

system. Boeing and Bristol Aerospace, both Winnipeg companies, have been doing developmental work with an eye toward production contracts on the MX missile for the last year.

Over the years the Government has given money to Canadian Vickers to produce parts for American nuclear submarines, to Hawker Siddeley to produce the launcher for the Lance nuclear missile, and to Heede International to build loading equipment for Trident and Poseidon nuclear weapon submarines. We would be better off without these contracts. If the concern of the Government is jobs, let me say that American studies on industrial conversion show that we could create twice as many jobs by investing in health care and education than by investing in weapons production.

Canada has not kept its hands clean of the arms race. The unwillingness of successive governments to begin even to strike an independent strategic policy has allowed us to drift into complicity in the nuclear weapons program of the United States. Declaring Canada a nuclear weapons free zone would not require us to end the long friendship between the two countries. I have no doubt that the friendship would endure. After all, what kind of friendship is it that could not endure our decision to take a strategic policy which promised to help reduce the threat of nuclear destruction?

Declaring Canada a nuclear weapons free zone would only be consistent with the Government's rhetoric about our non-nuclear role in the world. It would be an act consistent with the efforts of the United Nations to establish such zones in the world. It would enhance our reputation internationally as a country willing to take action in its advocacy of peace. By declaring Canada a nuclear weapons free zone, we would be taking concrete steps toward reducing the nuclear threat which hangs over the heads of all Canadians, which hangs over the heads of all people of the world.

There is another dimension to the nuclear arms race with which I should like to deal because in my view it goes to the heart of our concern. I am referring to our ability to achieve global peace while we fail to recognize adequately the existence of widespread social and economic injustice in the world. The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency recently reported that we will spend a total of some \$1 trillion in 1985 in the global arms race. We could make a significant step in the direction of achieving global peace if we were to direct some of those moneys, if not all, toward eradicating the sources of that economic and social injustice to which I have just referred.

The United Nations has estimated that one half of the Third World countries have no safe drinking water supplies, yet we have the means available to provide clean water within 10 years if we had the political and moral will to do so. We could do the same for the hundreds of thousands who are dying of hunger throughout the world. We have the technology and the expertise to achieve it.

It is estimated that some 130 million children are denied access to any kind of education and that 800 million adults are considered illiterate throughout the world. If we used some of the armament expenditures, we could provide the schools and

Nuclear Disarmament

teacher training which would alleviate that sorry condition. In addition, we know that air and water pollution is responsible for the increase in deaths from such diseases as cancer, asthma and heart disease. We could implement a global cleanup of our environment. We have the technology which would put a stop to our environment being used as one of the biggest sewage disposal systems the world has ever seen.

● (1720)

In addition, the World Health Organization estimates that some ten children die each minute of measles, diphtheria and tuberculosis. Only 10 per cent of the Third World's population of 18 million people are immunized against disease. In addition to that, some 50 million young people enter the workforce each year. Because there are no jobs, they face prolonged periods of unemployment.

If we believe that Third World problems are totally dissociated from our problems in Canada, perhaps we should consider spending some of the billions of dollars we set aside for death and destruction to solve some of our social problems. It is a known fact that three out of every five single women over the age of 65 in our country are living in abject poverty. More often than not, our native population is living in conditions which should not be ignored by any civilized society. Ten per cent of all Canadians are disabled or handicapped. In that group the unemployment rate is between 70 per cent and 90 per cent. Some 11 per cent of our total workforce is unemployed and 18 per cent of our young people are out of work.

Those facts surely tell us that our priorities are all screwed up. Why do we find it necessary to spend \$1 million a minute on arms to kill, maim and destroy when we could better spend those resources for socially useful purposes? It was only several months ago in Private Members' hour in the House that we were discussing cancer, the dreaded disease which nearly every Canadian has been touched by in one way or another. If we were to take a sizeable chunk of the money we spend to destroy the human race and property and put it into cancer research, the people I have spoken to in that field feel that in all probability we could come up with successful treatment of that disease which touches every family in the world.

For all those reasons I hope that the House will agree to this motion and refer it to committee where witnesses can be heard and it can be examined in more detail than we will have time for in the House. I urge Members to support this motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): The Chair would like to comment further on the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker). The Chair proposes to read from Erskine May's Twentieth Edition a paragraph which is found on page 379 under the general heading "Rules governing subject-matter of motions". Under the heading "Matters already decided during the same session" one reads:

A motion or an amendment which is the same, in substance, as a question which has been decided in the affirmative or negative during the current session may not be brought forward again during that session.