

**HALIFAX/NOVA SCOTIA
APRIL 15, 1986**

The discussion in Halifax was wide-ranging. Whilst the common themes of security, the role of the U.N. and Canada's international image did emerge, the discussion raised many other issues which reflected local, national and international concerns, both related and unrelated to the relationship between Disarmament and Development.

In focusing on the Paris Conference itself, there was discussion of Canada's role in the process. Noting that it will be difficult to make substantive progress multilaterally at this time, it was suggested that Canada take the lead in focusing and acting on the issue domestically. Canada could, for example, study its role in the arms exports industry as a means of putting some emphasis on monitoring/curbing the international arms trade. An international arms trade register could be the ultimate goal of this exercise.

Several people gave this broad question a local focus in questioning the appropriateness of Government plans to alleviate regional underdevelopment in the Maritimes by encouraging military/arms export-related industries e.g. Thyssen in Cape Breton, Litton in P.E.I. This was viewed by some as a moral vs. economic argument. On the other hand, the point was made that Canadians generally were not against defence measures or expenditures. If viewed in moral terms, as some did, the Government's policies would be criticized no matter how much or little was spent.

Canada was widely criticized for the development of the arms/defence-industry in Canada which was seen as a national manifestation of the Disarmament/Development linkage and interrelationship. The influence on the native peoples was a matter of some concern.

It was noted that the possibility of providing employment in depressed areas through defence-industries had sparked debate within local communities. It was suggested that "privatisation and militarisation" were not appropriate solutions to Canada's regional underdevelopment. As well, the view was expressed that militarised development was the sign of a sick economy.