

Earlier I talked about the immoral expenditure of money on weapons. In another sense, it has always been easier to get the weapons in the first place than to get rid of them later on. Last week's agreement came after months and years of negotiations, wranglings, false hopes and dashed expectations. How ironic it is that we can all heave a collective sigh of relief when the superpowers are able to agree to remove weapons that were supposed to be designed to protect us. It is increasingly ironic that at the same time Canadians are contemplating increasing our own contribution to the arms race.

As a middle power, Canada is not in the arms race in the same manner as the United States or Russia, or even as France, Britain, or West Germany. We still spend \$10.3 billion a year on it. There are calls for us to spend more in the name of national security. At the present time I am not naive enough to argue for unilateral disarmament. I do maintain that increasing our military expenditures will not increase either our sense of security or our real security.

On the other hand, anything that we could do to relieve or decrease the level of world tension would help our security.

Murray Thomson of Peacefund Canada, has quoted the late Olaf Palme of Sweden who said, "Security must be achieved not against one adversary but together with him". In our world that is very true. We must find some method of common security. We cannot have some type of fortress mentality that will guarantee our security against an adversary.

On the face of it, a 1 per cent decrease in arms spending by Canada would not be very significant. But it would be a start, and it would require a reciprocal decrease in some of the Third World countries. The idea of taking money from armaments and putting it toward development is not new.

Clyde Sanger in his 1981 book entitled *Safe and Sound: Disarmament and Development in the 80s*, summarizes the results of Inga Thorsson's three-year United Nations study on disarmament and development. He pointed out that there have been several different proposals to deal with this issue.

For example, in 1955, Prime Minister Edgar Faure of France proposed that all countries reduce military expenditures by an increasing percentage each year and contribute some of the savings to a development fund.

In 1956, Russia called for a 10 per cent to 15 per cent reduction in her own arms expenditures as well as those of the United States, Britain, and France. Again, some of the savings would go to development.

In 1973, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a U.S.S.R. resolution calling for a 10 per cent reduction in the military budgets of the five permanent members of the Security Council, stipulating that one-tenth of that reduction would go to development assistance.

There have been other proposals from Romania, Brazil, Senegal, and France.

Development Assistance

My proposal, Mr. Speaker, is more modest. It does not need to wait for the big military powers to agree. Canada can lead the way along with one or two Third World countries.

On August 24 of this year, our Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark), speaking at the international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development, stated, "... the test of this conference will be what we do, not what we say. There is rhetoric enough on the evil of arms and the need for development. What we must seek to achieve here is practical co-operation, not mutual recrimination". He also stated, "The relevant question is how do we make progress, not whom do we blame".

He went on to say, "As a first step now, we should attach higher priority to the development of confidence-building measures, which are a prerequisite to any major arms limitation agreement". He pointed to the examples of Europe and Central America. He stated, "These examples differ in form, but demonstrate that small, steady, practical steps can create the confidence that leads to progress. We should increase our efforts to promote such co-operation at the regional level".

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that my proposal to take 1 per cent of our defence budget and make it available for development assistance to countries in the Third World that decrease their own military spending would be one such small step. It would be a small step that Canada is uniquely situated to make, a small step for Canada, but if followed by others it could be a big step toward world peace and security.

● (1420)

[Translation]

Mrs. Monique Tardif (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Like many of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I think that the motion introduced by the Hon. Member for Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands (Mr. Manly) is interesting, but in fact it is unrealistic.

As my colleague pointed out a few moments ago, I also think that Canadians are supportive of disarmament, but in a world-wide context. He would want that to be done as soon as possible on a world-wide basis.

Still, Mr. Speaker, we must keep in mind the fact that nations have been making and keeping arms for quite some time, and that they will continue to do so as long as they have reasons to justify this course of action.

If I take a closer look at the motion before the House today, it reflects the widespread notion that there is a causal link—I would almost say a reverse connection—between defence and development expenditures. The belief appears to be that a reduction in defence expenditures will be followed by a corresponding increase in funds earmarked for international development. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it does not work out quite that way.

Admittedly, if billions of dollars are spent every year on armed forces throughout the world, there is a connection, but