



first place. And it has taken a new Soviet leader to realize that a more stable world is possible through mutual reductions in military might.

We welcome the new spirit as well as the tangible achievements.

The agreement introduces the most stringent verification measures yet seen. For the first time, American and Soviet inspectors will be stationed on each other's territory. Measures like these are essential, not only to ensure compliance but to build trust. This precedent will be extremely valuable for future arms-reduction accords.

The fear that removing these missiles might somehow split Europe from North America is unfounded. The links were strong before the missiles were introduced. They will remain strong after they are removed. The presence of American and Canadian forces in Europe is compelling evidence of the North American commitment to Europe.

Security is indivisible. The elimination of intermediate-range weapons benefits all Western countries. But the weapons that directly threaten Canada — destabilizing intercontinental missiles, as well as nuclear-armed submarines and bombers — are not affected by this agreement. We therefore especially welcome the progress that has been made on strategic weapons at this Summit. Canada hopes that the INF Treaty will now provide the momentum for reducing the huge number of nuclear weapons that remain, and lead to an agreement in Moscow next spring. This would meet the fundamental Canadian priority — stable security at much lower levels of armaments.

The INF Treaty tells us much about the meaning and importance of collective security. In 1979, the Western Alliance decided to deploy a limited number of these missiles. At the same time, we offered to negotiate reductions with the USSR.

Some West European governments came under strong public pressure not to provide bases for these missiles. Our

West European allies held firm. When they saw that the Alliance could not be divided, the Soviets returned to the table they left in 1983. The Treaty just signed is a clear vindication of NATO's policy of combining deterrence and dialogue. We abandon either element at our peril.

Change and Continuity in East-West Relations

The Treaty is welcome for what it accomplishes. It is also welcome for what it tells us about East-West relations. Only a few years ago, such an agreement seemed far in the future — hopelessly idealistic.

So much has changed since then. What was once the stuff of dreams is beginning to come within our grasp: significant arms reductions; the resolution of regional conflicts; progress on human rights.

But we must not delude ourselves about the daunting obstacles that remain. Nor should we forget how we arrived at this point.

The need for Western cohesion remains as necessary as ever. Antagonism between East and West will not evaporate overnight. Though we hope the walls will become lower, Europe remains divided. The Soviet military forces remain well in excess of what anyone in the West would consider reasonable and sufficient. *Glasnost*, welcome as it may be, will not be able to transform quickly a Soviet Union that has roots in centuries of Russian authoritarianism as well as Marxist dictatorship.

The need for consistency and prudence therefore remains. Freedom will continue to need a strong defence. Neither Western Europe nor North America nor both together can maintain an effective and stable military balance between East and West by conventional means alone. Thus the West as a whole will continue to rely upon nuclear deterrence until our security can be guaranteed in other ways.

It also means we must seek, through negotiations, to do away with the current imbalance in conventional forces and scrap chemical arms entirely.

That elements of the past endure should not, however, blind us to what is new and positive.

In the Soviet Union Mr. Gorbachev is courageously trying to arrest social decay, to turn around the economy and improve the standard of living. If this means that ordinary Soviet citizens will have greater initiative and self-expression, this evolution is decidedly in our interest, as well as their own. We should not hesitate to encourage a Soviet leader who is trying to loosen the shackles of the past, repudiating some of the errors and excesses of the past.

Externally, the Soviet leaders are coming to recognize the price of going it alone and the challenge of interdependence. The Soviet Union will never be secure by making other countries feel insecure.

Some steps have been taken. Mr. Gorbachev seems to recognize the advantages of collective action through international organizations. This is welcome. Of course, there are issues of confidence which depend on Soviet action.

Soviet troops have brought death and destruction to Afghanistan for eight years. Up to now, Soviet leaders have ignored the demands of the international community for a total and immediate withdrawal. To comply now, to allow the Afghan people by themselves to determine their future, would greatly bolster confidence in Soviet intentions.

In the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe, dissidents have been released, divided families allowed to reunite, emigrants allowed to leave. We certainly welcome those developments. But there are still far too many people who are penalized for seeking to exercise rights guaranteed them in international human rights accords. We ask only that Soviet and East European leaders keep the human rights promises they freely made in those accords.

Mr. Gorbachev's interest in the world economy is understandable. He cannot ignore the information revolution, global