

incompatible with the French concept of European defence; that it would be specifically incompatible with the spirit of the Franco-German Treaty of Alliance which was signed in January 1963; and that, for all these reasons, it is more likely to divide than to reinforce the Alliance.

In recent weeks there has seemed to be a serious risk that these conflicting points of view on the multilateral force might be heading towards a collision. There were reports that France might consider withdrawing from NATO -- if not from the Alliance as such -- if the agreement to set up the multilateral force were proceeded with on the basis then under discussion. Since then there has been general agreement not to press forward with this project by any particular deadline. This is a turn of events which we in Canada welcome. It will allay, for the time being at least, the risk of irreparable damage being done to the unity and integrity of the Alliance. It will give all of us pause for further thought as to how these problems -- which, of course, transcend the issue of the multilateral force -- can best be tackled. And it will provide the new British Government with an opportunity to formulate ideas which they are known to be formulating and which, as the British Prime Minister suggested in his speech at the Lord Mayor's Banquet a week ago today, would be aimed at underpinning the concept of collective security in an interdependent alliance.

Against this general background, I think it would be useful for me to set out clearly the Canadian approach to the Atlantic Alliance and to the problems it faces at this time. We have never accepted the limitation of purpose that is implicit in any definition of NATO as being solely a military alliance directed to the defence of Europe. Rather, we have looked upon it as an instrument for bringing together the Atlantic nations in an Atlantic community united as closely as possible in policy and in purpose. That is why we have always attached the utmost importance to the broadest possible range of consultation on the problems confronting the countries of the Alliance, and why the name of Canada has been particularly associated with those provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty which envisage co-operation in the non-military sphere.

It is inherent in our historical experience and evolution that we should regard as vital the transatlantic nature of the Alliance. As the Prime Minister put it when he opened the ministerial meeting of the NATO Council in Ottawa in May of last year: "The Atlantic nations must come together in one Atlantic community. The West cannot afford two such communities, a European one and a North American one, each controlling its own policies and each perhaps moving away from the other as the common menace recedes". We do not believe, therefore, that continentalism, whether European or North American, is compatible with the Canadian interest.

We also do not believe that in the nuclear age the continental approach provides an effective answer either to the defence of Canada or to the defence of the Alliance, which, in our view, are indivisible. We would be concerned, therefore, about any trend towards the fragmentation of Atlantic defence. We would be particularly concerned if such a trend were to affect the pre-eminent part which the United States has played and is bound to continue to play in ensuring our collective security. By the same token, we could not conceive of an effective