(a) on receipt of a request from the International Commission of Control and Supervision;

(b) on receipt of a request from the Four-Party Joint Military Commission or the Two-Party Joint Military Commission;

(c) on receipt of a formal request from five of the members of the Conference, excluding the Secretary-General of the United Nations; and

(d) after determining, at the request of any member of the Conference, that a two-thirds majority of the members, excluding the Secretary-General, considered that there was cause to reconvene the Conference.

It soon became clear that few participants at the Conference were prepared to support the type of independent international reporting mechanism, involving the Secretary-General of the United Nations, we had suggested, and some were strongly opposed to the whole conception. It think it is safe to say that it was only because of our insistence on this matter that the Conference addressed itself at all seriously to the matter. What finally emerged in Articles 6 and 7 of the Act (of the International Conference on Vietnam) was the most that could be obtained. Under these arrangements, the reports and views of the International Commission will at least be transmitted outside the closed circuit of the belligerents to the Conference participants, and the Conference itself can be recalled.

I made clear to the Conference our disappointment that it could not agree on a more effective arrangement, and I questioned whether the mechanism established went far enough and whether it could work. I emphasized to the Conference on March-1 that the arrangements provided in Articles 6 and 7 would be carefully reviewed by the Canadian Government in determining the extent to which our conditions for continued participation in the Conference had been fulfilled.

The Act provided an opportunity for world powers to acknowledge their respect and support for the January 27 agreement in association not only with the parties to that agreement but also with the governments participating in the International Commission established under it. It is also noteworthy that the Conference was conducted in the presence of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

I signed the Act on behalf of Canada because the spirit of the Act and the good will reflected in it were such as to command the support of the Canadian people. The Act welcomes peace in Vietnam and it calls for the participants to do nothing to jeopardize that peace. It was, therefore, important to have all the participants at the Conference associated with those objectives, and failure to sign could have been open to misinterpretation. Moreover, not to have signed the Act could only have been construed as meaning that one of our *sine qua non* had not been met. We were not in a position at the Conference, nor are we yet in a position, to say whether the machinery provided in Articles 6 and 7 could serve the purpose we have had in mind. We will look at these arrangements in the light of our experience