

co-operate in setting up control stations and inspection of the kind outlined in the report of the experts.

Apparently this was not read or, if read, not understood.

Indeed on more than one occasion Canada has agreed unreservedly to her northern areas and Arctic regions being made available for inspection in order to ensure that surprise attacks will not take place.

These views have been communicated to Mr. Khrushchov on two occasions.

The first was on January 18, 1958 when I wrote him and said this:

I gave assurance that in the context of a disarmament agreement the Canadian Government would be willing to open all or part of Canada to aerial and ground inspection on a basis of reciprocity. It seems to me that this is the type of proposal which should prove attractive to both our countries since we are neighbours across the Arctic. I have in mind in particular the kind of proposal Canada joined in sponsoring last August involving a system of inspection in the Arctic regions. We were willing then and are willing now to take such action in order to provide assurance against the fear of surprise attack.

This was turned down by Mr. Khrushchov in a subsequent letter, or at least he did not deal with the matter, because he said we would have to have it as part of a world agreement. On May 9, 1958, I wrote to him in part as follows:

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.

That was Canada's stand.

... Going on from there, and I hasten to conclude, I think that if the nations really desire to bring about disarmament and peace there is one field that could constitute an initial step, a course alongside one or other of the courses to which I have referred, and that is the acceptance of the jurisdiction of an International Court of Justice, the predecessor of which was the Permanent Court of International Justice. All through the years the stand that we have taken is that the principle of compulsory arbitration under law among nations would be effectual in the settlement of international disputes.

Of the 85 states that are parties to the statute today, 38 accept compulsory jurisdiction of the Court but only 13 do so unconditionally or subject to the condition of reciprocity; nine do so subject to reciprocity or with respect to those disputes which arose after the declaration came into being or when other means of peaceful settlement have been employed by the parties; 16 apply more restrictive reservations. So far as Canada is concerned at the present time she reserves from the jurisdiction of the Court only those disputes between members of the Commonwealth of Nations, those arising out of World War II, and those that are of purely a domestic nature, the nature of which is decided upon by the Court.