



# STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 61/10

## REVIEW OF WORLD CRISES

A Speech by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Howard C. Green, to the House of Commons in Committee of Supply on September 7, 1961.

... Today we meet in the Canadian House of Commons at a time of deep crisis. ... For some weeks tension has been increasing steadily over Berlin, and within the last week the Premier of the Soviet Union has announced a resumption of nuclear tests. In addition to that, he has stated that his country can develop a nuclear bomb with the power of 100 million tons of TNT, and that such a bomb could then be hurled by rocket to any target in the world.

It was very interesting to read the first reports of this shocking statement. ... I refer in particular to one which is contained in the Ottawa Journal of September 2. It is a dispatch from Moscow reporting an interview Premier Khrushchov held with two members of the British Labour Party. To them he is reported as having declared that he had decided to resume the testing of nuclear weapons in order to shock the Western powers into negotiations on Germany and disarmament. In amplifying that statement, he apparently said that by taking a tough line he hoped to make the Atlantic alliance agree to merging the discussions at Geneva on a nuclear test ban treaty with negotiations for general and complete disarmament.

There is no doubt that world opinion has been profoundly shocked by the statement and also by the actions which followed so quickly on the heels of the statement. I refer to the conducting of four nuclear tests in the atmosphere, where of course the radiation and fall-out are of the maximum degree. The United States has now decided that in the face of these actions by the Soviet Union, it must undertake nuclear tests, although they are not of the same type and are reported as being such that they do not produce fall-out. They will be tests in the laboratory and tests underground.

In the meantime a very statesmanlike step was taken by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan of the United Kingdom when they appealed to the Soviet Premier on September 3 in the following words:

"The President of the United States of America and Prime Minister of the United Kingdom propose to Chairman Khrushchov that their three governments agree, effective immediately, not to conduct nuclear tests which take place in the atmosphere and produce radioactive fall-out. Their aim in this proposal is to protect mankind from the increasing hazards from atmospheric pollution and to contribute to the reduction of international tensions.

"They urge Chairman Khrushchov to cable his immediate acceptance of this offer and his cessation of further atmospheric tests.

"They further urge that their representatives at Geneva meet not later than September 9 to record this agreement and report it to the United Nations. They sincerely hope that the U.S.S.R. will accept this offer, which remains open for the period indicated.

"They point out that, with regard to atmospheric testing, the United States and the United Kingdom are prepared to rely upon existing means of detection, which they believe to be adequate, and are not suggesting additional controls. But they reaffirm their serious desire to conclude a nuclear test ban treaty applicable to other forms of testing as well, and regret that the U.S.S.R. has blocked such an agreement."

As yet there has been no reply to that appeal, and I am sure I speak for all members of the House when I say that we still hope Premier Khrushchov will agree to the proposal which has been made.

In my opinion, ... the great tragedy of 1961 has been that Soviet leaders have not understood or have ignored the fact that President Kennedy and his top advisers have, from the start of their administration, genuinely desired to bring about a reduction in world tension. We know that for a fact because of our contacts with these United States leaders.

For Canadians it is so important at this time not to add fuel to the flames with the world hovering on the brink of a nuclear war. We must do our utmost to help to reduce tension, and the Government has been doing that during the recent very serious weeks. We must not lose our heads but must show Canadian common sense. Common sense is one of the finest qualities in the Canadian character, and now is the time to remember this and to show that common sense in our talk and in our actions.

In addition, we must continue our idealistic approach to world affairs. Because the situation is serious is no excuse for Canadians to abandon the idealistic approach they have had down through their history. These attributes have been shown by Canadians for a long time. Such is our record, and this is what is expected of us now by all nations, including the nations in the Communist camp. A few weeks ago in Geneva, I had a brief talk with Mr. Gromyko, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. There was, of course, a certain amount of banter but finally he said: "I know that Canada stands for peace". That is our reputation in world affairs, and it is a very good reputation to have.

### Factors in World Situation

Today I propose to deal with certain material factors in the present world situation. Ordinarily I would go on to cover various other subjects which probably are of equal importance, but I plan today to deal with the facts relative to the present serious situation and later during the discussion of the estimates I shall try to deal with these other subjects.

First of all let me deal with nuclear tests. The tremendous world interest in nuclear tests is because people are rightly afraid of the effects of radiation and fall-out. They remember what happened at Hiroshima and they know that the damage and destruction would be infinitely greater in a nuclear holocaust with the present hydrogen bombs. They are worried about the effect not only on themselves but on the generation to come.

