

That is why we decided last week to announce what I call Phase One of our defence policy, saying that we were not neutralists and we were not pacifists, that we believed in aligning ourselves with countries who wanted to protect the same kind of values as we in the world but we wanted to do this by leaving also our military options open to these four priorities. And that is why we shall not say, until our foreign policy has been determined and presented to Parliament and presented to the country, in a final way, what forces we shall put into NATO and what forces we shall draw out of NATO. It is our foreign policy which must come first, and not the defence policy and not the military alliance.

That is why last week, because of the dead-lines, because there was a meeting of the foreign ministers of NATO countries in Washington, we had to then state our general position. And we did. We stated we were remaining in NATO but we would not be pressed into making decisions now about our contributions to NATO, which I repeat we shall only make after our foreign policy has been determined overall. This is going apace. We have made several announcements. We have talked about recognizing Peking; we have talked about our policy in South America; we have even talked about the Vatican, to the scandal of a lot of people. We have talked of a lot of areas where we are reassessing our foreign policy. But until this policy has been presented, I repeat, to the Canadian people, we shall not close our options and say that all of our military strength will be oriented towards NATO.

We have a right to ask questions of our allies. If they want to keep us on these terms we shall be very happy because, our friends in NATO, we want to keep them. We want to continue "dialoguing" with them in the political sense. We want to keep these channels of communication open. We want to keep friends in Europe. But we don't want their military policy to determine our foreign policy. That's why we shall ask questions. It's right now, I believe, that we ask questions of ourselves about NATO and we ask questions of our allies about NATO.

Is an armoured brigade the right kind of contribution Canadians should make to Europe, could make to NATO? Is an armoured brigade, which can only be used in the plains of northern Germany, the right kind of contribution for Canadians to make? Is our squadron of CF-104s, which can be armed with conventional bombs or with nuclear bombs, the right kind of contribution? And what is the scenario for using nuclear arms in Europe, in our bombers, in our CF-104s? Do we want to participate in this way in an alliance without knowing in which way these so-called tactical weapons will be used? And has the scenario ever been explained to you, to the Canadian people, as to under what conditions our aircraft would fly nuclear weapons and unleash them on Europe? Will it only be as a second strike, will it only be as a deterrent? Are these 104s, are they soft targets? In the eyes of the Soviets, in the eyes of the Warsaw Pact countries, are they not entitled to ask themselves: "Well, what are these 104s flown by Canadians going to serve? Are they going to be first strike or second strike? Is it likely that they will be second strike? They are soft targets, they are on the ground, we know where the airfields are. Isn't it likely that they might be used to attack us first?" These are the questions that our enemies, the Soviets, are asking themselves, and these are the questions we are asking of our allies.

Our contribution in the naval area to our anti-submarine warfare -- is this the right contribution? Should we be having the kind of naval force which is prepared to destroy the Soviet nuclear-armed submarines, which are a deterrent for them as the Polaris is a deterrent for the United States? The United States