

*Income Tax*

of armed conflict. This principle should also apply to the paying of taxes. Already in Canada a group of people who have objections of conscience to paying money for militaristic purposes have established a peace tax fund. It is based on the principle of freedom of conscience, which last year we formally recognized in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

This peace tax fund has a growing list of adherents, Mr. Speaker. It is not yet recognized by Government, but I believe it should be. In addition to those who are conscientious objectors, there is a wide class of people who do not oppose all use of force by the state but who object very strongly to the present insanity of the arms race. They are a group of people who believe that their money can contribute much more to Canada's security and world peace if it is directed toward such things as peace research, international exchanges and visits to promote understanding, goodwill and trust, and toward pilot projects which could lead to reconciliation in areas of strife. They believe the money could do more good if it could be used to endow peace research chairs in universities. At present the Department of National Defence supports some five chairs in strategic studies. Why do we not do something in terms of supporting peace research? They believe that their money could be better used for some kind of independent analysis of the arms race.

We often hear criticism of Canada's Armed Forces, Mr. Speaker. Just this last week a United States source criticized our navy as a collection of miscellaneous cats and dogs. Yet this next fiscal year we will spend some \$7.8 billion on defence, an 11 per cent increase over the \$7 billion spent last year. It is a fact that 8.8 per cent of our tax dollars goes to defence; that is over \$300 for every man, woman and child in Canada. But still this is not enough to satisfy those people who look to our Armed Forces to provide us with the kind of security we need to live a decent life. It is true that it is not enough and it will never be enough, and we only need to look at the United States right now and the debate whether over \$230 billion is enough to understand that we can continually escalate the amount of money we spend on defence and it will still not be enough. The simple fact of the matter is that we do not find security through armaments. Whether we limp or whether we sprint, the arms race is not the answer to our problems.

I would like to read just a couple of short paragraphs from a speech given by the late Lord Louis Mountbatten on May 11, 1979. He said:

Next month I enter my eightieth year. I am one of the few survivors of the First World War who rose to high command in the Second and I know how impossible it is to pursue military operations in accordance with fixed plans and agreements. In warfare the unexpected is the rule and no one can anticipate what an opponent's reaction will be to the unexpected.

So much for some of our planned limited nuclear warfare. He goes on:

As a military man who has given half a century of active service I say in all sincerity that the nuclear arms race has no military purpose. Wars cannot be fought with nuclear weapons. Their existence only adds to our perils because of the illusions which they have generated.

There are powerful voices around the world who still give credence to the old Roman precept—if you desire peace, prepare for war. This is absolute nuclear nonsense and I repeat—it is a disastrous misconception to believe that by increasing the total uncertainty one increases one's own certainty.

• (1740)

We cannot increase our security as a nation by increasing the insecurity of our world.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has talked about suffocating the arms' race, but if anything has suffocated under his leadership it is our halting effort at disarmament. The ambassador of disarmament has a budget of \$300,000 per year, which is approximately what the Department of National Defence spends on its magazine. That is what I call suffocation, Mr. Speaker.

This past winter, in 130 communities 75 per cent of the people voted in one way or another for disarmament. On the specific question of Cruise missile testing in Canada, 52 per cent of Canadians are opposed. The Government pretends that these figures do not mean anything. It claims that it is easy to vote for disarmament, and it asks how serious the commitment is behind that 75 per cent.

This motion challenges the Government to give people the opportunity to vote with their money. If only 1 per cent of Canadians chose to divert 8.8 per cent of their income tax to peace research, that would bring in approximately \$2.7 million. That money could go into peace research and should be compared with the measly \$300,000 that is presently allocated to the ambassador for disarmament.

I should like to deal briefly with some objections raised by people who say that the peace research fund sounds like a good idea but that it would be difficult to administer. There are many ways it could be administered. All Members of the House have benefited from provisions in the Income Tax Act that allow people to make contributions to political Parties and to claim tax credits for them. We could have a similar provision to allow people to make contributions to the United Nations fund or to recognize non-Governmental organizations and claim a 100 per cent tax credit.

The second objection is that anyone with an axe to grind concerning some Government expenditure would want similar provisions. For example, someone who objected to the official languages policy might demand that his money not be used for that purpose. The critics fear a hodge podge where everyone opts out of paying taxes for one project or another.

In answer to these criticisms I propose that the Government should bring in a Bill to alter the Income Tax Act and make this diversion possible. The issue of national security and world peace is the most serious issue of our times. Such a provision demands the time and attention of Parliament. It would rule out the possibility of less serious issues receiving the same consideration.

The third objection is that the arms' race would continue in any event. In a sense that is true. The danger of the arms' race is not likely to end overnight, but with this proposal a significant number of people would be able to register their disapproval of it in a way that the Government understands. They would be able to make a positive contribution to peace and work toward that time when the arms' race would no longer be