

bound to be concerned that every possible effort be made to avoid any cracks or cleavages within the alliance and to arrest the development of continentalism, whether of the European or North American variety, since such concepts would tend to isolate us and weaken the effective influence which Canada can exert internationally. The serious potential consequences for our defence and for our economic prosperity, and, in the long term, for our political independence, must be recognized.

. . . We in Canada believe that NATO has served a very useful purpose, not only for the defence of its members but for the peace of the world. One of the consequences of the so-called disarray which exists is the fact that it has been a successful defensive alliance providing defence for its members and serving to contribute substantially to the peace in the world.

There are differences as to the nature of the military organization of NATO, one group taking the position that only by an integration of forces can we hope to pursue the effective development of the Organization, and the other taking the position that the alliance should be based on the contribution made by individual national military bodies co-operating together for the purpose of common defence. NATO is an organization made up of freedom-loving nations, and, because they are free nations, they suffer the disability of the consequences of that very freedom. There is not the same dissentient expression in bodies that are not made up of free nations.

We are thus the inheritors of some disadvantages which arise out of the very strength that gives meaning to the concept of freedom which each of the 15 nations in the NATO alliance enjoys. I think nothing is to be gained by failing to recognize that there are differences of view as to the kind of military organization that should be pursued in NATO. There is public discussion of this, and there have been discussions at the ministerial meetings of the Council itself. These discussions have reflected efforts to see if some compromise arrangement could not be arrived at.

As I said in answer to a question . . . a few days ago, it would be a matter of the greatest regret if, as a result of these differences in the concept of organization, there was to be any slackening in the unity or the integrity of NATO itself. This, I think, can be avoided, but it is only correct to emphasize that some feel that, in order to avoid a confrontation of a serious nature, we should seek to arrive at some *modus vivendi* among the various partners. The new British Government has informed its allies that it is engaged in a thorough review of British defence policy, including an examination of the proposals for a multilateral force. As this review progresses, I have no doubt it will be discussed by the British Government with its NATO allies. We, for our part, will look forward to the visit to Ottawa on December 9 of the British Prime Minister and his Foreign Secretary. We believe this will provide the opportunity for the two Commonwealth members of the Western alliance to have a direct bilateral exchange of views on the range of problems covered by the British review.