

*The Address—Mr. Evans*

job creation and training programs for which our young people are certainly in dire need, for housing and the war on poverty. All of this could be done in our country.

● (1610)

In underdeveloped countries, these funds could be used to raise the world's poor above the poverty level. In those terms alone we should be looking actively at ways of de-escalating the arms race. We can be speaking in terms other than the world threat that nuclear arms present to us.

Canada has been a prominent and a very active participant in many international efforts for arms control and I believe we must continue to build on our record. That is certainly what the Prime Minister's initiative is intended to do.

As the Prime Minister stated at the first United Nations Special Session on Disarmament in 1978, Canada was the first nation in the post-war period with the capacity to produce nuclear weapons that chose not to do so. The Prime Minister mentioned that in his speech today. We were the first nuclear armed country which chose to divest itself of nuclear weapons and we have maintained a non-nuclear role for our United Nations forces in Europe and our NATO forces as well.

Canada has been active in its support for a comprehensive test ban treaty, an extended non-proliferation treaty and steps to prevent the militarization of space. These are all matters which the Prime Minister mentioned in his speech this morning. Our participation in negotiations on arms control and disarmament in such international forums as the United Nations General Assembly, U.N. committees and NATO has demonstrated our commitment to peace and security in an interdependent world.

However, the past few years have witnessed a significant deterioration in the international political climate. The recent deployment of the Pershing II and Cruise missiles in Europe, as part of NATO's two track response to the deployment of the Soviet Union's SS-20s and more recently their more advanced missiles, has greatly exacerbated East-West tensions. We have since witnessed the suspension of high level political dialogue between the superpowers on issues of arms control and disarmament, as demonstrated by the breakdown of the INF and START negotiations, as well as the MBFR talks. The only sign of political discussion on these issues is the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, which commenced in Stockholm at the end of January.

The Prime Minister, among others, has called for politicization of these talks, and rightfully so. As a result, the conference provided an opportunity for foreign ministers of NATO and the Warsaw Pact and neutral and non-aligned countries to resume negotiations and rebuild international confidence. I know that we all have a great hope that these discussions will lead to a fruitful conclusion.

It is in this increasingly unstable international environment that the Prime Minister's peace initiative must be placed. In launching his initiative, the Prime Minister has called for a "third rail of high level political energy to speed the course of

agreement", and I have noted today that certain of the nuclear disarmament groups in Canada have swung on side and are now supporting the Prime Minister's third rail initiative.

At the Williamsburg Summit in 1983, the leaders of the Western industrialized nations stated:

We commit ourselves to devote our full political resources to reducing the threat of war. We have a vision of a world in which the shadow of war has been lifted from all mankind, and we are determined to pursue that vision.

The Prime Minister, as one of the participants of the Summit, has indeed taken concrete political action to this end. The Canadian peace plan also demonstrates the need for the leaders of middle powers, not simply the two superpowers or the five nuclear armed powers, to become involved in the search for peace.

Since 1945, the world has witnessed a terrifying proliferation of nuclear arms with increased capacity for destruction. After the first atomic bomb we have seen the development of thermo nuclear weapons, ICBM fleets, submarine-launched Cruise missiles, independently targeted multiple warheads, and if we do not stop this chain of destruction we will soon see anti-satellite systems in space.

While technical capabilities have increased, I do not think that there has been a concomitant development in the political purpose governing the development and use of these weapons. It seems that nuclear strategists have been able to divorce successfully nuclear military strategy from both political objectives and social reality to the point where they find it possible to discuss the concept of a winnable or protracted nuclear war.

There is no such thing as escalation dominance. Unless we succeed in de-escalating world tensions and stopping the momentum of the arms race, we will not see escalation dominance but rather, mutually assured destruction—apocalypse now.

As the Prime Minister has stated, "casting a fresh linkage of military strategy with, and subordinate to"—which is very important—"strong political purpose must become the highest priority of East and West alike".

Robert McNamara, the former U.S. Secretary of Defence, has written an article in which he expresses similar concerns. He asserts in fact that nuclear weapons can serve no military purpose at all except to deter one's opponents from using them. He questions whether there is any issue, any conflict which could possibly justify the use of nuclear weapons in a confrontation. I confess that I cannot conceive of any situation which would warrant such a response, and I believe that any military or defence strategies pursued must take these factors into account.

As a member of the NATO Alliance, Canada recognizes the legitimate security needs of our allies. We must ensure that steps are taken to safeguard our collective security but that these steps do not in fact end up endangering it.

Throughout history, it seems, war is not solely the response of nations reacting to a direct and present danger. Often, military preparedness itself leads to war. Given the lack of