

In considering Litton in the Disarmament and Development context, it was suggested that military expenditure diverts resources from true development -- this was one component of the Litton issue. It was also suggested that Litton had implications for Canada's participation in the international arms trade - it was not simply a question of enhancing Canada's defence capabilities as there was a significant export dimension to the system.

Given the historical underdevelopment of the region, the Litton decision was seen as a development, not a defence issue i.e. the question is how best to ease historical underdevelopment and unemployment in P.E.I. Are defence industries the only alternative?

It was considered by some to be "blackmailing" Islanders into either participating in the arms industry or remaining unemployed. The appropriateness of this sort of defence-related industry was questioned in light of the Island's traditional economic base. In the strongest terms used in this discussion, Litton was seen to be forcing P.E.I. to become dependent on the arms industry and therefore develop a long-term vested interest in perpetuating the arms industry and hence, the global arms race.

There was a feeling that the Litton decision was generally opposed by the public and that both P.E.I., and the Atlantic region as a whole, were being oppressed by this sort of military-based development.

In returning to the larger question of the relationship between Disarmament and Development, it was suggested that it was difficult to address the question of disarmament unless one addressed the question of the economic role of the arms industry. In the global context, as well as in the case of Litton, there was a need to cut the link between profitability and the arms race.