

Some discussion took place on the concept of security and the need for political will in the disarmament and development context. It was considered that Canada had little "sense of threat" and that it tended to be swept up in the U.S. definition of security which was often put in terms of protecting commercial/economic interests. Canada needed to redefine security to reflect better its traditional non-ideological, non-confrontational approach.

In moving to the Disarmament and Development relationship it was suggested that, whilst many people had difficulties in making the connection between the subjects, the activities of the peace movement revealed that they had an intuitive understanding of the relationship. However, in order to promote this understanding more broadly, it was necessary for the peace movement to have greater resources. In particular, the peace movement in P.E.I. was frustrated as a result of geographic isolation and lack of funding. It was suggested that one way of supporting global work for peace would be to support more fully the work of groups on a local level. This was one way the Government could manifest its desire for peace in realistic, concrete terms.

A common theme which emerged was that of the need to generate political will to seek peace. Thus, the question was posed: why can governments not be motivated to act in ways which reflect the people's will for peace? There was seen to be a dichotomy between the general will of the people to cooperation and peace and the policies of governments to confrontation and war.

Discussion of the decision to have Litton Industries establish a plant in P.E.I. as part of its contract to build the LLAD system was prolonged and intense. The Litton issue was seen as a very real manifestation of the disarmament/development relationship on a local level.

There was a good deal of concern over what was seen to be a lack of democratic consultation on this question. As well, many complained about the lack of information to the public on the exact nature of the system and the plant.

It was widely considered that "no single issue on P.E.I. had been more destructive to development and peace on the Island than Litton"-- it was seen to be divisive and confrontational.