

# STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES



CANADA

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 63/4

## AN ERA OF FAR-REACHING CHANGE

Statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Howard C. Green, in the House of Commons on January 24, 1963.

Before I proceed ... may I express the belief that we have now moved into a new era in the world, largely because of certain developments which have taken place within the last few months or which will take place within the next few months, each one of which has very far-reaching implications. For example, there is the movement of Great Britain into the European Community. We all know it is not yet certain whether that move will be made; but, no matter whether it is or is not, what has happened in connection with that proposal as between Great Britain and the six countries of continental Europe is bound to have very far-reaching effects. In the last day or two, we have seen France and West Germany signing a treaty of friendship covering political questions, economic questions and defence questions. There is a great shifting going on in Europe, and no one can tell at this time what the end result will be.

That brings up another far-reaching development. I believe that in the Commonwealth at the present time we are in a state of flux. I had the privilege of attending the prime ministers' conference in September of last year, and naturally every one of the delegates there was very much interested in the question whether Great Britain would go into the European Community, and what the future of the Commonwealth was to be. Whether one thought that Great Britain should or should not go in, a great deal of thought was given to the future of the Commonwealth. I think the value of the Commonwealth was impressed upon the mind of everyone there, and I have no doubt on the minds of millions of people in the various nations of the Commonwealth.

### Trade Changes

Again in the field of trade, we are now in a period when very far-reaching changes may take place in the trade carried on in various parts of the world. That question, of course, was of great importance in connection with the British and European Community negotiations, but it is also important in many other spheres. I recall ... at this point the statement which was

made by our Prime Minister at the prime ministers' conference with regard to this question, when he made a proposal which I think can roughly be described from the following notes of his comments:

"I propose that this conference should declare its intention to extend an invitation to all member nations of the Commonwealth, of the EEC, EFTA, the U.S.A. and Japan and other like-minded nations, indicating a desire to participate, to meet at the earliest practicable date to give consideration as to how to deal with the trading problems before us in a way which will be to the mutual advantage of all."

That idea, or something very much like it, may very well be the course that is followed eventually. However ... in October of last year, the United States Congress approved important new trade legislation under which the United States was to participate in forthcoming international tariff negotiations. At that time, in an exchange of letters between our Prime Minister and President Kennedy, it was agreed that Canada and the United States should take the initiative in proposing a meeting of the ministers of the GATT contracting parties to discuss important trade developments and to make plans for the GATT tariffs and trade conference. That has now been carried out. A joint Canada-United States proposal for such a ministerial meeting was accepted in November of 1962 and the GATT Council, which is not, of course, a ministerial council, is to meet on February 18. It will set a date for this ministerial meeting, and it is expected that the ministerial meeting of GATT will be held about the middle of May.

#### World Trade Conference

Then at about roughly the same time in the United Nations the under-developed countries were pressing for a United Nations world conference. There was a good deal of discussion about that in the Second Committee, and finally it was decided that there would be a United Nations world trade conference, which will be concerned primarily with the broad range of trade and development problems of the less-developed countries; and this conference is to be held early in 1964. Canada, by the way, took a very prominent part in bringing about agreement on the terms of that resolution in the United Nations. There was a dispute between the less-developed countries and the large trading countries as to the time at which the conference was to be held, but we were able to bring about a settlement of that difficulty. All these movements are going on, or are about to go on, in the field of trade. I suggest that this will be an extremely significant trade year for all parts of the world, and particularly for Canada, because we are as vitally interested in world trade as any other country.

Another development of far-reaching implication has been the successful settlement by President de Gaulle of the trouble in Algiers. This had the whole Arab world in a turmoil and was causing trouble with the African countries. It was a great bleeding wound for France herself, and was a problem which appeared almost impossible of solution. Yet that problem is at least well on the way to settlement, and I think the fact there has been such a settlement will be of great importance in the months ahead.

