

*Income Tax*

necessary. It depends upon mutual distrust, but if we accept this motion we can begin to build trust and understanding. In the long term, this would lead to a reduction in the arms' race.

The final consideration that many people raise is employment. With two million people already unemployed, we do not want more people laid off from DND establishments or defence-related industries. I admit that this is a most valid concern in today's economy, but two factors need to be considered. First of all, in the foreseeable future, Canada will continue to need the Armed Forces for United Nations peace-keeping duties, for establishing and maintaining territorial sovereignty, air-sea rescue facilities and dealing with disasters. There would be no immediate dismantling of domestic facilities.

As well, it is important for Canadians to realize that more jobs per dollar are created through peace-related industry and activity than from military-related activity. One of the areas of research that the peace research funding should be directed toward is the transition from a military to a peace economy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to accept the motion and to recognize its importance. By accepting it we would implement in a political manner the Prime Minister's suggestion that we suffocate the arms' race. We would recognize that Canada's way to security is not by limping along behind the United States but that our security can only be found through world peace. A peace research fund such as I and others have proposed would be one small step in that direction, and I urge the House to take it.

**Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to challenge some of the statements made by the Hon. Member who proposed the motion. He has raised a number of issues that cannot all be answered in the short time available to me.

The first of these is the statement made by a naval officer in the United States, Commander Byron, who happens to have expressed a personal opinion which has not been confirmed or substantiated by the United States Navy or their external affairs officers. He is a submariner and has a very periscopic view of forces. He sees the force only as a submarine commander does, with a very narrow and limited view. He would like to see the Canadian navy converted essentially into a submarine supporting agency for the United States Navy. This has never been the intention nor has there ever been any suggestion of it by NATO commanders. The three submarines that we have are training submarines and take part in submarine detection.

I would prefer to quote a former commander of the Atlantic supporting units of NATO who indicated that there is no better marine unit in the world than the Canadian marine unit in detecting submarines. He has given them full credit for a job well done, particularly emphasizing the professionalism of the men who carry out the duties allotted to them. The safety of transportation across the Atlantic depends on the submarines, surface vessels and the Aurora planes.

The statements made by Commander Byron are not indicative of the true state of our navy. It has been allotted a task by NATO, but it must also protect the sovereignty of our islands, protect our fishery patrols, support whatever needs there are in search and rescue, as well as take part in the collective security of the country, along with our commitments to NATO.

● (1750)

However, as far as the Hon. Member's motion is concerned, while doubtless prompted by the highest of motives, it is one which I suggest it would not be prudent for the House to support. The course of action which the motion would have the House advocate is one that it would be irresponsible for the Government to follow. The fault lies not in the motion for more peace research or indeed in relation to support of the United Nations. The fault lies in the implicit idea that our efforts to come to grips with the causes of international conflict are an alternative to, or a substitute for, Canada's efforts to preserve our security by the maintenance of our contribution to collective defence.

Some Members may say that the motion does not necessarily call for a transfer of resources from the defence effort to anything else. This is quite true. It does not. However, it relates one activity to another in a way which could create an utterly false impression that the Government's defence policy is in some mysterious way not concerned with peace—the making of peace and the keeping of peace. Members will be aware that Canadian security policy has been and continues to be aimed exclusively at the maintenance of world peace and, in particular, the prevention of a war that would engulf Canada.

As the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Lamontagne) stated recently, we have achieved our aim by providing, in concert with our allies, a believable and therefore effective deterrent to the threat of aggression which we have seen the Soviet Union and its allies as potentially raising against us. At the same time, we have pursued with vigour and persistence the objective of arms' control and disarmament arrangements which would produce equal or greater security for all, while lowering reliance on military power, particularly nuclear power, for that purpose.

The Government is convinced that as long as there is a threat to our security at home by way of a nuclear attack on North America, or there remains a threat of aggressive action against any of our European NATO allies, the preservation of our collective security must be found first in collective deterrence and defence measures. Unattractive as a policy of deterrence may be for keeping the peace, it has the advantage of having worked. It is also likely to continue to work as long as there is as much thought given to preserving a deterrent as there is to finding means to get around it. As costly as defence measures may be, there is no substitute for them in a world in which the application of military force is an option in the pursuit of national objectives. What we seek is stability through a balance in the potential for the use of force between