

world. By the same token, we should regret any reversion to a more restrictively national or continental approach to the tasks we share. That would not be in the Canadian interest, and we do not think it would be in the wider interest of the Alliance as a whole.

#### CANADIAN NATO POLICY

"...Canadian policy, as it has evolved since the formation of the Alliance, has been based on three related elements:

*First*, a contribution of ground, air and naval forces to Western Europe and the North Atlantic;

*Second*, a contribution to North American air defence through NORAD;

*Third*, a contribution to international peace keeping through the United Nations.

"Within this general framework, we have had to take cognizance of the high cost of maintaining a meaningful Canadian contribution in these areas in circumstances where the pace of technological development carries with it increasing hazards of obsolescence. We have, therefore, embarked on a programme designed to improve the flexibility and mobility of our forces and to lead to the progressive integration of the three armed services. The substance of that programme was set out in our Defence White Paper of 1964. Its object is to ensure the most effective use of our military resources in relation to the three basic elements I have just mentioned.

"...There are a number of uncertainties looming on the horizon that we shall need to take into account and that will have a bearing on the balance we strike, at any given stage, in meeting our responsibilities in the North Atlantic area, in North American continental defence and in peace keeping under the United Nations.

#### CANADIAN FORCES IN EUROPE

"In Europe, there has been a welcome improvement in the capacity of the Western European members of the Alliance to assume a greater share of the responsibility for the common defence effort. The Alliance is also engaged in a comprehensive defence review. While that review is still in progress, the results could have a bearing on the nature of the role of Canadian forces in the Western European theatre over the longer term. I want to make it quite clear, however (because there has been misinterpretation of the Canadian position in some quarters recently), that, in the absence of durable political settlements, we regard the continued participation of North American land and air power in the defence of Western Europe as both vital and inescapable. That is the position of the Canadian Government, though we cannot, of course, afford to shut our eyes to the implications of other points of view that are being put forward.

#### CANADA IN NORAD

"In North America, Canadian defence co-operation with the United States goes back nearly a quarter of a century, to the historic Ogdensburg Declaration of 1941. This co-operation was further consolidated in 1958 with the establishment of the North American Air Defence Command. Like yourselves, we are

constantly reviewing how we can most effectively contribute to continental defence arrangements given the declining threat of the manned bomber and the uncertainties surrounding anti-missile defence....

#### CANADA AND PEACE KEEPING

"Canada has participated in every peace-keeping operation undertaken by the United Nations since 1948. We have set aside standby forces within our military establishment to be at the disposal of the United Nations at its request in situations of emergency. We took the initiative last autumn in convening a conference in Ottawa to enable countries with experience in United Nations peace-keeping operations to compare notes, to identify the technical problems that have been encountered, to pool their experience in meeting those problems and to see how, individually, we might improve our response to the United Nations in future situations requiring the services of an international force.

"We are confronted at the moment with a situation in which the whole future peace-keeping capacity of the United Nations is at issue. We are giving that problem a very high priority, and we shall do what we can to see that it is resolved without detriment to the part the United Nations has played and must continue to play in the maintenance of world peace and security.

#### NATO NUCLEAR ARRANGEMENTS

"I turn next to the nuclear arrangements within the Alliance. The basic problem facing us here, as I see it, is how to adjust those arrangements to the changed conditions of today. Put in practical terms, the problem is how we can achieve a greater sharing in the military direction - which is to say, in the nuclear strategy - of the Alliance without further proliferation of control over the use of nuclear weapons.

"One way of tackling this problem has been the suggested creation of a Multilateral Nuclear Force. While we appreciate the reasons for the MLF proposals, we decided, in the light of our other commitments, not to take part in the discussions on this force. More recently, the British Government has put forward proposals for a somewhat more broadly-based Atlantic nuclear force, comprising nuclear forces already in being as well as those still in the planning stage. Proposals which have as their basis an inherent Atlantic conception and which relate to forces in being, thereby possibly affecting Canadian forces on both sides of the Atlantic, are naturally of more direct interest to us. We believe that discussions on any new nuclear arrangements should be held in the NATO forum on as broad a basis as possible. We also welcome the indication by the United States of its willingness to consider proposals that meet the legitimate needs of other NATO countries. We...have suggested that one approach could be to take a fresh look at existing NATO machinery and existing nuclear arrangements, such as those agreed on at the NATO meeting in Ottawa in May 1963, to identify those areas where progress may be possible towards achieving a broader basis of participation in strategic planning and the nuclear decisions of the Alliance.

(Continued on P. 4)