

Third, we think that, if such arrangements are not to prove divisive, they must be open to all members of the Alliance.

Fourth, no final decisions should be taken on these important issues until there has been full consultation in the NATO forum where all points of view can be heard.

I should now like to return to my point of departure, which was that, as long as the threat of aggression in a divided Europe continued, the need for an Alliance such as ours was as compelling as ever. But I also said that this was not a plea for immobility. I believe that the time has come for us to take a fresh look at our partnership and to see whether it reflects the many and fundamental changes that have occurred within the Alliance and in the world around us.

The world of 1965 is not the world of 1949. There has been the resurgence of political and economic strength in the countries of Western Europe. There have been the beginnings of a broader unity of purpose and endeavour among some of these countries. In the Soviet world, too, there have been changes. It is no longer anything like the monolithic entity it was at one time. There has been an element of reassertion of national identity and national interest in the countries of Eastern Europe. There has also been the growing rift between the Soviet Union and China. The Soviet Union itself is facing many of the problems and responsibilities that go with great-power status and great-power commitments in a changing world. And beyond Europe there is a whole new constellation of nations which have emerged to independence, nations with staggering problems of poverty and under-development, nations with very different priorities and preoccupations from our own, but nations, in the final analysis, to whose stability and success in solving their problems the continued maintenance of world peace and security will not be unrelated.

I am encouraged by the fact that the Alliance is facing up to the need to take a fresh look at itself. That process was formally launched last December, when NATO ministers directed the Permanent Council to study the state of the Alliance and the purposes and objectives commonly accepted by all members. I do not wish to prejudge the results of this important exercise. I should like, however, to put two specifically Canadian glosses on it, one regarding the means and the other regarding the ends of the exercise.

Canadians are pragmatists. We are by nature inclined to build upon what has been found useful in the past. This does not mean that we are not ready to consider new departures. But we should want to be reasonably sure, before we strike out in new directions, that this is the best way to proceed towards the objectives we share in common.

As to the future shape of the Atlantic Community, I have tried to suggest that the challenge that is facing us today is a good deal more subtle and sophisticated than the challenge which faced us when our Alliance was formed 16 years ago. This has an obvious bearing on our response. We must not forget that we have at our command immense resources and immense strength.