

ued for, say, 10 years or got worse. I also said that it would give a further opportunity to refer to the Charter in the treaty and would provide an answer to criticisms which are being made in this country that the result of this pact would be to create a second United Nations organization and to substitute its agencies for the present authority and responsibility of the Security Council.

Obviously the question of duration cannot be definitely settled here until the State Department has taken further Congressional soundings. Ends.

275.

H.H.W./Vol. 6

*L'ambassadeur aux États-Unis  
au sous-secrétaire d'État par intérim aux Affaires extérieures  
Ambassador in United States  
to Acting Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs*

TOP SECRET

Washington, January 17, 1949

Dear Mr. Reid:

In your message EX-97 of January 14th you expressed concern lest certain views on military organization under the North Atlantic Treaty which were put forward by Hickerson should remain on the record without being challenged by the Canadian representatives. I think that you need not worry about this. No official record of proceedings in the Working Group is kept, and the only papers coming out of the group are their reports and recommendations to the Committee of Ambassadors. Some of the representatives may, of course, keep notes of the discussions, but they are for their private use and have no standing whatever. This practice was adopted when the talks began, and it has permitted the Working Group to discuss the matters before it with great freedom and informality.

The Working Group has only discussed in a very general way the military organization which might be built up under the Treaty, and has made no recommendation to the Committee of Ambassadors. The question itself has not been discussed in the Committee of Ambassadors, and the Working Group has not been asked to make any recommendation on it. I doubt that the views expressed by Hickerson in the Working Group on military organization represent more than his personal estimate of what his Government might advocate at a later stage. I told him in private conversation some days ago that we would have to agree with the French if they were to express criticism of any proposal to employ the Combined Chiefs of Staff as an agency for military decision under the North Atlantic Treaty. He observed that he sympathized with the reasons which led me to make this remark.

In any case there is no record to be set straight, and I am strongly of the view that it would be unwise for us to introduce a detailed discussion of this problem at the present stage of the negotiations. My reason for this is that I would much rather have the Treaty in existence than run the risk of prejudicing its acceptance or prompting the introduction of unwelcome amendments by raising now matters which cannot in fact be settled until the Treaty is in effect. We shall, of course, have trouble in working out a solution of the problem which will meet our point of view.