

the leaders of the democratic countries. Having convinced themselves that it is useless to denounce the SS-20s, people find it easier, I suppose, to forget about them. The strange result of this forgetfulness is that it somehow becomes possible to portray the Soviet Union not as the aggressor, but as the innocent target. This represents a curious amnesia and reversal of roles, which the Soviet leaders are quick to exploit for their own purposes.

They hope, obviously, that one-sided information, and one-sided protests, will lead to the unilateral disarmament of the West. Indeed, there is a segment of public opinion in western Europe which has already adopted that policy.

During the first special session on disarmament at the United Nations, I proposed, in the name of Canada, a strategy of suffocation. It was designed to smother, even in the laboratory, the development of any new nuclear weapons systems. Obviously, my proposal had to apply to both sides or to neither. There certainly was no suggestion in that proposal that the West should disarm unilaterally.

Because our strategy of suffocation was rejected by the Soviet Union, as evidenced by the continued deployment of the SS-20s, a weapon much superior to the SS-4 and 5, there was no question of urging its acceptance by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries alone. That is why we allied ourselves with the "two-track" strategy of our NATO partners. Those two tracks are to seek to negotiate the removal of the Soviet SS-20s and, at the same time, to prepare for the deployment of new American missiles in Europe so as to pressure the Soviet Union toward serious negotiations, and so as not to leave our European allies in a vulnerable position, if the negotiations on intermediate range nuclear forces ended in failure.

Having declared our support for the two-track strategy, Canada should bear its fair share of the burden which that policy imposes upon the NATO alliance.

It is hardly fair to rely on the Americans to protect the West, but to refuse to lend them a hand when the going gets rough. In that sense, the anti-Americanism of some Canadians verges on hypocrisy. They're eager to take refuge under the American umbrella, but don't want to help hold it.

When we seek to apply moral principles to this issue, it's easy to become trapped in positions which are either too complex or too simple. The former can paralyze us. The latter can deceive us.

Into the trap of over-complication fall those who insist that no moral position is valid which does not take into account every possible future breakthrough in nuclear weapons technology, every possible future difficulty in detecting the actions of the other side. Into the trap of over-simplification fall those who are content to talk about

---