

set way of accomplishing this aim. In response to a suggestion as to the possibility of a Korean-type settlement, the U.S. delegate indicated that a Korean-type settlement was entirely acceptable.

U.S. policy was then reviewed and a U.S. delegate pointed out that the policy of the U.S. in Vietnam to resist the aggression from the north had not changed.

A Canadian delegate asked why the U.S. could not accept the suggestion of U.N. Secretary General U Thant that the bombing be terminated and assume that the U.N. Secretary General was correct in his report that discussions would follow within two weeks thereafter. The U.S. delegate reviewed the results of previous bombing pauses and the frustration which these had meant for U.S. efforts to obtain a peaceful solution. In all cases, North Vietnam had taken advantage of the bombing pauses to resupply its own people and the long bombing pause in early 1966 had failed to lead to any meaningful discussions in spite of the fact that all possible intermediaries had been urged to seek a solution. One U.S. delegate pointed out that peace was difficult to obtain with the Communist world. Even in Korea there was no negotiated peace 15 years after the war had ended. Every proposal which had been made had been flatly rejected. One member of the U.S. delegation wanted to clarify that in spite of the dissent and debate currently in progress in the U.S. and particularly in the U.S. Congress, not a single U.S. Presidential candidate was advocating unilateral U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. This U.S. delegate recapitulated the positions of the two Democratic candidates for the Presidency who are opposed to President Johnson's Vietnam policy and showed that the positions of Senators Kennedy and McCarthy did not involve a unilateral withdrawal but only a reduction in the conflict and a call for greater activity by the South Vietnamese forces. It was pointed out that the major thrust of the Administration's policy in Vietnam was also a reduction in the conflict and a phasing out of the war. So far Hanoi has not responded to this desire.

One U.S. delegate clarified the cause of the frustration of the American people and pointed out that millions of people were involved both with the soldiers in Vietnam and the potential draftees but in spite of these frustrations, it seemed clear to the members of the U.S. delegation that there has to be a meaningful response from North Vietnam

before the bombing could simply be stopped. The U.S., it was pointed out, cannot take the initiative if the other side does not respond. The suggestion that Canada could act as an intermediary if through her contacts she was able to bring about discussions with the North Vietnamese was again reiterated. One member of the U.S. delegation also informed the Committee of the plan suggested by a number of Members of the U.S. Congress for a phased de-escalation of the bombing provided there were verifiable reciprocal responses on the part of the North Vietnamese.

In conclusion, it was recognized that there were no easy, ready solutions to be offered, that it would be necessary to explore every avenue of a possible termination to the conflict and that there was recognition of the desirability, as suggested by one member of the Canadian delegation, of reaching and communicating directly with the Communist Chinese government in Peking.

There was a consensus in the Committee on the part of the U.S. delegation that the U.S. has certainly the will to end the war in Vietnam. So far we have not summoned a way.

The majority of the Canadian delegates indicated great sympathy with the difficulties of the U.S. in Vietnam and indicated that if Canada could be helpful in any way it would be glad to do so.

Visit to the United States Senate

The following is an excerpt from the Congressional Record of the Senate of the United States of America, March 21, 1968.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY CANADIAN MEMBERS OF THE CANADIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. Aiken: Mr. President, today the Senate is signally favored with a visit from our neighbours to the north—the best neighbours any country could possibly have.

Certainly our long record of an unfortified frontier, our cooperation with Canada in rendering assistance to less fortunate peoples, and the freedom with which we travel each other's country, should be an example in democracy which all nations could well observe and emulate.

While I am not going to call upon each one of them to make a speech to the U.S. Senate, I am going to read the names of our distinguished guests from the Canadian Parliament