For this reason, and also in the hope that an agreement to ban nuclear tests would be a long step toward a general disarmament agreement, the three nuclear powers, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union, decided nearly three years ago to try to work out a nuclear test ban agreement. France did not participate in that conference and, I think unfortunately, in the intervening period set off certain nuclear blasts, although the other three countries until last week maintained a moratorium on any further testing.

This conference held its 339th meeting this week and it meets again on Saturday, September 9, in Geneva. Up to the end of last year there had been great progress made in these negotiations. Scientists of the three countries had met and reported on various ways of checking tests, and the delegates had agreed to many paragraphs of a test-ban treaty. Incidentally, at the United Nations last year there were two resolutions passed dealing with the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. One of them contained the operative paragraph:

"Urges the states concerned in these negotiations --"

(The reference is to the negotiations at Geneva)

"-- to continue their present voluntary suspension of the testing of nuclear weapons."

That resolution was sponsored by Austria, India and Sweden and was adopted by a vote of 89 in favour, including Canada, none against and four abstentions. Another resolution, sponsored by India and 25 other countries, contained the following operative paragraph:

"Urges the states concerned in the Geneva negotiations to continue their present voluntary suspension of the testing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, and requests other states to refrain from undertaking such tests."

That resolution was adopted by a vote of 83 in favour, including Canada, none opposed and 11 abstentions.

This year for some reason or other -- I really do not understand why -- the Delegate of the Soviet Union to the conference in Geneva became intransigent. It was really impossible to make any further progress.

#### The "Troika" Proposal

The United States and Great Britain submitted revised proposals meeting many of the objections which had been taken by the Soviet Delegate, but these were not even adequately discussed by the Soviet Representative. He was insistent on the troika principle for controlling the test ban under which principle there would be one representative of the U.S.S.R. one representative of the Western side and one neutral, and was also insistent that the whole question of nuclear tests should be taken out of the conference and put into a general conference on disarmament. However, the conference still goes on. The Western side have refused to take steps to break it off, and I believe have acted very wisely in so doing.

At the United Nations in 1959 Canada sponsored a resolution calling for more adequate reporting on radiation and for additional steps to warn the people of the world about the effects of radiation as well as further action along that line. The resolution was co-sponsored by ten other nations and was finally adopted by unanimous vote on November 21, 1959. We offered to conduct in Canada tests of samples of air, soil, water, food and bone collected in nations which did not have the scientific facilities for carrying out such tests. In the intervening period arrangements have been made with Burma, Malaya, Ghana and Pakistan for Canada to carry out such tests. We have had to build up staff in Canada to do this work. We have extended our facilities and everything has now been prepared with this end in view.

As a result of the resolution, increased attention has been given to radiation problems internationally. For example, 12 other states have offered their facilities in the same way Canada did. These include the United Kingdom, the United States,

Australia, France, Norway, Belgium, Sweden, Denmark, Japan, Israel, the Soviet Union, Argentina and Italy, in addition to the International Atomic Energy Agency and the World Health Organization. There has been a marked increase in the number of member countries supplying the United Nations with data on fall-out levels. I think we can be proud of the results that have followed from the initiative taken in 1959.

In addition we have made it perfectly clear for a long time that the Canadian Government is opposed to nuclear tests of any kind. That was done in order that there would be no misunderstanding and that every country would know exactly where we stood. We see no reason for Canada to change that policy.

In the present situation, with the Soviet Union conducting these tests in the way it has been, there can be no doubt that the responsibility for this backward step must be placed at their door. The United States has said that it now proposes to carry out tests. I think in fairness every Hon. Member of the Committee would agree with me that the United States could not sit by indefinitely while the Russians were proceeding with their tests; but naturally we regret that it has been deemed necessary for the United States to announce the resumption of tests at this time. Canada on this problem will endeavour to further an agreement banning tests. That may not be an objective easily reached, but this is the target at which we will be aiming.

#### Berlin Crisis

Having dealt with nuclear testing, I turn now to the situation in Berlin and Germany. I am sure all Hon. Members of the Committee and the Canadian people generally will join with me in supporting the clear-cut, analytical and statesmanlike speech made by the Prime Minister of Canada in Winnipeg on September 1. I see by the press that the Leader of the Opposition has said he agrees with the attitude adopted in that speech by our Prime Minister. It would be tantamount to gilding the lily for me to attempt today to go over the same ground which was covered by the Prime Minister on that occasion. I merely point out that for many months there have been warnings by the Soviet Union that there would be a peace treaty signed with East Germany and there have been various threats, not all confined to one side, incidentally.

Threats do not obtain very good results. Perhaps this is one of the ways in which the leaders of the Soviet Union misunderstand the people on the Western side. The Soviet cannot obtain results by threatening the Canadians, the British, the people of the United States or other Western nations. We have been threatened before, and have met those threats with the proper action. That is the reason we are in active business in the world today. We do not back down in the face of threats.

