

Thanks to the imaginative statesmanship of France, the plan for a European Defence Community which will include Germany as part of that Community and not as a separate military entity has shown us the way. Under this plan, German forces, as part of the European Army, will serve under a NATO command. The plan, of course, has as yet only been signed by the various governments concerned, and it remains to be ratified.

The Kremlin, of course, will do its utmost to prevent this ratification. This has become the first objective of Soviet foreign policy. So we may expect abuse and threats and intensification of the cold war during the months ahead until ratification is achieved. They are months which will call for strong nerves and steady judgment on the part of the Western peoples; we must not get panicky over the firecrackers or be unduly impressed by the rockets that explode in the form of a dove.

So much for NATO as a defensive alliance. This was and remains its primary, but certainly not its sole purpose. If NATO is to survive, it must become much more than a defensive alliance and, indeed, Article 2 of the Treaty foreshadows such a development. But the threat to the free world is still so great that we do not need to be apologetic about saying that the strengthening of the alliance must be our primary concern.

While pursuing this immediate and concrete objective, we must not forget the ultimate goal of a North Atlantic community, closely co-operating in social, economic and political questions. This remains the long-term objective which we must continue to pursue. But it is one which does not lend itself to 3-or 5-or 10- year plans, and the progress, which will often express itself intangibly, will be difficult to measure. The impatience of those who would build the North Atlantic community in a year is understandable in the light of the crisis of our times, but the criticism, the proposals that this impatience sometimes inspires should also be judged against the background of history.

Out of the habits of consultation and co-operation which we are now acquiring, concrete political results will, I hope, come; but they will come slowly and gradually - at times almost imperceptibly.

In co-operating for defence now we are, I hope, laying the firm foundations of later co-operation in other fields. Historically the needs of defence have always been a profound influence in the development of political communities. Fear of aggression by European states was a powerful influence in creating the United States in 1789. Apprehension that some of the British North American colonies would fall into the lap of the United States was an important influence leading to Canadian confederation in 1867. Common dangers may prove to be the compelling impetus in creating a firm North Atlantic community.

This, then, is our dual purpose in NATO: first, to acquire, as quickly as possible, the military strength adequate for defence. We should resist proposals to establish defence levels higher than absolutely necessary and therefore we should in the NATO civilian agencies scrutinize with a critical eye, the programmes set before us by the military committees. Moreover, we should give the necessary weight to social and economic considerations in deciding the level of defence programmes which should also be continually reviewed in the light of such considerations.

Finally, while we are concentrating, and rightly so, in my opinion, on the short-term problem of adequate collective defence, we should at least lay the foundations for that longer term non-military co-operation which may well determine whether NATO will or indeed should survive the emergency which brought it about.

When I was thinking of what I should say tonight, I recalled that I spoke to your annual meeting in Vancouver four years ago. I thought I had better read what I said then. I did, and discovered that though the date was nearly a year before the Atlantic Pact was signed, I advocated a regional defence agreement under Article 51 of the Charter, the members of which would be willing to accept greater responsibilities for co-operative defence in the