



## STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

59/44

### CANADA'S INTERNATIONAL ROLE

Transcript of an interview with the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Howard Green, by Charles Lynch, on November 21, 1959.

- Q: Mr. Green, you've been in office for less than six months and in that time you've been about as busy as a Minister could be, travelling to Europe, speeches around this country, and appearances and some very interesting attitudes at the United Nations. I'd like to run down some of these attitudes which made a good deal of news. The first is the radiation resolution on which you got a unanimous vote. To get that sort of thing, did you have to water the resolution down to the point where it might be meaningless?
- A: Well, we wouldn't have done that. We changed it a bit from the original draft in order to get the other nations to agree. However, the resolution as it was finally adopted by the United Nations, I think, covers the point that we wanted to cover.
- Q: And what is that?
- A: Well, we feel that there isn't adequate collection of information on radiation and fallout and the effects on different people. And while a great deal is done, we feel that a great deal more should be done.
- Q: Is this a move to reinforce an end to the nuclear bomb tests?
- A: Well, of course the bomb tests are one feature of the situation. But there is radiation from many other causes than bomb testing.
- Q: Do you think the unanimous vote you got indicates the sincere desire on the part of all nations, including the Communists, to do something about this?

- A: I think so.. Actually Czechoslovakia followed us. The Czechoslovak Representative spoke after I did. The Czechoslovaks seem to be the leaders on this particular subject among the Communist countries. And they were very much concerned about the question, just as we were.
- Q: And you think their concern is just as sincere as yours?
- A: I think so. I think it is a very genuine concern among all the nations.
- Q: Do you think anything will happen quickly as a result of this resolution?
- A: We are hoping for very prompt action. This will depend a good deal upon the Scientific Committee of the United Nations. Canada will do her part.
- Q: There is a great deal of comment in this country about our stand on the racial discrimination in South Africa. Last year we voted against South Africa on the item. This year we are abstaining. Why did we do that? Is our attitude changing?
- A: For one reason the resolution this year was quite a bit more condemnatory than the resolution last year and this, of course, is always a difficult question because Canadians are very much opposed to an apartheid policy. At the same time, South Africa has been in the Commonwealth for many, many years and the nations of the Commonwealth try to work together, and it's just a question how you can best bring about the result; by condemning them or by not condemning them, and trying to work with them in friendly way. The British have the same problem as Canada. They voted with the South Africans. We didn't. We abstained. We voted for the general clauses of the resolution condemning an apartheid policy but where there were clauses which named South Africa, on these we abstained. And the Australians did the same thing.
- Q: Another item, again a matter of a good deal of attention; the balloting for the vacant seat on the Security Council and the fight between Poland and Turkey. Canada backs Poland. Why?
- A: We think they have a gentleman's agreement as to how these non-permanent seats should be divided, and our understanding of that agreement is that there should be one seat for Eastern Europe. Also we do not think that the voting for the seats should be made a cold war issue. Poland's candidature had been announced some weeks before the United Nations General Assembly met, and then at the last minute

Turkey was put up, and in our judgement it wasn't the sort of issue that should be made a fight between the East and the West.

Q: In fact, it became a tremendous fight and remains so. Do you think you achieved anything by backing Poland?

A: Yes, I think that Canada's stand is the proper one and now we're hoping that there will be a split term with each of the two countries taking one year. Whether that will be the end-result or not, I don't know, but that is what we are striving for.

Q: If that doesn't work, are you still behind Poland?

A: I don't know that. This will depend on developments within the next week or two.

Q: Still more controversy. The French plan to make and test an atomic bomb, and we voted against France's desire to do that. Why did we do that?

A: Well, we voted against having this nuclear test in the Sahara. Canada has taken the position that there should be NO more nuclear tests, and of course the French test comes in that category. Furthermore, this project has caused a great deal of concern among the African and Asian countries. They are deeply worried about it. We are worried about it from the point of view that we think there should be no more nuclear tests.

Q: We wouldn't, for example, let France test the bomb in our vast Northland somewhere to take the heat off the Arabs and the Asians?

A: I wouldn't suggest that. We don't think there should be any more nuclear tests.

Q: Yet another matter in which you have been very outspoken. The question of consultation within NATO in advance of the forthcoming summit meeting. Do you think in the closed circle of the NATO Council that Canada's voice can be heard loud enough to matter at the summit meetings this fall?

A: Oh yes, I think so. On this subject the position is that we cannot have all the NATO countries participating in an East-West summit. We have to restrict that to a small number. But then the other members of NATO must be given the widest possible opportunity to confer with the members

that are to attend the summit meeting. This is the basis of our stand and that stand has been agreed to by the bigger nations that are likely to be participating in the summit meeting.

- Q: NATO's a military alliance, though, sir. Is there not a fear that the atmosphere of NATO is predominantly military and that their views on a variety of subjects might better be expressed in some other atmosphere?
- A: NATO is really wider than a military alliance. It is true it is a defensive alliance but that involves political issues of many different types, and if all the Nations in NATO are not to be consulted on these political questions, then the NATO alliance is not very attractive. Certainly to Canada.
- Q: You have said that you have insisted on a greater degree of consultation. Are you going to have strong things to say when you go there in December?
- A: Well, I hope so.
- Q: And are you going to have things to say to the Disarmament Committee in February?
- A: Canada, of course, is one of the five Western nations on the Disarmament Committee. This a very responsible position in which to be, and we will certainly do our best to see that Canada makes a worth while contribution.
- Q: Sir, these six months we have been talking about. We have covered a few of the subjects in which you have made news. You have been coming to grips with situations which you have never seen before at first hand. What is your impression on Canada's role and her influence in the world as a result of your first-hand experience, sir?
- A: Canada is in an extremely fortunate and challenging position for several reasons. For example, we have our great friendships with the United Kingdom, with France and with the United States. We have the position in the Commonwealth, which is of vital importance in the world today; and then our membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, our neighbourliness with the Latin American states and the active role that Canada has always taken in the United Nations. There is perhaps no other nation in the world today in a finer position to give leadership than Canada.

Q: Leadership, you mean in the largest sense of that term?

A: Leadership in the very best sense of the word, I think we can do more for the world at large perhaps than any other nation today.

---

S/C