

Canada's security policy, but the answer came back that was precisely why I was asked to open (the benefit of ignorance they supposedly thought to be advantageous). Combine that with jet lag as I arrived just an hour ago from Scotland and I think you can excuse any idiocy which you are about to hear. But I would like to speak very much not as an expert at all, though there are plenty of experts at this table, but as a practicing politician dealing with the democratic problems of operating any kind of security policy. I think that we are, not just here in Canada, but in the United States and in all the NATO countries, coming up to a really difficult period within 6 months, with time running out on the 1979 deployment decisions. Therefore, I think it is going to be a very important topic in all of the Western countries, particularly in the next few months.

My first observation is that the security of our peoples in the real sense of the word has been decreasing, not increasing, over the years because of the increase in both the number and power of nuclear missiles. Also because of the increased sophistication over the last two decades of nuclear weaponry, political control over their deployment and potential use is now much more difficult. For example, it is argued in Britain that decisions about the use of cruise missiles, if we have them in Britain, cannot be satisfactorily covered by the political agreement between the United States and Britain which dates from Mr. Atlee and President Truman. Now it is self-evident that a political agreement designed to cover the use of the bombers stationed in Britain is rather different, I would have thought, from the split-second decisions required on the firing or not firing of cruise missiles. It seems to me that, because of these factors, the political debate, public