There is an election campaign under way in West Germany which tends to add to the confusion with respect to the situation in Berlin. Voting takes place on September 17, ten days from now. The leader of the main opposition party is the mayor of West Berlin. I suppose knowing elections as we do, we might have expected that there would be a great many statements made which might not have been made the day after the election.

I also draw attention to the flood of refugees from East Germany into West Germany. This is a very significant factor. It shows more clearly than a million words could do what the people in East Germany think of the régime in that country. Of course it has had a very damaging effect on the image of Communism which is being portrayed to other nations of the world.

### Kennedy on Berlin

Let me say a word also about President Kennedy's stand on Berlin. A few weeks ago he made a speech ... in which he set out the position on which the Western world would stand. I think it was wise to do that in order that there could be no misunderstandings, no miscalculations, as are supposed to have happened in the case of both the First and Second World Wars. He went further and said that the United States was willing and anxious to enter into negotiations about this whole question, and that too was very wise. Our own Prime Minister has said the same thing and has stressed the need for negotiations. At one stage or another all parties have said that there must be negotiations in an attempt to iron out this difficult problem.

Our policy today on Berlin and Germany is that an attempt must be made to settle it around the table. There are many channels and methods for exploring with the Soviet Union possible grounds of agreement. Partly to this end the foreign ministers of the three major Western powers and of West Germany will be meeting in Washington on September 14, ... to discuss further the steps which may be taken to reach a satisfactory agreement with the Soviet Union. Similarly, consultations will continue in the North Atlantic Council -- and there have been many consultations in that Council during the last few weeks -- about peaceful solutions to this dangerous problem in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

Through these discussions with our allies and in negotiations with the Soviet Union, it is hoped that it will be possible to reach an honourable accommodation with the Soviet. Canada certainly will do everything in her power to help bring about negotiations, and will do her part to see that they are brought to a successful conclusion.

## State of NATO

The third material factor with which I wish to deal briefly is the position of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Today I would think there are not very many Canadians who believe that NATO is superfluous, and that it does not have a very important part to play in the world situation. So often it is forgotten that this is a defensive alliance. It was not set up for purposes of aggression. We know that the countries of that alliance do not believe in aggression. It was set up to defend Western Europe and the North Atlantic area. It is so important that that organization be kept strong...

In recent months discussions in the NATO Council have greatly improved, and I am glad to be able to announce that on Monday next we shall have in Canada Mr. Dirk U. Stikker, the distinguished Secretary-General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He will be here for a two-day conference with Canadian ministers, and this will give us an opportunity to review the whole NATO situation. Mr. Stikker took on this difficult post just a few months ago; he has been making a great success of that work, and we shall welcome him very warmly when he pays his first visit to Canada.

I think Canada must state once again that she believes in the equality of membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. There is always the danger of the bigger nations trying to set up a sort of executive or control body. A few months ago there was concern over a possible three-nation executive, a three-nation triumvirate directing NATO. Now, with the Berlin crisis, West Germany has been taking part in the various discussions on Berlin with the United States, the United Kingdom and France. I think we must take care to see that there is not a four power group assuming executive powers in the Organization.

At the last meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty foreign ministers, we were very pleased to find that there was practically unanimous opinion that there was no incompatibility in the member nations of NATO taking independent stands in the United Nations, particularly on peace keeping activities of the United Nations and on appeals to world opinion. Canada has never believed that membership in NATO should restrict her activities in the United Nations.

## Problem of Disarmament

A fourth material factor today is the question of disarmament. ... Canada was a member of the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee which was torpedoed by the five Communist members in June of last year. Two months later, with the United States, we were able to bring the question before the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations and to obtain a unanimous resolution there that negotiations should be resumed. Subsequently we brought in

a resolution at the United Nations General Assembly last fall, which was designed to help get negotiations under way again. That resolution was co-sponsored by 18 other nations.

During the meeting in London this spring, the prime ministers of the Commonwealth issued a very significant statement on the question of disarmament. This was particularly helpful because of the membership of the Commonwealth. The prime ministers came from practically every continent and they had varying opinions. They did not agree on all things. But on this statement on disarmament they were unanimous and issued a communiqué in respect thereof. I think in the days ahead as work proceeds on disarmament this Commonwealth resolution will be of great importance.

At the session of the United Nations which ran over into the spring of 1961, it was finally agreed that the problem of disarmament and all pending proposals relating to it, which included the Canadian resolution, would be stood over until the session of the General Assembly in the fall of this year. In addition the United States and the Soviet Union agreed that they would sit down and try to work out a negotiating group, as well as general principles for negotiations, on the question of disarmament.

