

concerned to resume their discussions and to make use of the United Nations machinery created for the purpose.

"One of your main proposals is that an obligation be adopted by the nations possessing nuclear weapons not to use these weapons and to cease the testing of nuclear weapons at a given date. We should point out that some time ago the U.S.S.R. did accept the principle, in the course of discussion in the Disarmament Sub-committee, that an obligation not to use nuclear weapons might be subject to the condition that they could be used for purposes of defence against aggression. This is a factor which certainly could be pursued further if disarmament talks were resumed. In general, we shall continue to advocate the proposals which we supported at the recent session of the United Nations Assembly. I would like, furthermore, to draw your attention to the flexible approach adopted in the NATO Communiqué that was designed to facilitate the re-opening of discussions at an early date.

"Rather than debate again the major issues on which our points of view diverge, I think it might be useful in this letter to concentrate on matters of particular concern or interest to Canada. Thus in reference to NATO policies, you refer to the existence of United States bases on Canadian soil. Canada has every right to take measures of self-defence and any actions it takes in this regard come within the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Our defence measures - whether taken alone or in concert with friendly countries - result from a conviction that such measures are necessary. Our readiness to bring about conditions in which the need for defence measures will be lessened was shown last summer when 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.

"Perhaps not unrelated to this is your assertion that attempts to alter the status quo by force would have catastrophic consequences. Without equivocation we assert that Canada rejects any attempt to impose territorial changes by force. It is not clear what comes within your definition of status quo, and this is something on which more information would be welcome. The Canadian Government continues to be concerned about the domination exercised by the U.S.S.R. over Eastern European countries and the Soviet zone of Germany. You

speak of co-existence, but if this concept means recognition of the existence side by side of capitalist and communist countries, it must also imply non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries including those of Eastern Europe. The events in Hungary of 1956 have not faded from our minds.

"The idea of the status quo is extended in your letter to cover the Middle East. I would like to emphasize that Canada is making a positive contribution to stability and peace through its participation in the United Nations Emergency Force. We hope that no power, including the U.S.S.R. will take any step which would interfere with the important duties which the United Nations Emergency Force is now performing with such a gratifying degree of success.

"As a member of the Disarmament Commission and Sub-Committee of the United Nations, we are studying the comments which you made on a proposal put forward earlier by Poland for the creation of a zone in central Europe free of nuclear armaments. The NATO Communiqué pointed out that we are prepared to examine any proposal, from whatever source, for general or partial disarmament and we therefore intend to join with our NATO allies in looking into the implications of this type of proposal. One factor in considering such proposals would be the readiness of the participants to undertake an adequate system of inspection and control.

#### HIGH-LEVEL MEETING -

"Your suggestion that a meeting of representatives at a high level could usefully be held would receive my immediate support if there were adequate assurances that beneficial results could be expected. Past experience has shown, however, that such meetings if they are to be fruitful must be carefully prepared through diplomatic and other channels. I am sure that you will agree that a meeting of this kind which did not lead to positive agreement on at least some of the basic issues with which we are confronted might result in a public reaction more likely to heighten than lessen world tension. In order not to disappoint public opinion in our respective countries we must therefore, I submit, make sure that such a meeting be prepared in advance with the utmost care. You may be aware that there has been a suggestion in the Canadian House of Commons that the Government might invite the participants in such a meeting to consider holding it in Canada. This suggestion was undoubtedly prompted by the consideration that Canada is the next-door neighbour of the United States and the U.S.S.R. and has a special relationship to Commonwealth countries and to France. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that when the participants decide that they are ready to call such a meeting and should they decide to hold it in Canada, they will be welcome.