

And we are realizing too that the strategic factors making for peace or threatening war have changed immensely in a generation, and that the existence of ICBMs which are pre-targeted on all the major European and North American cities and which can spell immediate destruction if they are ever unleashed is a new factor. And that there is a very delicate balance, a balance of deterrent forces, between the two poles of military strength on this planet of today, and this is a new factor.

And we realize that all these factors are "inputs" in our foreign policy, and that we can't go on as we did in the past with the same foreign policy. Before the Second World War, it is said, we practically had no foreign policy, we were too small a country in terms of population and in wealth, and our foreign policy wasn't very different from that of the United States or of the United Kingdom, providing they had the same foreign policy, and when their interests diverged or were divergent, well, we tacked onto one or onto the other. So before the Second World War we didn't have a very distinct foreign policy.

After the Second world War, we were faced with a Europe which was divided into two power blocs, hostile, a Europe which had been impoverished and destroyed by war, and we realized that the tensions in Europe could be the most destructive ones for a lasting peace. And it's at that time that Canada, along with other countries, realizing the principal threat to peace was Soviet aggression, helped set up NATO as an answer to that possibility of aggression. And it's at that time that NATO was developed as a very important policy for peace in the world because Europe at that time, a Europe which had been destroyed, I repeat, by the war, had to be strengthened and had to be fortified against the danger of aggression. And as a result of that, NATO became practically all of our foreign policy. Until then, our foreign policy was that of the United States or of the United Kingdom. But since '49 our foreign policy has taken on a new dimension. That was the dimension of NATO, a dimension wherein we could talk to other countries in Europe which had more or less the same values as us but which had the same interest in stopping any possibility of Soviet aggression.

Twenty years later, today, Europe has been rebuilt. The gross national product of the NATO countries in Europe is over \$500 billion. The population, 300 million people. Canada's contribution to this Europe, important though it has been and important though it remains, is marginal -- 20 million people against 300 million. Our defence policy, which flowed from this foreign policy of NATO, now was more to impress our friends than frighten our enemies. Our contribution in Europe which was brought in the early years after the Second World War was very important then; it is marginal now in terms of strict military strength -- one mechanized division against perhaps 80 or 55, depending how you count them. This is our contribution. It is important; I am not trying to belittle it. But we have to remain free to decide our own foreign policy. And when we are told that we shouldn't be taking a free ride to peace in the world, when we are told that if we withdraw from NATO even in any degree this will lead other countries to withdraw from NATO, I don't admit this. I don't admit that Europeans or even Americans won't follow their own wisdom, that they don't have their own foreign policy. And I don't admit that our friends and allies will be guided in their decisions and determined in their actions by what Canadians do, and, if they think we are doing the wrong thing, that they will imitate us just because we have done it. I don't believe this. I believe that each country must have its own foreign policy. And in our case, where our contribution to Europe, I repeat, is marginal, but where we still believe that NATO is an important force in the world, we are entitled, we have a right, to ask questions about our participation in NATO.