

instead of extending its energy and its efforts in job retraining and the whole area of conversion, this government is trying to prop up those industries by loosening the restrictions so they can export more to countries like Saudi Arabia.

How irresponsible. How irresponsible on an international, global sense, and how irresponsible on a local economic sense. How stupid as well. Let us not continue to try to support the industries whose time has come, thank God. Let us rather be joyful that the need for the arms industry has decreased. Let us ease the transformation of the arms industry into peaceful industries. Let that be the goal and the objective of the government, rather than Bill C-6 which just gives them a greater lease on life.

Bill C-6 also damages our international credibility, as with so many other steps that this government has taken. I am sure even poor John Diefenbaker would just shake in his grave over it. We have been continually losing our credibility in the following areas: the sense of fairness and neutrality of not being an arms dealer; a country willing to work in international efforts like the United Nations Peacekeeping Organization; and a country that other countries in dispute can come to as a fair-minded mediator. Certainly Bill C-6 heightens that.

The Canadian government can no longer speak with the same type of credibility in urging international arms control. We will be laughed out of international fora when we stand up to make proposals after we pass Bill C-6.

As well, because of the economic reason of maintaining our defence industries, we are proposing to loosen the restrictions a little bit. What happens if there are further defence cutbacks in other countries as well as Canada? It is not going to be enough to maintain those industries. Will not the temptation to ease further restrictions be there? Of course it will be there, and we start down the slippery slope where we could conceivably end up being a full scale arms merchant selling to the highest bidder for whatever we can get away with.

Of course the government says it has its criteria in terms of existing legislation as to the countries to which it will deny the export of military goods and technology. Included in these four items are countries involved in or under imminent threat of hostilities. We are going to be

selling these to Saudi Arabia. In the period of 1977 to 1986, 37 per cent of the global arms trade occurred in the Middle East. Fourteen wars have been fought since 1967 with more than three million dead and we are going to sell them more arms.

Does that not contravene section (b) where Canada generally denies the export of military goods and technology to countries involved in or under imminent threat of hostilities? I then look at section (d): "Countries whose governments have a persistent record of serious violations of the human rights of their citizens".

Surely nobody is going to stand up and claim that Saudi Arabia has a sparkling record in terms of human rights. One could very well foresee the possibility of these personnel carriers being used against the people of Saudi Arabia themselves should they ever begin to rise up and demand a more democratic system. We will see Canadian troop carriers with automatic weapons mounted on them facing the people of Saudi Arabia.

It makes no sense even under our existing guidelines.

The other point I want to make is that it is very hard to control the final use and destination. Yes, we are going to attempt to restrict the sale and export of these weapons, but can we really determine who the end users will be? Of course we cannot.

I also want to address the larger question that I commented on at the beginning of my remarks. I think there were many of us who saw some light at the end of the tunnel when it became obvious that the arms race and the cold war were going to end, that the trillions of dollars that had been spent on useless arms production could finally come to an end.

• (1630 )

I have always maintained that the major reason for the deficits that we have in the world today, be it the Third World, France, England, the United States or Canada, is due to the arms race. The trillions of dollars of capital that the arms race has taken out of the world economy has made capital more scarce and forced up interest rates at the expense of health, education, food, social programs, pensions and so forth. Human beings throughout the world have paid a horrific price because of the arms race. The farmers going broke in my constituency because of the high interest rates in part are victims of the arms race. It is the arms race that has caused these