

Pact and NATO?²⁰

Mr. Beatty replied that the INF agreement--although very significant--did not deal with other areas of concern in the NATO-Warsaw Pact balance. In his words:

...left untouched were a number of important areas, such as conventional imbalances between East and West where the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact maintain an advantage of two or three to one at the present time in chemical weapons and a range of other areas. We are hopeful that progress can be made in these areas.²¹

Mr. Stackhouse referred to the NATO-Warsaw Pact military balance again on 23 February 1988, observing that the task of redressing the current imbalance of conventional weapons in Europe was a top priority for the Canadian Government and for NATO as a whole.²²

On 4 March 1988, Liberal MP Len Hopkins referred to the state of the European military balance in introducing a motion reaffirming Canadian support for, and participation in, NATO:

The Soviet nuclear and conventional power is strong, and European free countries cannot deal with it alone. As the nuclear threat is reduced, so must the conventional arms threat be reduced. Certain elements of the Armed Forces in the Warsaw Pact outnumber NATO forces by three to one. Therefore we cannot remove the nuclear protection while leaving the European continent at the mercy of an overdose of conventional power.²³

²⁰ Commons Debates, 21 September 1987, p. 9140.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Commons Debates, 23 February 1988, p. 13069.

²³ Commons Debates, 4 March 1988, p. 13401.