Since the spring there have been discussions between the representatives of these two great powers. Canada has throughout warmly approved this attempt to reach agreement on a suitable forum for resuming disarmament negotiations and a satisfactory set of directives to guide the negotiators. We have been kept closely in touch with all that has gone on at each of the meetings, and here again the United States has made a real attempt to devise a satisfactory basis. It has been flexible in its approach during these two-nation discussions.

The talks, of course, have been confidential and it is not possible to reveal the substance of the matters discussed. While they have not achieved their goal, the differences between the two sides have been clarified. Yesterday the United States and the Soviet Union were meeting in New York on this question of disarmament.

The last few days ... have seen barely-concealed threats which, as I have said, we must meet squarely. This situation, however, does not mean that we should downgrade our efforts to further the cause of disarmament. On the contrary far-reaching measures on disarmament are now more vital than ever if we are to avoid even sharper East-West conflicts in a world which daily sees the development of more frightening weapons. We must recognize clearly that, until a realistic basis for negotiation is established, we will continue to run the most dangerous risk of all, the risk of nuclear war.

## New Western Plan

During the past months Canada has taken an active part in the drafting of a new Western disarmament plan. Throughout this period the United States and the other countries which represented the West on the Ten-Nation Committee have been in close consultation. The other members of the Western alliance who were not on the Committee have also had an opportunity to express their views on the new plan. The contents of this plan cannot be revealed at this time, but it does constitute a significant improvement over previous Western proposals. We have been represented during these discussions by Lieutenant-General E.L.M. Burns, who has played a very large part in the field of disarmament for a long time and who, I suggest, has no peer anywhere in the world in this particular field.

Many of our suggestions have been accepted in the working out of this new plan. A great deal of effort has been put into trying to meet the desires expressed at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference to ensure the maximum amount of disarmament in the shortest possible time. Full consideration has already been given to the reasonable Soviet proposals.

This new Western plan will be put forward for negotiation, and not on a "take it or leave it" basis. The Western powers are willing to take into account any further suggestions the Soviet Union may have, provided they reflect a genuine willingness to arrive at a realistic and properly safeguarded disarmament programme.

At the session of the General Assembly which opens on September 19, Canada will work for the endorsement of this new Western plan by the widest possible number of states and we will do our best to ensure that any negotiating body which may be agreed upon will have close relationship with the United Nations. We believe that the most important objective in the field of disarmament is to get negotiations started again just as quickly as possible.

## Belgrade Conference

Then, I should like to say a few words about the unaligned-nations conference which met over the week end in Belgrade. There you had 25 neutral nations, some of whom were not very friendly towards the West if one can judge by their actions in recent years. The representatives of these nations came from various continents to try to work out some plan to help reduce tension in the world. I grant that a good deal of time was spent in attacking the question of colonialism and issues which affected particular nations. I believe that the press reports of the meetings of these unaligned countries have not done justice to the significance of their reaction to the questions of Berlin and the resumption of nuclear testing. The despatch which came out during that conference after

the Soviet announcement that nuclear tests would be resumed is contained in one of our newspapers under this heading: "Neutrals Rap A Testing; Urge Berlin Talks."

It is very important that that should have been the reaction in Belgrade. I think, for example, that the statements made by Prime Minister Nehru have been and will be very helpful in bringing about some solution of these terrible problems. I learned the hard way at the United Nations, when dealing with our resolution on disarmament last year, that there are a good many countries which will not stand up and be counted for fear of antagonizing the United States. There are a great many others who will not stand up and be counted for fear of antagonizing the Soviet Union. As I say, these neutral countries do not like to take a stand if it can possibly be avoided, yet we have witnessed the sharp reaction of these 25 neutral nations to the resumption of testing by the Soviet Union and also to the question of Berlin.

Another important factor in the present situation is the attitude of the new nations. We are living in an era in which there has been a greater expansion of freedom, a greater launching of new nations, than at any other time in history. From Asia and in Africa the young leaders of these new nations are coming over to New York, to the United Nations, and are taking their part in the deliberations. They are vitally interested in building up their own countries. They have no use whatever for the cold war because they are so busy and have so many problems of their own. They do not want to be bothered with the cold war. They know that if the cold war ever gets hot they will get little economic assistance from either the Western world or the Communist world. These new nations have an important part to play in the world today. I believe that their opinion as expressed in the United Nations in the next few weeks may have a good deal to do in bringing about a reduction of tension and in putting pressure behind the great powers for a settlement of these problems.