Then, of course, there was the Cuban episode. There the Americans, acting with firmness and I think with moderation -- I suggest with moderation -- achieved great success. The Cuban episode has made perfectly clear that in the world today the preponderance of power is with the United States. No longer is it a question of two great equal nuclear powers. I suggest that at the present time the United States is beyond any shadow of doubt preponderant in power. That ... may constitute quite a temptation. When you are the biggest fellow in the school yard it is quite a temptation to shove everybody else around. Now, I am confident that there will be no such development in United States policy. I am confident that they will not adopt a policy of getting tough with their allies. For Canada, of course, it is particularly important whether anything of that kind develops.

#### Congo Operation

Another outstanding development has been the success of the United Nations in the Congo within the last few days. That was the most difficult operation this great world organization had ever undertaken. I have no doubt that every Member in this Chamber has wondered many times how on earth the United Nations would ever get out of the Congo and also how they would ever be able to bring about any order in that unhappy country. Yet they are well on the way now. The Premier of Katanga met the United Nations troops when they drove into Kolwezi and welcomed them there, and took the stand that his state would be part of the nation of the Congo. This means a great deal in building up the prestige of the United Nations and a great deal in bringing about world order.

The United Nations also had another big lift or a great impetus from the fact that in the Cuban crisis the United States and the Soviet Union rushed right into the UN in an effort to get some agreement worked out. They did not stand outside. They did not just ignore the United Nations and go about working things out themselves or anything like that. They went to the United Nations and Secretary-General U Thant did a statesman-like job in helping to work out an agreement on Cuba.

### Colonial Problem

Another development which I think is very far-reaching has been the steady reduction in the number of colonies. This colonialism question has been a difficult and nasty one in the United Nations and all over the world. Most of the former dependent countries now have their independence. There are a few more to come, and I am confident that they will gain independence in due course. However, quite a large segment of that problem has been settled. There is one which remains to be dealt with and in which our own nation of Canada took the lead, namely the question of Soviet imperialism or what happens inside the present Soviet Union. These Soviet representatives have been very quick and very bold about attacking Great Britain and France in the United Nations for what they have been doing about colonies. However, there has not been in the Soviet Union one little move to give the people within their boundaries any right at all to decide whether or not they wish to have their independence back again. Hence this issue is one which will still have to be dealt with.

### Sino-Indian Conflict

Another far-reaching development has been the attack by Red China on India. That was an amazing action, which it is hard for any Canadian to understand. Here was India, one of the leaders of the unaligned countries, which was certainly giving no offence to the Red Chinese and doing nothing to justify aggression of that kind, yet Red China struck. It does not require much imagination to realize that this action will have a far-reaching effect in all the unaligned countries. I am confident that they are watching that action and that they will have made some decisions which certainly will not be against the interests of Western nations such as Canada.

Then there has been the disagreement between the Soviet Union and Red China. For many months now we have heard rumours about arguments going on in the Communist camp. I do not think it is ever wise to put too much credence in reports of that type, for should anything develop leading to really serious trouble I have no doubt they would get together again very quickly. However, the argument has gone on, it has grown louder and it has come out into the open ... As I say, this development may have very far-reaching effects.

Then another development with far-reaching implications has been the recognition by every leader in every nation of the world of impending doom -- and I repeat the words "of impending doom" -- if there is a nuclear war or if no method of living together can be devised. Across this world today there is a will for peace such as there never has been previously. One needed only to go to the United Nations at the last session and be there while the Cuban crisis was under way in order to realize that mankind, as represented there by the delegates from 110 countries, was determined that something had to be done, and quickly, in order to

bring about world peace for hundreds of millions of people who otherwise would perish from this earth.

As I see it, these are the main developments which have taken place or are in the process of taking place and which have much wider implications than has been the case at any other time since I have had the privilege of being Secretary of State for External Affairs.

### Disarmament

The question may be asked, where does Canada fit into this picture? May I say that Canada is involved and is helping in an idealistic way all over the world. I mention first the field of disarmament. I deal with that first because this is the main way in which world peace can eventually be achieved. This is where effort is most worthwhile.

By disarmament I do not mean simply stopping the development of more deadly weapons or reducing existing weapons, although such results would be of the utmost importance; I define it in the wider sense as including the stopping of nuclear-weapons tests, stopping the pollution of the air that we, our children and our grandchildren will have to breathe, reducing tensions, reducing distrust. It is very hard to bring about any settlement as long as nations distrust each other so that every word one says the other disbelieves instantaneously. I include all activities of that kind under disarmament.

