

And I shall hope that one of the conclusions of our discussions on Tuesday and Wednesday, prior to the visit of General de Gaulle, would be that we could agree on a formulation that represents the collective position of all of the NATO countries in our efforts to improve East-West relations.

Mr. Anthony Westell: In your statement, Mr. Martin, I note that you have emphasized that France is continuing to subscribe to the Treaty.

Mr. Martin: To the alliance.

Mr. Westell: To the alliance. And you have said that there is no foundation to the story that she is going to withdraw her political support. Where does the problem arise there?

Mr. Martin: Well, the difficulty arises out of the fact that General de Gaulle is going to Moscow at a time when France has taken a very vital decision with regard to the NATO force structure, and it is naturally asked what is the purpose of this visit. Are there going to be arrangements made at that meeting that will be inconsistent with the general purpose pursued by NATO collectively and by its individual members acting in their own national right. That is what we mean. I do not say that there will be. I take General de Gaulle's decision not to denounce the Treaty -- to be obligated by its automatic military provision -- as an indication that France does not share in the concept of military organization, but that it does share in the basic political purposes of the NATO alliance.

Mr. J.M. Poliquin: Sir, what about the bases?

Mr. Martin: We shall have to vacate our two bases, as the United States will have to vacate its five. We have until April 1, 1967, to decide where we shall relocate. But this is a decision which we shall have to make fairly soon. It will not be made at this meeting, but it will have to be made fairly soon, because the Department of National Defence will have to make arrangements so that we can be relocated by the target date.

The United States feels that it has the right to go on for another two years. There is a difference in the terminal date provision in the contract that the United States has with France, as compared with the contractual arrangements that Canada has with France. We have only one year. They argue that they have two. There are many problems, of course, arising out of the relocation-- for example, whether or not there will be any compensation. We shall be very much interested in such questions as to whether or not France will continue to contribute to the costs of infrastructure, which could represent a very great sum of money. If France decided not to continue to support infrastructure, this would mean that the 14 countries would have to bear a pretty important financial burden.