

5 HON. PAUL MARTIN: I do not think that that
would be a factor. The American position on this has
been reported to the press. I think it is too early
yet to say what the final positions on this question
really are, but I have indicated how we feel. I think
that, if it has been possible for the military committee
to be in Washington all these years and for the
Council to be in Paris, that there should be no great
10 military inconvenience in having SHAPE separated from
the Council. However, I could be wrong in this, but
this is my present view, and it would seem to me that
France might feel that she would have a closer contact
with the Alliance, if the political organ of NATO
were to stay in Paris. This is a matter that some
15 countries feel as strongly about as I do, but it is
not an irrevocable position. It is a question we
will have to decide one way or the other, I am sure,
at this next meeting either to stay in France or to go
wherever SHAPE goes. It could be that the new host
20 country might insist that it is not prepared to accept
one without the other. This would be a very important
consideration, if that position were taken by any
of the potential host countries.

HILLARY BRIGSTOCKE: Could you see London as
a possible location for SHAPE?

25 HON. PAUL MARTIN: London is, of course, a
very agreeable place for most things as far as
Canada is concerned. I would think that in the con-
text of NATO London was not a satisfactory place.