statesmen. The SDI initiative is blocking progress on disarmament, a declarative objective of the Government upon which the Minister has spoken eloquently from time to time. Instead, we have here with this initiative a risk of accelerating the arms race and at the same time siphoning off those precious dollars which could be directed to Third World development or at least put to better use.

Yes, the Minister supports a comprehensive test ban but hedges it with the issue of verifiability and so on. It is time for the Minister and the Government to speak out. They should have spoken out in support of the Soviet moratorium which, as we know, will expire at the end of this month.

We know what a sensitive area the control of arms exports is, and on page 48 of the report we find some language which questions the advisability of a register of exports in these areas. From the Iranian experience, which we have witnessed, we know our systems are inadequate. One of our own manufacturers has now suspended shipments to that country. I ask the Minister to come forward with a stronger policy in terms of the exportation of arms from this country and the use of end user certificates of some kind to put some teeth into the current regulations which in fact were introduced fairly recently. This is an important and critical issue, as we know from what is taking place in the United States at this very moment. Again, I say that response is not sufficient.

Perhaps one of the most important areas is that of our foreign aid, our official development. The majority of the committee felt we should achieve a goal of .7 per cent of ODA by 1990. That has been rejected by the Government. Instead the Government has said we will reach .6 by the middle of the next decade. This simply is not good enough for Canada and it is not good enough for the world.

The most insidious threat to peace on this earth is the growing disparity between the rich and the poor, between the Third World and the industrialized nations. I know about budget constraints. I was in the Government and I have listened on hot lines to people all over the country asking why we should be spending money on Third World developed countries when we have unemployed and all these demands

here. But in fact, as we know, the per capita GNP of all developed countries in U.S. constant dollars grew from \$340 in 1955 to \$730 in 1980. During that same period, in the industrialized market economies, it went from just under \$5,000 to just under \$11,000, a gap which increased from \$4,600 to \$9,800 in real terms, an increasing gap.

• (1200)

Apart from the humanitarian issue there is a much greater issue. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) must sensitize his colleagues and the Canadian public to this issue. It is that the population explosion in those countries will virtually make this world uninhabitable as we know it now unless we reach a zero rate of growth in terms of world population by the year 2000 or shortly thereafter. If that goal is retarded to the year 2075 it is estimated that the world population will be 20 billion by the end of the next century. We know that poverty breeds people, something which has been established scientifically. So there are real interests in the long term in terms of the bias fear, apart from the humanitarian interests and humanitarian needs which are so pressing today.

I would now like to refer to Central America which is my last point. Here is a real opportunity for our Government and for our Minister to show statesmanship. Reference is made to the Contadora process. But at the moment the Contadora process is simply not enough. I think that if the Minister were to stand up and speak honestly in the House he would probably say that he is worried about it, that it is virtually dead and that it needs to be resuscitated. I understand that the General Secretaries of the OAS and the UN have offered to help revive the Contadora process and to give it support. So I encourage the Minister to take a statesman-like position in the great tradition of this country and tell the world that Canada is prepared to support those efforts, to provide peace-keeping if necessary, to provide observers if necessary, to do all possible to bring concerted diplomatic action to the crisis in Central America which risks becoming a Vietnam on this continent. This is a time for an active diplomatic role.

I would also draw to the Minister's attention that there are human rights issues in Central America which have to be addressed. Today I met with the Mission for Peace which recently came back from El Salvador and which has reported that human rights violations are once more on the increase. This takes us back into the area touched upon in the paper of aid to those regimes which suppress human rights. I encourage the Minister to look into that situation and determine whether more effort cannot be made to go to the non-governmental organizations to ensure that the aid reaches the people.

Our Minister has the opportunity, and I believe he has the capacity, to walk in the footsteps of some of the great statesmen this country has seen on the international stage. I refer to Lester Pearson and Pierre Elliot Trudeau. Let him not be timid. Canada does not wish timidity. As the Minister himself