

Mr. Eden: I feel there may have been some misunderstanding on this. What we contemplated was that the number of observers under the United Nations might be increased with advantage. That, of course, is a matter for the United Nations. General Burns is there under the authority of the United Nations. If the numbers were increased they would be no doubt increased by recruiting from a number of countries, of which yours and ours might be one. I have never heard of any specific proposal—certainly we did not have one in mind—to allot some special task to Canada.

Mr. Lloyd: We have the United Nations as the principal supervisory organization, and the people to be recruited would serve in that organization. There was no idea of sending an actual national contingent.

* * * *

Question: In view of the fact the expression "H-bomb" was used twice yesterday, are we ready to go on with it knowing that possibly the enemy has a good stock of such weapons?

Mr. Eden: You mean, what is the additional danger from the fact that three countries have or will have the hydrogen bomb? I tried to explain in Washington that, in my view, that creates a certain mutual deterrent. It is good because nobody who knows about these things is going to start major trouble; that is what I call the negative advantage, the deterrent advantage. It does not solve any of our problems, but it prevents in certain instances their becoming explosive, even though the bomb itself goes off.

* * * *

Question: I should like to refer to the question of the Middle East. You mentioned yesterday, sir, the possibility that the great powers might guarantee negotiated frontiers. In the event of negotiations failing or it being impossible even to start them, do you mean to suggest that the great powers should, in effect, guarantee the present frontiers by forcibly restraining any act of aggression in that direction?

Mr. Eden: The present position, so far as we and the United States and France are concerned, is covered by the tri-partite undertaking. What I said yesterday, if we could get agreement—that represents the position of the United States government and ourselves—if we could get agreement between the two sides we would then guarantee the frontiers resulting from that agreement.

* * * *

Question: Would you have any observations to make, as a result of your visit, on the means of furthering our Anglo-Canadian trade?

Mr. Eden: I am glad you have raised that topic. It is a point of some interest to both of us. We very much want to increase mutual trade. Few things are more important in our relations. I have certainly already had the advantage of some informal discussions since I have been here. For instance, I have seen James Duncan, who is a very old personal friend of mine and who has done wonderful work in this direction.

As you probably know, I think it worked out last year that your exports to us, which have increased a great deal or considerably were about twice our exports to you. Now, we want the trade to go on growing but it is most important that the unbalance should be rectified to some extent if the trade is to go on growing. Now, that is one of the problems. I am sure it can be met and there are a number of ways in which you are already helping.