### Fallout Over Canada

Canada is involved in this question for good reason. We just happen to lie between the two great nuclear powers. If there is a nuclear war, we are in for it. Our cities will be destroyed. On the Saturday night after the Cuban crisis arose, I believed, and I have no doubt many other people did, that before morning Ottawa might be demolished, as well as Montreal, Toronto and my home city of Vancouver. Canada has another good reason to be interested in questions having to do with disarmament, for we are in a heavy fallout area. This nation is in one of the worst fallout areas in the world, the temperate zone. It is admitted that Canada is in one of the worst areas. Fallout may affect not only us but the very food we grow, and no one knows yet what the end result will be of the nuclear tests which have already taken place, because a lot of the fallout is not yet down. Questions were asked just today about Strontium 90 in the food Eskimos in Northern Canada are eating.

The Government believes that Canada can do something worthwhile on the question of disarmament. One reason is because we were chosen by our Western colleagues in NATO as one of the NATO negotiators on the 10-Nation Committee set up in September of 1959, and I would point out that this does not look as though we were

quite as low in the esteem of NATO as some of our friends opposite would have the Canadian people believe. Five NATO countries, - Great Britain, the United States, France, Italy and Canada, - and five Communist countries, - the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Roumania, - formed the Committee.

Then there is the question of our position vis-à-vis Great Britain and the United States. Our relationship with these two countries are such that we can talk to them on this or any other issue on a more intimate basis than any other country in the world. Another reason we believe that Canada can do something worthwhile is that we happen to have the confidence of practically all the unaligned countries in the world. I do not believe there is a country of the NATO group or of the Warsaw Pact group that has nearly as many friends among the unaligned countries as Canada has, and that is because these nations have confidence in us.

Another reason we believe that Canada can do something on this question is that we have our chief disarmament negotiator, Lieutenant-General E.L.M. Burns, a distinguished Canadian with a splendid record in both wars, a record as head of the United Nations Emergency Force, a splendid record in the Civil Service, a man who in my judgment is the best-qualified man in the world today on the question of disarmament. He certainly has the respect of the delegates of every one of the 16 nations participating in the present disarmament negotiations, including the Communist countries.

### Soviet Withdrawal

The 10-Nation Committee was set up in September of 1959 by the four Western foreign ministers, not by the United Nations. The Committee tried to work out some agreement but on June 27, 1960, all the Communist delegates got up and walked out. The chairman at the time happened to be from one of the Communist countries and he refused to hear any Western delegates. He heard the delegates from the other four Communist countries; then the delegates from the five countries picked up their brief cases and out they went. That was not a very promising development from the point of view of anyone interested in the field of disarmament.

However, the Americans worked with us on this issue in a spirit of splendid co-operation and we managed to get a meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. The Communists said they were not going to attend and were going to boycott it right up to the time we were about to meet in New York. But, when India and all the other unaligned countries made it perfectly clear that they were going to be there anyway, in came the Communist delegates at the last minute, and we had a pretty good meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. This was not a meeting of the United Nations, although the nations were the same, but a meeting of the Commission and, by the way, it has not met since.

A resolution was approved unanimously urging the resumption of disarmament negotiations at once. The Russians voted for it too. But then nothing happened. However, it was an expression of world opinion. At the meeting of this Commission we demanded that negotiations be resumed, and we urged that representatives of the unaligned countries be added to the negotiators. There was no use sending back the five Warsaw Pact countries and the five NATO countries, because they would clash in the first 15 minutes and that would be it. So Canada urged that representatives of the unaligned countries be added.

The General Assembly of the United Nations met a few weeks after that, in the fall of 1960. At that time the Hon. Member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was my Parliamentary Secretary, and he took a magnificent part in the deliberations at the United Nations ... We stressed the need to resume negotiations from the start to finish of that session....

