

5
10
15
20

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 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 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 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.

25

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

30

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 context of NATO London was not a satisfactory place.