

Supply

Then we should be considering what is necessary to produce those and direct the rest of our resources to meeting the needs of the one-sixth of the people in our country who are under the poverty line and the needs of the aboriginal peoples of our country. We would find we have some left over to meet the needs of the countries that were recently colonies of Europe that have been pillaged and need to be allowed to stand on their feet.

Mrs. Gaffney: Mr. Speaker, I think one of the benefits of this debate has been the furthering of my knowledge of what ARMX is all about. I appreciate the comments of my colleague here and also the colleagues across the floor and on the NDP side of the House. We have heard quite a distinct divergence of views this afternoon. It has certainly lifted some of the aura of indecision and confusion that seems to lie around the ARMX bazaar that is happening shortly in Ottawa. If I could move off ARMX for a moment, I would like to briefly comment on where we stand as a nation today in world military spending. We all know we spend more than 25 times what we spend on foreign aid to the developing nations of the world, and that weapons imports now amount to 25 per cent of the total debt burden of the developing world. I think this is something that concerns us all.

I believe it is incumbent upon us all to ensure that Canada has a multilateral approach to peace in the world, and working with other nations and other peoples is surely the best way to ensure peace and prosperity for all. The question that we all should be asking ourselves is how Canada can best contribute most effectively in the search for global peace. One of the key problem areas is the existence of nuclear weapons. We should all be working toward their reduction and the means to ensure that the East-West conflict will not occur.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Gaffney: There is no question that Canada should not get into the game of mass producing military weapons for export abroad. One of the things that the Free Trade Agreement does is it threatens the capacity of Canadians to pursue an independent foreign policy. The question I would like to ask my colleague is this. Looking at the NDP policy with regards to the arms race and peace in the world, I am wondering if he as an NDP still rejects Canada's view that we should be neutralist in our commitment to NATO. Also would he not agree that we

as Canadians should continue our commitment to our NATO friends abroad?

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, in fact as the statement that we adopted a year ago last month lays out, we believe that NATO has outlived its usefulness for peace and that it is now one of the embodiments of a sort of unthinking momentum toward the arms race. Our policy is that in the first year of government, we would withdraw our troops from Europe. We would continue with the political side of NATO until perhaps a second term. The decisions could be made as we continue along, but what was clear and unambiguous in that statement is that we would withdraw our troops at the beginning of an NDP Government.

I think that is an important signal. When we began debating this in public, that is to say when certain journalists affected great surprise at discovering an NDP policy which had existed since 1969, what we found was it generated a great deal of discussion, not only on the left in Canada, but amongst people who are not considered to be on the left, and we find there is a great deal of debate within the United States and Europe about the usefulness of NATO. There are some alliances that do not last forever, and it is fairly clear that NATO will not. Therefore what we propose is that Canada should first of all restrict itself in such things as having nuclear ships visit our ports, testing potentially nuclear missiles and quartering troops in central Europe. Those are now quite unnecessary for the defence of Europe and quite ineffective for the defence of Canada, but they are provocations which continue to justify other countries in building up or maintaining their armaments. At the present time there is the chance of reducing armaments, and this is the kind of action that Canada should be taking.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, if I understood the Member for Spadina correctly, he said that Israel was to be one of the participants or at least one of the window shoppers at this event?

Mr. Heap: An Israeli firm will be an exhibitor.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): An Israeli firm will be an exhibitor? So it is not unreasonable to conclude that there will be official Israeli agents there?

Mr. Heap: Right.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): Perhaps checking out the competition? I was wondering, although this Chamber careers off into realms of morality and ethics, given the Hon. Member's background, if he would care to comment on whether or not there can be any moral