

In recent weeks . . . we have been forced to give closer examination to our collective security arrangements by reason of the success of the U.S.S.R. in the launching of the inter-continental ballistic missile and in the launching of two earth satellites. It has been a shock but it has had a salutary effect in terms of the re-appraisal of our common defence.

## NATO

We in the democracies are apt to relax until pressure is brought upon us by the course of events; then we jump into action. . . . In this age of infinite risk we should have some concern about this characteristic tendency to relax in the absence of pressure. That attitude of relaxation when there is no pressure on us may, and in this case probably has, tempted fate. However, we have now been dramatically reminded of the terrible menace of nuclear warfare and as a result all members of NATO recognize they are faced with the necessity of making far-reaching decisions in the military field while, at the same time, having to cope with political problems of exceptional complexity. . . . I wish to say a word about the military and political problems because I think the success of NATO in rising to the occasion will depend largely on how it can merge its military and its political objectives.

Despite Soviet accusations that NATO is an aggressor and was designed for aggression, the sole military purpose of NATO — this has been declaimed over and over again and we have no reason to doubt it — is to deter aggression by providing firm evidence that aggressors would be quickly and successfully met if they should attack any member of the Alliance. In NATO there is a formidable capability — as General Norstad stated in Ottawa 10 days ago — to deter aggression. In this connection he also said that this capability is not altered or modified by the possession by any other power of a nuclear inter-continental ballistic missile.

This is a field, I am aware, where theories abound and often conflict. I do not intend to do more at this point than to state the Government's position, indeed its conviction, that the value of NATO as a deterrent remains intact and that it is incumbent upon us — we who have banded together in NATO — to exploit the opportunities which exist for closer co-operation in the fields of military, economic and scientific affairs.

We must seek for co-operation by increased exchange of scientific and technical information and from the stimulation of scientific education and research in the NATO countries. We should be able to find that further co-operation is possible in the economic production of modern weapons.

Military problems will loom large on the agenda of the NATO meeting which is to be held next month in Paris but, in the minds of many governments and of many peoples, that meeting will be judged just as much by its achievement in the non-military field as in the military field. With the challenge of communism all the time advancing, NATO must move with the times in the field of politics.

It is essential that we of the NATO alliance should intensify and develop our military contribution. But that is not enough. It is essential that we should work together to improve our machinery for consultation and promote the intimacy of our intramural understanding. These obligations are with us and they must be observed, but they are limited. To confine ourselves in NATO