

When I first learned of your Government's announcement regarding nuclear tests, I ventured to hope that this step heralded a genuine disposition to move towards agreement on other aspects of the disarmament problem. It has, therefore, been all the more disappointing and disturbing to me to observe the attitude which your government has adopted in the recent Security Council discussions. Personally, I am at a loss to reconcile the Soviet attitude and argument in these meeting with the conciliatory tone of your message to me.

Canadians have noted with concern the unjust accusations which your Government suddenly levelled against the United States in the Security Council on April 21, at a time when preliminary negotiations towards a summit conference were on the point of beginning in Moscow. I must also tell you frankly that the people of Canada have watched incredulously the negative reaction of the Soviet Union to the proposals advanced on April 29 by the United States for the prevention of surprise attack in the Arctic regions. This is the very area regarding which we as Canadians are especially concerned, and which we have repeatedly offered to open to international scrutiny.

If you are really anxious about developments in the Arctic and if you wish to eliminate the possibility of surprise attack across the polar regions, I find it hard to understand why you should cast aside a proposal designed to increase mutual security in that area. Let me repeat here, Mr. Chairman, that we stand by our offer to make available for international inspection or control any part of our territory, in exchange for a comparable concession on your part. I would hope that you would accept some arrangement along these lines not only as an indication of our good faith, but as part of a first, experimental step in building a system of international safeguards against surprise attack. When there is, by your own admission, a danger of nuclear war breaking out by accident or miscalculation, it is difficult for Canadians to comprehend your refusal to engage even in technical discussions intended to explore the feasibility of an international system of control.

As you know, the Canadian Government has not been opposed to a summit meeting for which adequate preparation has been made in advance. You have yourself stressed the need for preparation, and I am sure that you would agree with me that considerable preliminary work will be required before satisfactory arrangements for a summit meeting can be completed. What I find difficult to understand and to justify is your view, if I have interpreted it correctly, that no progress can be made on such important and complicated questions as the control of nuclear tests and the prevention of surprise attack until the time for a summit meeting arrives.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN G. DIEFENBAKER

