

2. Lacoste said that he had received an appeal early that morning from Mr. Pineau to seek to get the Canadian Delegation to cast a negative vote on the Arab-Asian resolution. Mr. Lacoste translated the text which was clearly the same as that contained in our Delegation's telegram no. 2670 of December 3. In other words, the text, as tabled, had not been altered. He said that Indonesia was acting as spokesman for the co-sponsors which included a large number of Arab and Asian countries. This resolution was definitely unacceptable to the French because it called for negotiations for a settlement or solution with the FLN. Mr. Lacoste insisted that France could not negotiate political matters with the FLN, although it was prepared to negotiate a cease-fire, and this only, with the FLN. (Actually the text of the resolution does not indicate who are to be the parties to negotiations). The French wanted us not merely to abstain but definitely to vote against this. Mr. Lacoste said that he hoped we would reserve our affirmative vote for the Latin-American resolution. He translated a text of this for us and indeed the text, as actually tabled, was sent in to Mr. Lacoste in a note during the interview. Essentially this resolution is the same as that adopted last February, which was reproduced in paragraph 4 of our memorandum to the Minister. This stands in the name of Spain, Peru and a lot of other Latin-American countries. As tabled it also has two additional preambular clauses, one making a friendly reference to the offer of good offices by Tunisia and Morocco, and the other to the recent legislative measures in France, meaning, of course, the Loi Cadre. The Minister was able to indicate to Mr. Lacoste that if it did come to a vote on the Spanish-Latin American resolution, we would be happy to vote in favour. The Minister was non-committal regarding our voting position on the Arab-Asian resolution. He did not say that we would vote against it, though he did assure Mr. Lacoste that we would never actually vote against France. Mr. Lacoste insisted, with his usual charm and persuasiveness, that in this instance an abstention might amount to a vote against, since, if Canada and a number of other friends of France were to abstain, the Arab-Asian resolution would probably secure a simple majority in the Committee.

3. Mr. Lacoste made some vague reference to the possibility of amending the Arab-Asian resolution. This gave us our opportunity to mention what our Delegation had in mind. The Minister asked me to explain paragraph 3 of our memorandum. Mr. Smith later gave Mr. Lacoste the draft text of a possible amendment. We explained to him that this might be put in the name of a number of countries including Canada, Norway, Iceland, Austria and Iran. We understood that it might not be unacceptable to the French Delegation. Mr. Lacoste, who had had no opportunity to consider the text, made no comment on this.

4. It was pointed out to Mr. Lacoste that if we could proceed by the method of an amendment, then this, under the rules of procedure, would be put to a vote first. It would not serve to introduce a new resolution since this could not be voted on before the Arab-Asian resolution which might well pass.

5. I explained to Mr. Lacoste that we understand that the preambular clause: "Recognizing that the principle of self-determination is applicable to the Algerian people", was to be changed, it was suggested, to make some reference to the people of Algeria working out their ultimate destiny. Unfortunately I did not get a draft text for this change from Mr. Holmes or Mr. Nesbitt.

6. I went out with the Ambassador as the Minister had to hurry over to a dinner at the Centre Block. I, therefore, did not get any specific instructions from our Minister for our Delegation. I gathered the impression, however, from my talk with him before and during the interview, that he is disposed to go along with the idea of attempting to amend the