

fence on a purely national basis and through collective effort. We in Canada are, therefore, by the very nature of the situation, committed to the doctrine of achieving a balanced defence by making our forces, and therefore our policies, interdependent with those of other members of the Atlantic alliance.

Some of our allies, as we all know, would prefer to see their forces organized on a purely European basis but not on an Atlantic basis, if that means yielding to the United States the final right of decision on matters vitally affecting national security. At the same time we know, on no less an authority than that of the French Prime Minister, Monsieur Pompidou, that a purely European defence — that is, a defence of Europe without the assistance in the final analysis of the United States — is considered a quite untenable hypothesis. In other words, there is a large measure of agreement on the basic arms and assumptions of the alliance even in this highly controversial field of how to work out the modalities of military planning and how control is to be exercised and whether the accent should be European or Atlantic.

It goes without saying that we are particularly interested in the evolution of French foreign policy, as is every member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is quite normal that this should be so. An important part of our population is of French culture, and it is a well-established policy of this and of previous Governments to develop satisfactory relations with France. For these reasons we in Canada believe that we have some obligation to try to fully understand the bases and aims of French policy. This is not with any intention of playing an intermediary or mediating role, although this we would not shirk. We believe, however, that on certain occasions we could usefully encourage some of our allies to adopt a more sympathetic attitude toward French preoccupations. In particular, we understand and support the French view that no hasty decisions should be taken when crash programmes are not really required. We also agree with the head of the Government of France that it is important that there be a fair balance between the European and North American contributions to the Atlantic alliance.

So, if by waiting a little now, as is recommended, the right balance can be established between the contributions which North America and Europe can make to Atlantic defence, we believe that a delay, which in any case is required for the consideration of new British proposals, would be justified. On the other hand, we hope the Government of France will acknowledge the importance which we attach to the ties which bind us to Europe and display appreciation of the advantages both for Europe and for France of a vigorous and deepening Atlantic partnership.

From our point of view there can be no doubt as to where we stand. We have upheld the transatlantic links with our mother countries in Europe. This is indeed so much a part of our heritage that we can trace the same thread from the time of our reactions to the American Revolution through our part in two World Wars to our role in the evolution of the Commonwealth idea and the conception and development of NATO. The Government of Canada is, therefore,