#### Colonialism Still an Irritant

The new nations are all extremely sensitive on the question of colonialism. They have an emotional reaction when that question is under debate and this reaction is understandable. We would have had the same reaction perhaps a hundred years ago. The Soviet never loses an opportunity to try to play upon and to take advantage of that reaction. Last year they introduced a resolution attacking the so-called colonial powers, demanding that all colonies be freed before the end of 1961, and insisting on target dates being set for each country. I do not doubt that they will be back at that same performance in the next session of the General Assembly.

However, this is one field in which the Commonwealth does not need to take any advice or any criticism from the Soviet Union. Last year our own Prime Minister spiked that attack in the United Nations by his great speech in the opening days of the session when

he pointed out the situation in such countries as Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia. I may say that one is amazed at the nerve of the Soviet representatives in coming to New York and talking about colonialism and the sins of the colonial powers. I marvel that they have the gall to take that position. However, certainly in this particular field, the Commonwealth in our own time in recent years -- and I am thinking of 1961 and 1962 -- has been and is showing perhaps the greatest statesmanship that has ever been shown by a great power in this world. Tanganyika is being launched on December 9, and the West Indies Federation next year. Shortly after that, probably, Uganda and Kenya will be launched. These latter two may come in with Tanganyika to form a federation of Eastern Africa. Other colonies under the British flag are to get independent government in the same way at the earliest possible date and just as quickly as trained leaders can be provided for those countries. We may have some extremely interesting discussions on this question of colonialism during the coming session of the United Nations.

#### U.S.S.R. and "World Opinion"

Finally, may I say this. The special material factor in the world today is the United Nations, and in particular the session which commences later this month. I have no doubt that nuclear tests and the question of Berlin will be discussed during that session as well as many other issues with which I shall deal later on in this debate on the estimates. We must never forget that the United Nations is the best place we have in which to focus world opinion. The big question in my mind is this. Have the Soviet Union gone so far that they are now prepared to ignore world opinion? Hitherto they have been playing up to other nations and trying to get support from other nations all over the world, just as the United States has been doing. In their statement announcing that they were going to have nuclear tests, they actually said this was a great movement to help peace and they appealed to the uncommitted nations on that basis. How they could justify that argument I do not know either. However, if they have decided to ignore world opinion, we are in for extremely serious trouble; there can be no mistake about that fact. Let us hope that the leaders of that great country will be sensitive to world opinion, and that they will not simply ignore it and decide to go their own way seeking world domination.

In my opinion ... it is more than ever vital that Canada support the United Nations. This is no time for belittling that world organization. Some people say, "Oh, look at the mess it has made in the Congo". May I say this. Without the United Nations in the Congo there would have been blood feuds there and tribal wars, with thousands and thousands of people slaughtered during the whole of last year. This situation probably would have spread to adjoining areas. The situation would have been disastrous and might well have brought on a world war. The United Nations moved in without any precedent to follow, without trained personnel to do the job. They moved in or recruited a United Nations force and

today there is a government in the Congo. They are having many troubles. They do not function as efficiently as does the Canadian Government, I admit. Of course, it would be difficult for any other government to do that. However, they have a government and I believe that the problems are going to be worked out as a result of the leadership and the action of the United Nations. I am sure we are all proud that Canada has played such a significant part in the Congo and that we are one of the three European and North Atlantic countries serving on the Congo Committee.

### UN Mankind's Main Hope

The United Nations today is the main hope of mankind. If it grows and succeeds, there will be world order. If it fails, there will be world destruction. That is the choice. I would hope that all Canadians will rally behind the United Nations at this time as they have never done before, although our people have always been supporters of that body.

In conclusion, I repeat what I said at the beginning. This House of Commons is meeting in a time of deep crisis. In times such as these a nation shows its calibre. Canada has done so on more than one occasion. We remember Canada in the First War. We remember Canada in the Second War, the June day 21 years ago, when France was falling and when our then Minister of Defence was killed in a terrible air crash. It looked as though the United Kingdom would be invaded. I do not believe that in my lifetime there has ever been a darker day than that particular Monday. But no Canadian Member of Parliament had a thought in his head that there was going to be any surrender, that we were not going to face that situation and were going to win through. I know that Canada will show her calibre and her mettle in these present trying times.

The road ahead will be hard. Perhaps we have had enough of the soft life anyway. But the road ahead is certainly going to be hard and there will be tension for a long, long time. We might just as well face that fact. From Canadians' courage will be required, both physical and moral, and sacrifice; and I believe above all, a return to our deep abiding fundamental faiths. If we face this challenge we will win through and the result may very well be to make our nation one of the leading nations in the world.