



CANADA

Communiqué

No. 25

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
March 2, 1973

**EXCERPTS FROM A STATEMENT MADE BY THE CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE
IN THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE OF THE ACT OF THE INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE ON VIET-NAM, PARIS, MARCH 1, 1973**

**DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES EXTÉRIEURES**

Reference articles 6 and 7.

The Canadian delegation appreciates the efforts of the United States and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam delegations to reach agreement on this text.

The Canadian delegation is bound nevertheless to say that it is very disappointed with some of the portions of the draft document, and in particular, the portion of the document now under discussion. Our concern and disappointment arises from our participation in the International Commission of Control and Supervision, and from our anxiety to make that commission effective. It is, after all, the reason why we are participating in this conference. As all delegations are well aware, when Canada agreed to participate in the International Commission of Control and Supervision for the initial period of sixty days, it expressed doubts and reservations about the effectiveness of the arrangements for the Commission. The Canadian government stated that it would base its decision on whether to stay on in the commission beyond March 29, after the first sixty days of its participation, on its judgment of the extent to which those arrangements proved to be effective and could be made more so at this conference. In particular, Canada stated that it would look to the conference to provide the commission with an appropriate continuing political authority, and it reaffirmed Canada's position that the creation of such an authority was a sine qua non of continued Canadian participation in the commission beyond March 29.

In his opening statement on Monday, the head of the Canadian delegation, the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, reverted to this subject, and made it clear that Canada would find it difficult to continue its participation in the commission after the initial period of sixty days if our well-known conditions for participation could not be satisfied. He emphasized, in particular, our long-standing conviction that the commission must have a continuing political authority through which the International Commission of Control and Supervision or any of its members could report and which would provide for some possibility of appropriate reaction to such reports. He emphasized that it would, in our view, have to be an independent mechanism more representative of the International Community than the existing mechanism, and he circulated a model resolution which gave concrete form to our views.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs said that we would work to find a solution that would meet our reasonable requirements. To that end, we were willing to examine any proposal that offered any chance of meeting our point. We have noted with satisfaction the expressions of interest and support for our approach to the question of a suitable continuing political authority on the part of some delegations. However, it seems clear to us, from the statements of a number of delegations in the plenary meeting of the conference and from the approach which a number of delegations have taken toward the role of the Secretary-General at this conference, that our original proposal, in any form, would not commend itself to the conference as a whole. That, unfortunately, became clear even before this drafting committee had an opportunity to give substantive consideration to the document before us. I must remind the committee that the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada described the proposal which he put forward as that which would best meet our requirements and expressed the hope that it would be given the most serious consideration.

It is all too clear that not only has it been denied serious consideration by this conference, but that the prevailing circumstances have been such that there was no prospect of it receiving any consideration at all. My delegation is reluctantly forced to conclude therefore that to pursue further the approach which was contained in the Canada model resolution would delay the deliberations of this conference to no practical purpose.

As I informed this committee the day before yesterday, we had intended to make some concrete suggestions to the committee. We would, for example, have wished to introduce amended drafts of articles 6 and 7 of the United States/Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam draft; our amended articles would have been based upon the Canadian model resolution. As I have said we have now concluded that this would serve no useful purpose. Thus, notwithstanding the obvious merit of the provisions, in the draft before us, for the respect of the Paris agreements by the participants at this conference--which we welcome wholeheartedly--the package as a whole is disappointing to us.

One of the major shortcomings of the arrangement contained in articles 6 and 7 is that it is essentially a closed circuit and does not provide for the kind of independent international transmission machinery that we consider to be essential. Having said this, however, and without prejudice to any statement which the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada may make in plenary discussion on the arrangement, I should say that we would have preferred it if for greater clarification certain drafting changes had been made in article 6.

In conclusion, I should like to re-emphasize that the proposal tabled in plenary by the Secretary of State for External Affairs was introduced not only because it reflected in its approach an arrangement that would meet one of our essential conditions for continued participation in the International Commission of Control and Supervision but also because it represents our belief, acquired through long experience in both cease-fire supervision in Indo-China and peacekeeping activities elsewhere, as to what is required for an effective operation of that kind. Canada will now therefore have to assess the situation very carefully.

Reference article 8.

We were pleased that article 8 makes reference to Cambodia and Laos, although we agree that it would not be appropriate for the conference to deal with the situation in those countries without their representatives being present, Canada is a member of both the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos and the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Cambodia and as such, was encouraged by the provisions in article 20 of the Paris Agreement of January 27 regarding the commitments of the parties to that agreement vis-à-vis both of those countries and would have been even more encouraged to see an explicit reference to article 20 (B).