

present circumstances at least, that we should join the chorus which has denounced the United States for being in Vietnam at all. That is a different matter.

If this is our position, I do not think we will accomplish anything constructive by accusing the United States of sole guilt and sole blame for what has happened in that country and by doing so trying to impose a kind of moral sanction against the United States. It seems to me that anyone in the position of governmental responsibility -- and I am certainly in that position -- who adopted those tactics, would by doing so cut, or certainly weaken, the lines of official communication between Ottawa and Washington on this subject and I cannot think any useful purpose would be achieved by doing that, especially if we felt we could use those lines of communication to give good advice to our friends....

I go along 100 per cent with the statement made by His Holiness the Pope yesterday which linked an end to the bombing with a halt to infiltration because it is a statement which has been made on this side in the House of Commons, and outside it, when we previously advocated bringing an end to the bombing and, associated with that, an end to infiltration of troops from the North into the South.

This is not a one-sided matter. There can be very honest, sincere, and indeed emotional differences of opinion on it. Last night I was looking over the record of the negotiation offers that had been made in the last two or two and a half years, each one of which had been rejected by the Government in Hanoi and accepted by the Government in Washington.... This does not mean that we should not try to find some proposal that is acceptable to all parties, and of course we will continue to strive to do that.

The other day I read an editorial in a very influential Washington newspaper, the Washington Star. The editor of the Washington Star says: "The time has come, in the Star's opinion, for the U.S.A. to stop bombing in North Vietnam. We say this without the slightest apology for the Administration's conduct of the war up to now. The decision to start bombing was necessary and right. An aggressor cannot be permitted to take for granted his security at home while he wages war on his neighbours. The policy of the careful escalation of bombing, subject to tight restrictions on the choice of targets, seemed likely to bring Hanoi to its senses and has had our full support. But every military strategy must be subject to constant review and reappraisal. It is necessary to weigh the gains against the risks, to ask whether hoped-for results are in fact being achieved. It is necessary to watch for the moment where a change of strategy may produce a greater gain at a decreased risk. That moment has arrived. We should say nothing, explain nothing, set no conditions or limitations on our switch of strategy. We should simply stop bombing and see what the enemy does...."

I am sure that the Administration in Washington is giving very careful consideration to this idea, which has been repeated in recent weeks by many inside the United States.