

with our nuclear force, it will take an awful lot of time and an awful lot of money, and an awful lot of persuading many Europeans that this is the way out. I don't think there are many of us who think that this is the way out. We would rather, by organizing ourselves better than we are organized today, be able to tell you the United States someday that we are ^{ready} and willing to shoulder a little heavier part of the burden; the military burden, instead of going out for the production of our own nuclear force which would equal yours, but which, in the context of the political clashes or potential clashes in this world would be unnecessary.

We don't need a third nuclear force to keep the balance of power. All we need and want in Europe is to build up an organizational structure of such a kind that our proportional influence in final decision-making would be greater than it is today. I don't mean 15 fingers on the trigger; I mean in the political buildup of positions which are now sometimes arrived at in a rather unilateral manner, shall we say. We in NATO know, and you who have something to do with NATO, know that too; that one of the most burning questions in NATO is the matter of consultation. We have promised each other that we will consult. We have a permanent political organ of NATO in Paris with permanent representatives. They talk an awful lot and they meet every day.

Yet, when very important things happen we are not consulted. This is so on both sides; I'm not blaming anyone in particular. But may I say that in the Suez crisis in '56, the United States was not consulted before the thing actually happened. In the Cuban crisis Europe was not consulted before the thing actually happened. And there you are. You can see