

Gazette took much the same position, and in noting that NATO "remains primarily a military alliance" saw "no reason why social and cultural co-operation should take place." (20-12-60). However, by the middle of 1961, the Gazette came around to the view that NATO might have to deal with problems outside the alliance area, for example in the Congo. (12-5-61). The Montreal Star (23-11-60), 10-5-61) and the Halifax Chronicle Herald (14-2-61) also objected to any expansion of the NATO base. As table No. 9 indicates the remainder of the papers expressing opinions on this issue tended to support the Government's position. Considering some Government statements indicated a desire to expand NATO functions to help in the developing areas, the percentage agreement obtained in the press was quite high. But the statements were phrased in very diffuse terms, and once a concrete situation arose - U.S. involvement in South East Asia - it was agreed in most circles that NATO should not become involved.

The second issue, need for greater consultation, had even more support from the press than the first, as 60% of the papers agreed consultation had to be increased. This has always been a continuing issue, but during the early 1960's the Conservative Government put considerable effort into the necessity of solving NATO's problems at the highest political level. (See Appendix No. 1). The Vancouver Sun, while opposed to the first issue, became one of the strongest supporter's of greater consultation by advocating a common foreign policy for the West. "Canada should already be leading a determined effort of the 11 minor NATO powers to establish the necessary common policy for the West." (4-5-62). While the Regina Leader Post was the only other paper supporting "a policy of unity" (9-5-61, and 4-5-61), the Toronto Globe and Mail and the Ottawa Citizen were strong supporters for greater consultation within the alliance. According to the Globe NATO consisted of "equal, sovereign states", and all members should be consulted; but because of a lack of adequate consultation the alliance was "united on only a few points" and on everything else the members worked "independently and often at cross purposes." The solution was to have a Heads of Government meeting since "a co-ordinated NATO policy" was required. (1-11-60, 10-4-61). During May and June of 1961 the Ottawa Citizen was agreeing with the position taken by the Globe. (9-5-61, 11-5-61, 17-6-61).

The Ottawa Journal and the Montreal Star were the only papers to question the Government's position. In the case of the Journal this is rather surprising since it is a known Conservative paper, and its' support score is identical to the Government's. (See table No. 9).* The Journal agreed more co-operation was needed, but at the same time made it quite clear that the U.S. must have the greatest say within the alliance. (18-5-59). The Montreal Star was opposed to de Gaulle's concept of triumvirate leadership (20-10-60), and at the same time was critical of the "lack of basic co-ordination". However, for the Star, the Cuban crisis indicated that the U.S. had "neither the time nor the inclination for consultation." (11-12-62). Even though the Montreal Star has one of the lowest support scores (30% in table No. 9), it could be argued that on the second issue both itself and the Ottawa Journal were more realistic than the Vancouver Sun or the Regina Leader Post.

* This suggests one of the difficulties of relying on clipping services. Undoubtedly, in some instances, the editorials in the various files are not representative of editorial opinion. The only solution is to go through each paper separately, and cover all the editorials during any given period. If time permits this is the only way to conduct a survey of editorial opinion.