

*Supply*

nuclear arms race. He pointed out rather clearly—and it was supported by other witnesses—that it was not the nuclear part of armament which was expensive. He said:

It is also important for those of us who spend a lot of our attention trying to reduce the cost of defence systems to remember that the total expenditure on strategic systems represents somewhere between 10 and 20 per cent of the defence budgets of the nuclear weapons states and no per cent at all for all the others.

This is something we should bear in mind when we hear some of the claims made about what could be done in the way of helping to solve all the other problems in the world with the money which we would save if we reduced the nuclear stock-pile.

Ambassador Ford was another distinguished witness. He has had more experience in Moscow than any other witness, with the exception of Mr. Arbatov, I suppose. He gave us his opinion of the Russian psyche; he knew the Russians very well after spending something like 20 or 30 years in Moscow. He said:

Economics, therefore, provide a good reason for the Soviets to try to seek a slowdown in the armament contest. The other good reason is that they are genuinely worried that the Americans, given their present mood of determination to close the nuclear gap, can, and will, produce a very formidable military machine. They are, for example, seriously worried by the technical excellence of the Pershing II and Cruise missiles.

Hence, I am sure that the Soviets are prepared to negotiate seriously on intermediate-range missiles—sometimes called TNF—at Geneva, and to recommence the negotiations on strategic nuclear forces, SALT II or START. It should be noted, however, that the Geneva talks could have begun two and a half years ago if the Soviets had been prepared to do so. They have only agreed to begin negotiations after it became apparent to them that the new American administration was determined to build up its forces without an agreement—

The Soviet threat consists, in short, of its undoubted ability to destroy the west if it so wanted. Since this would also mean its own destruction, it is not likely to happen, but the possibility exists. Circumstances could certainly arise under which both sides would stumble into conflict, but the real threat lies in the political power the Soviet military strength represents, one they are not shy about using.

● (1620)

Mr. Arbatov was a very interesting witness. He assumed a totally uncharacteristic role of being an ordinary person and a layman. The role suffered somewhat when he displayed a great deal of technical knowledge about the weaponry on both sides. Some deviousness by this self-styled ordinary layman was evident in one exchange, which I would like to read. The first few words from this committee hearing are mine. I said:

For many years they had the trip-wire theory for use of nuclear weapons in western Europe; that is, if somebody put his foot across the line of the other side, a nuclear war would start. This was a NATO policy and well known, I believe. They have gone toward a flexible response which would not mean that they were going to fire everything at once, but would select among nuclear weapons if they could.

I was saying this to Mr. Arbatov. I said:

But I was rather alarmed when we were given to understand that it is Russia's avowed intention to respond with strategic ICBMs against the continental United States if any nuclear weapon, no matter how small, is used by the United States' servicemen against Russians in Europe, which is a kind of trip-wire in reverse. I wonder if that is really Russian policy.

Mr. Arbatov replied:

Actually, such wording was never said by anybody in the Soviet Union and it is, I would say, a very inaccurate and frivolous deduction from some of the points made in connection with the concept of limited nuclear war.

To which I replied:

Actually, it is a misquote of a quotation of yours, sir, in Bonn on, 15 March, 1981 where you said when discussing tactical nuclear weapons: "Should these missiles—I repeat, American missiles—strike Soviet territory, the retaliatory blow will be directed not only against those countries in which they were fired but also against the United States exactly as if they had been launched in Montana." Now, that is a quote that is attributed to you.

To which Mr. Arbatov said:

Yes, yes, I said it.

As I said, it was very interesting to have a witness who had this deviousness of playing a simple country squire which he liked to pass himself off as.

Later I would like to say a few words about what might happen with conventional war as an alternative, but I think it might be appropriate to quote some of Dr. W. Harriet Critchley's evidence. Dr. Critchley is a well known political scientist, lecturer and university professor who, surprisingly, takes a particular interest in northern warfare. Her reputation is well established. She said:

One of the things I would like to see more emphasis on in the forthcoming special session on disarmament has to do with the control of conventional weapons. At the first special session, the neutral and non-aligned states, contended that nuclear weapons were the greatest danger to world peace and, therefore, we had to have disarmament or arms control of nuclear weapons first, before we discussed conventional weapons.

Yet, as I mentioned a little bit earlier, in the 37 years we have had nuclear weapons, we have not used them. In that same 37 years, according to the IISS, we have had about 133 wars and killed 25 million people. The wars involved 80 different countries, at one time or another, and they were all conventional weapons wars. The neutral and non-aligned do not want to discuss conventional weapons arms control, not to mention disarmament. What also bothers me in that regard is that they have a marked reluctance to sign the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

I agree entirely with Dr. Critchley when she says that she would like us to be sure not to forget conventional warfare and the devastation it wreaks throughout the world.

This brings me to the area of nuclear weapons, the area that attracts the most attention from disarmament and arms control advocates.

There have only been two instances of nuclear warfare since the development of the atomic bomb 37 years ago. Both of these uses were in the Second World War and they occurred within three days of each other. They were directed against one country, Japan. The bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki resulted in 287, 669 dead and injured and the destruction wrought by these nuclear weapons is commonly cited by nuclear disarmament groups.

However, I think something has been lost over the years. In 1945, the Allies made the decision to drop a nuclear bomb on Japan in order to bring an end to the war that had dragged on for over four years at the cost of hundreds of thousands of lives. It is interesting to note the actual world wide casualty figures for the Second World War: battle deaths, 14,904,000; battle wounded, 25,218,000; civilian casualties, 38,573,000.