

should be changed from “could invite” to “should invite.” This proposal was not repeat not accepted. (B) There was consideration of how to present the memorandum. It was finally decided that Brazil, which had been chosen because it was first alphabetically, should read the memorandum and that there should be no repeat no supporting statements. This procedure was adopted in order to ensure that no repeat no interpretive comments were made, which might not repeat not be acceptable to all the supporters of the proposal.

3. Brief and entirely non-committal statements were made during the course of this morning’s meeting of plenary by the nuclear powers. The co-chairmen agreed that at tomorrow’s meeting the nuclear nations would be given an opportunity to put questions to the non-aligned nations in order to clarify the proposal.

4. This procedure has caused the neutral nationals some anxiety. Their proposal is extremely vague, owing to the compromises required in order to reach agreement. They are holding another meeting before plenary tomorrow in order to try to decide how questions should be answered. The preliminary view of several representatives is that they ought to decide on perhaps two spokesmen. We have heard it suggested that India and Sweden, as the two principal advocates of the proposal, might play this role.

5. It is difficult to know what USA and Soviet responses will be. It seems possible, that the amplification of the proposal will reveal that it basically accepts USA concept of verification by an international inspectorate. To the extent that this is made explicit, it may make it difficult for USSR to accept the proposal as a basis for negotiation.

6. A number of the neutral representatives are aware that their proposal has come forward at such a late date that it may not repeat not provide a basis for settlement before the present test series begins. However, it is their hope that it will remain before the Conference and provide the basis for negotiations between the two sides after they have both completed tests. We have discussed this point of view with a member of USA mission and he assures us that this possibility is recognized, and that efforts will be made not repeat not to reject the proposal outright.

29.

DEA/50271-M-40

*Note de l’adjoint spécial, Bureau du secrétaire d’État aux Affaires extérieures,
pour le sous-secrétaire d’État aux Affaires extérieures*

*Memorandum from Special Assistant, Office of Secretary of State for External Affairs,
to Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs*

CONFIDENTIAL

[Ottawa], April 19, 1962

NUCLEAR TEST SUSPENSION AGREEMENT – TALK WITH GENERAL BURNS

In view of the report from Geneva that the Soviet Government had accepted the formula of the neutrals as a basis for further negotiation, we spoke to General Burns to ascertain

- (a) the precise nature of the Soviet acceptance,
- (b) the nature of the U.S.A. reaction,
- (c) the intentions of the neutrals as regards further action, and
- (d) any views that General Burns might have about further action by Canada either in Geneva or Washington.