

confidence, the mistrust that exists today, we must strive to ensure that the lower nuclear threshold and increased potential for destruction that exist today do not and never will result in the deployment of nuclear weapons in a super-power confrontation.

It was with great interest and perhaps with some degree of coincidence that last night on the PBS television system in the United States, on Bill Moyers' program *A Walk Through the Twentieth Century*, he discussed how weapons development has changed the face of the world and the concept and notion of war. He mentioned that, indeed, the man who has given us the Nobel Peace Prize was the man who invented dynamite, with the notion at that time that dynamite had such horrendous potential for destruction that it would never be used but would be a force to stop and end war.

Carrying on into the early 1900s, we saw the change that has taken place in the concept of war just in the last half century. Prior to the invention of the machine-gun, war was thought to be a chivalrous activity in which combatants alone were involved and killing took place between military forces of combatants in which civilians were not involved.

The invention and application of the machine-gun was the beginning of the depersonalization of war. He showed how the application of the machine-gun changed the notion of war from being a chivalrous act—which it never was—to one where an individual using a piece of mechanized equipment could literally kill thousands of people without seeing their faces, knowing their names or realizing what they stood for or were trying to achieve.

● (1620)

As the machine-gun depersonalized war, the next stage in the evolution of depersonalization during the First World War was the application of the second element of destruction, namely, the submarine and the use of that submarine in the sinking of civilian vessels, such as the *Lusitania* where over 1,000 men, women and children, all non-combatants, were killed by the use of a torpedo, with no other purpose in terms of the impact that it might have on the war. Civilians were killed indiscriminately by a piece of mechanized equipment. That piece of equipment was thought to be of such horrible destructive power that it would never be used and that it would bring an end to war.

The third phase to war was the invention and the application of the airplane. That really brought about the ultimate depersonalization of war in the last part of the First World War and certainly later in the Second World War. Literally millions and millions of human beings were destroyed, civilians, non-combatants, by the application of a high technology item.

When we think the First World War was called the war to end all wars and then think of what happened during the Second World War when millions of people died at the hands of machines manned by individual who had no concept, no notion, of the terrible force which they unleashed on human beings, they were simply using a piece of equipment, it seems to me that that program brought home even more forcefully

*The Address—Mr. Evans*

the futility of looking for the ultimate weapon to end all war. There is no such weapon, Mr. Speaker. There is no weapon that will end the terrible destruction of war. It just makes it more terrible indeed. By depersonalizing war it removes, as the Prime Minister was trying to say in a much more deep historical sense, the element of politics from war, because we do not confront individuals in a battle situation any longer; we confront machines and the machines confront people. That depersonalization has made the risks of all-out war much, much higher than ever before.

It was pointed out that the Second World War was the first war in which more civilians were killed than combatants. In the First World War the numbers were about even. In the Second World War, 16 million combatants were killed and 34 million civilians were killed. The estimates of a third World War in the ludicrous context of a limited nuclear war would be somewhere in the range of 300 million or more killed, over 90 per cent of whom would be civilians. These would be people with no interest in the war, no desire for war, just innocent victims of a nonsensical approach of trying to solve the world's problems.

It is unacceptable. All of us in the House believe it is unacceptable. It seems to me we have to devote every effort we can to ensuring that that never comes about. It might be thought that each weapon advance—we are seeing it now and we are hearing about it and with it the testing of additional weapons, will take us to a high level of deterrence. But it does not. It does not take us to a higher level of deterrence. Contrary to the fervent belief of inventors and the fervent belief of those who would escalate the arms race, each advance has not put an end to war. It has only made war increasingly more terrible, to the point now that if we use just the limited number of weapons we have, we could virtually ensure the destruction of mankind, ensure the destruction of life on earth as we know it. The lunacy of this has gone far beyond the point to which we should have ever let it go in the first place.

The vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world, the growing hostility of the superpowers and a deep understanding of history have prompted the Prime Minister to put forth proposals designed to avert such a threat. In his visits with world leaders, East and West alike, he has received support for his efforts. He has called for the establishment of a global forum for negotiations which will include the five nuclear powers and an extension and strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. The initiative has included suggestions for raising the nuclear threshold in Europe through a mutually acceptable balance of conventional forces at reduced levels. Other proposals include the suffocation of the development of new weapons systems, a ban on anti-satellite systems in space, and improved verification procedures, including mobility restrictions on ICBMs. Perhaps most important, the Prime Minister has emphasized the need for an injection of political will, to bring back once again political control over the system, because the essence of politics is human interaction. That, it seems to me, is the historical evolution that has occurred over the years since the early