

I recommend, therefore, that we do not respond to Belgium's appeal for NATO solidarity in this instance. Since Canada is not a member of the Security Council, however, I would hope that we would not find it necessary to make any public statement of our position.

Would you agree that the foregoing assessment might be transmitted to Mr. Ritchie and to Mr. Léger?¹

N.A. R[OBERTSON]

2.

DEA/6386-40

*Note du chef de la 1^{ère} Direction de liaison avec la Défense
pour le sous-secrétaire d'État aux Affaires extérieures*

*Memorandum from Head, Defence Liaison (1) Division,
to Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs*

TOP SECRET. CANADIAN EYES ONLY.

[Ottawa], January 16, 1961

Reference: African and Middle Eastern Division's Memorandum of January 12, 1961, to the Minister.

REQUEST FOR NATO SUPPORT FOR BELGIUM'S CONGO ACTIVITIES

You have asked for our views on the enclosed memorandum by our African and Middle Eastern Division to the Minister.²

2. My first remark is that the memorandum has been overtaken by events in the United Nations Security Council where the U.S.S.R. and the three Afro-Asian countries have failed to secure the condemnation of Belgium for having allowed the transit of Congolese troops through Ruanda-Urundi. The United States, the United Kingdom, France, and all the other members of the Security Council, except for the U.S.S.R. and the Afro-Asians, abstained on a resolution which would have found Belgium guilty of violating its trusteeship over Ruanda-Urundi. The matter is likely to come up in the General Assembly, however, as the U.S.S.R. Representative, Mr. Zorin, indicated that he considered the issue should be brought before the Assembly although he did not say whether he would request such action before the Assembly resumes its regular session in March.

3. It also seems to me that our African and Middle Eastern Division has misinterpreted somewhat the Belgian appeal for "Western solidarity" in the Congo. I think you will agree that Ambassador Rothschild, when he addressed the Political Advisers Committee, did not ask for a formal expression of NATO solidarity on the Ruanda-Urundi incident. He was at pains, of course, to defend the action taken by his authorities in this particular instance, but his appeal for "Western solidarity" was of a more general character. As reported by our NATO Delegation in their telegrams 45 and 47 of January 10, † Ambassador Rothschild, in the course of his address to the Political Advisers Committee, raised three problems, namely: (1) the transit of Congolese troops through Ruanda-Urundi; (2) political problems in Ruanda-Urundi; and (3) relations between the Belgian and the Congolese Governments. It is true he prefaced his remarks by stating that "Belgium and the West have both an interest and a moral responsibility in the Congo" and that Belgium "had to have the support of some other NATO countries in attempting to defend the area against the United Arab Republic and the

¹ Note marginale :/Marginal note:

Not signed by USSEA. Comments requested from DL-1 and European Divs. See their memos Jan. 16 & 19. C.O. Spencer A[frican] & M[idle] E[astern] Div. 19 Jan 61.

² Voir le document précédent./See the previous document.