

I will give just a few instances of some of these countries from Amnesty International. We mentioned Chile already, but for example, in El Salvador, there were arrests of suspected government opponents, some of whom were supposedly tortured, subjected to severe psychological pressure or extra-judicially executed, some of whom disappeared while in custody. What we are told publicly is that anyone who is accredited to Ottawa, any diplomat accredited to Ottawa is invited to attend. In other words, to that extent, all these countries that are human rights violators are invited to attend. While of course they cannot carry away a tank in their knapsack, as Colonel North said, in fact they can make contacts and place orders. Guatemala has the same sort of record.

Apparently Israel has a Canadian subsidiary that is exhibiting here. In December, at least 23 Palestinian demonstrators in the West Bank and Gaza were shot and killed—this is a report of the previous year—by soldiers during widespread violent protests against the Israeli occupation. There were also severe and indiscriminate beatings of demonstrators and hundreds were summarily tried and imprisoned. There was an increase in reports of ill-treatment and torture of detainees by members of the Israeli defence force and the general security service. Yet Israel is invited to exhibit here and Israel is free to attend and make arrangements for buying.

In fact, it appears that the primary object of the arms bazaar is not to equip the Canadian Army. We would not need 13,000 visitors which the Government says it is expecting to equip the Canadian Army. In fact, I think the clear object of this is simply to make higher profits for arms producing companies, including Canadian ones, and to make those profits without regard to what happens with the weapons that are sold. This is what I object to and what our Party objects to and what is clearly opposed in the statement that we produced last spring called "Canada's Stake in Common Security". We object to having the manufacture of armaments done primarily or solely for profit or perhaps solely for profit with the only condition that it stays within the general guidelines of NATO. I say general because obviously our weaponry gets to countries who are not in NATO but perhaps through NATO partners. Otherwise, it is a matter of profit.

### *Supply*

Indirectly, also, technological growth in turn increases the power to make profit, but the key question is profit. I would like to point out that more and more economists are pointing out the flaws in the theory that building up armaments builds up the general economy and the industrial strength of our country. It has been pointed out that in recent studies done under the United Nations and in the United States, countries such as Japan and Germany with the least investment in weaponry, that is in production of war goods, have a better industrial performance, a more efficient industrial performance, than the United States does. For Canada, of course, with our DPSA agreement with the United States, any jobs that we gained by selling to the United States are balanced by jobs that go to the United States when we buy from them. We are only supposed to sell as much as we buy. Actually we sell less than we buy. So the sale arrangement is not one that increases the jobs in Canada. We simply at best exchange jobs with the United States.

• (1420)

There is also, Mr. Speaker, what has been found by experience; that the technological spin-offs from military development are not very important, not very useful. In fact, that is one of the reasons why Japan and Germany have been able to progress faster than the United States and Canada in their economies.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that you are indicating to me that my time is running out. I want to finish by pointing out that it is possible to plan for a transition from war production that is not needed to peace production, production in the broadest sense. That does not appear to have occurred to the Government in connection with its closure or announcement that it will close certain bases. It does not appear to have made provision for alternative economy or alternative employment. It can be done. It was done in the United States and Canada after World War II, quite successfully. If you are not interested in making highest profits, that is what we should be doing. Instead of promoting, as this armaments exhibition does, just mindless increase in the sales of weaponry, we should be choosing after public debate what kind of weapons we need to defend our country and the ones that can be least used to threaten others with attack.