

*Government Orders*

Listen to the words of the former trade minister, the current minister responsible for Atlantic development. He said in the House of Commons of March 7 of this year: "We are discussing automatic weapons, that is rifles and other small arms of that nature, machine guns and the like which are necessary for armies, police forces and civil authorities to have if they are to be in a position to keep order in their own countries".

Project Ploughshares has said of these weapons, according to a GM spokesperson: "Military leaders of small countries may like its capacity to 'quell' civil disturbances".

We have here a weapon which this government proposes to permit to be exported to Saudi Arabia. Let me make it clear as well, the bill does not just specify Saudi Arabia. The bill gives the cabinet a licence to add any country in the world to the list of countries to which these weapons may be sent.

I come back: If gun control is all right for Canadians, why is it not all right for other countries and other people? Are we not a common humanity? Are we not our neighbour's keepers? How can we in this House, in conscience, pass a bill which will permit the export of automatic weapons to other countries if we do not permit those weapons in this country except for our own national security?

No case can be made that the export of automatic weapons to Saudi Arabia or most of the rest of the world is in our military or common security. The only case made by the government for the export of these weapons is one of jobs here at home. No case can be made on the basis of conscience, no case can be made on the basis of our national security for this bill and for the provisions within it.

In March the government spoke for Canadians when it set out a policy that might at least begin to turn back the arms race which has caused such destruction in this century and when the government called for a world summit for the transparency in arms deals and for restraint at home in arms deals. We supported the government when it said those things. We supported the government in committee, in the House and in public.

What has happened to that initiative? Where has the government gone? Is it because we have had a change of

minister? Is it because this government never was serious about trying to restrain arms sales?

My friends in the Liberal Party asked me during the course of this debate: "What about jobs?"

**Mr. Fontana:** CAW supports that bill.

**Mr. Brewin:** Let me speak on behalf of the CAW. My friend asks me to do that. The CAW have been long supporters of the New Democratic Party and we are proud of that support. I want to put on record the fact that the local in the area, Local 27, calls on this House to support the bill.

**An hon. member:** Pat Clancy too.

**Mr. Brewin:** I will get to Pat Clancy in a minute if the member will just restrain himself. CAW makes the case that the jobs are vital for its members and for that community. We respect and honour the position that it takes.

Let me quote directly from a letter from Pat Clancy, the area director for CAW Canada. It reads:

The CAW has for years taken the position that Canada should not become a major international arms dealer. We have taken a position that workers in plants producing armaments should not just be thrown on the unemployment roles, but that their jobs would be protected by conversion methods, building products for peaceful use.

The problem with the current situation at GM Diesel in London is that the workers have in fact been building these military vehicles for some years now for the U.S. military. No doubt, many of those ended up in places like Saudi Arabia. If these orders were to be cancelled, it would mean a lay off of approximately 700 workers because there are no plans to convert this facility to produce alternate products.

As far as the NDP is concerned, we realize that the party represents a broader constituency and therefore should feel free to deal with this issue consistent with party policy. I am sure you realize however, as a union, we cannot take a position that would mean the immediate loss of 700 jobs.

Our caucus took those views carefully into consideration, but we feel that even though the immediate prospect may be the loss of jobs in Kitchener in respect of Diemaco and in London in the case of the Saudi Arabian deal, we have no choice but to oppose this bill with all the vigour that we can muster. We say, in the broader interest of the Canadian national interest and the broader questions of the world interest, that this is a bad bill and this is a bill which must not be accepted by this House.