

We need to approach the coming period with the same spirit of enquiry, the same creative diplomacy, the same forward-looking vision.

The world has changed since 1967. We sense the shifts of power and psychology. East-West relations are far more complex than they were 17 years ago. There are competing trends of autarchy, interaction, and interdependence, unforeseeable at that time.

It is essential that this new review chart a course for the alliance to the end of this century. Canada will make its own contribution to the work, and abide by the results. I congratulate the current Belgian Foreign Minister, Leo Tindemans, for his part in launching the review. I welcome the incoming Secretary-General, Lord Carrington — a man whose own ideas on East-West relations will inspire us with creativity and guide us with common sense.

NATO is an alliance of democracies. Open discussion and independent action are as important for us as they were for Harmel. An alliance which fails to defend democracy in its councils will surely fail in its defence of democracy in the field. NATO summit meetings have a particular importance, and should be the senior level, the supreme level of responsible alliance leadership and authentic debate. Prime Minister Thatcher and I discussed this point during her visit here last September. In my remarks after dinner in Toronto, I suggested that: "...Canadians look upon NATO as the cornerstone of our defence policy. We do not wish to be silent partners, however. It is a political alliance, after all, and politicians like to discuss and even argue the issues. If we disagree from time to time, and expend great effort in trying to resolve our differences, that is not a sign of weakness in the alliance, but a sign of the strength which pervades a free association of independent countries".

Just as NATO's last general policy framework emerged from the intellectual ferment and military turbulence of the 1960s, so should the next review take into account, if only as background, the full range of ideas now current about international security and the effects of nuclear arms. Many of these ideas are uncomfortable, incompatible, and awkward to examine. But they are there, and no conspiracy of silence will make them go away.

Neither the alliance, nor its member democracies, are built on blind faith. National support for defence policies — and for defence expenditures — cannot be sustained by political or strategic liturgy alone. Bridging the gap between accepted wisdom and public anxiety surely means an open examination of the intellectual territory now occupied by many critics — critics of every persuasion, I might add — of contemporary concepts and doctrines.

I believe the new NATO review should reflect what I have been calling the need to bring statecraft and high politics to every level of the East-West system. And I suggest that the review will also have to cope, as Harmel did, with differences of perception among alliance members; with European and North American perspectives, inconsistencies and ambiguities; with inchoate doubts and aspirations on each side of the Atlantic.

Canadians know the gravity of these issues. They know that Canada's power is limited and that we