#### Resumption of Soviet Tests

At the same time, starting really in 1959, we had been bringing in resolutions about radiation with the idea of focusing world opinion on the menace of these nuclear-weapons tests. We have been getting these resolutions carried with more support every year. This year we did not have nearly as much trouble, I will tell you, as we did in 1959. In 1961 the Soviet Union, if you please, resumed tests. They had been negotiating the question with the United States and Britain for nearly three years. During all that time there had been a voluntary moratorium. Then in September, 1961, out they come and start tests. Obviously they had been making preparations for several months.

When the United Nations General Assembly met in 1961, the Soviet Union was in the middle of these tests. Perhaps you will recall that they were going to set off a 100-megaton bomb and Canada and the Scandinavian countries -- Canada nearly always works with them in the United Nations -- took the lead in bringing in a resolution urging Premier Khrushchov not to set off that bomb. There again we had a lot of trouble, because some nations said what is the use? In the meantime he set off a bomb, and everybody thought it was a 100-megaton bomb. Then, fortunately, we discovered it was only 50 megatons, so our resolution still made sense the way it was worded against the 100-megaton bomb. In the final analysis, that resolution carried with the support of all the nations except the Communist countries.

By this time opinion had been aroused about this testing, and in December of 1961 the United States and Russia reached agreement that there would be an 18-Nation Disarmament Committee, and they named the Committee....

Agreement was reached by all the members of the United Nations to set up this 18-Nation Disarmament Committee, including the same five countries from the West and the same five from the East, plus eight unaligned countries as we had been urging. Those

countries were India, Burma, Sweden, United Arab Republic, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Brazil and Mexico. They met at Geneva in March of last year. Mind you, only 17 countries met, because for some reason or other France declined to participate. The Western countries are now only four -- namely, Great Britain, the United States, Italy and Canada.

At the meeting in Geneva, we took the lead in urging that the United States and the Soviet Union be joint chairmen of that Committee. This had worked very well in the conference on Laos, and we thought it would help to have them as co-chairmen of the Disarmament Committee. This was agreed to. I feel it is a good idea because, in reality, if these two countries do not reach agreement there is not going to be any agreement, and it is wise to have the responsibility directly on them. It has some disadvantages. I think that having nuclear weapons, they do not have the same sense of urgency about getting some agreement worked out that the rest of us do. I know the Disarmament Committee was to meet on January 15, of this year, but these two nations got together and decided it should not meet until February 12. However, in the meantime they are carrying on what could be very useful. By the way, we did not agree to the delay. We thought it was a mistake to postpone the meeting.

In the Disarmament Committee, negotiations, the eight unaligned countries have played an excellent part. I never hesitate to pay tribute to them for their objectivity and for their sincerity, for the way in which they are trying to help bring about agreement. There is a subcommittee on nuclear test ban problems. We tried to have that subcommittee composed of the three nuclear powers plus some of the others, but they would not agree. There are only three nations on that subcommittee.

### Collateral Measures

Then there is a Committee of the Whole on Collateral Measures. This was a Canadian idea. We thought there were some issues which did not come directly within the terms of the disarmament treaty which could be dealt with collaterally and dealt with quickly, that, if agreement could be reached on some of these collateral measures, it might help open the door for agreement of a more extensive kind. The first collateral measure considered was war propaganda, a declaration against any of the countries using war propaganda. Agreement was reached on that in the committee of the whole. The Russians agreed to that. They had much to say about changing the words, putting in "these" and "its" and so on, but agreement was finally reached.

Just the day before the agreement was to be approved in plenary session, word came from Moscow that there had to be four or five additional conditions attached to it, all of which were obviously cold-war conditions and which made agreement impossible.

It was a very good example of Moscow pulling the rug out from underneath their own negotiator. The person involved here was Mr. Zorin, who had the rug pulled out from under him just a few weeks ago in New York.

### Outer Space

In so far as this question of collateral measures is concerned, there are three which are in line for consideration. One is a measure to prohibit the launching of weapons of mass destruction from outer space. This was a Canadian idea. Last March, nearly a year ago, when this Collateral Measures Committee was first set up, we walked in with a declaration to the effect that weapons of mass destruction were not to be used in outer space, that they could not be launched from outer space. Well, that threw everybody into a tizzy. I mean there was a good deal of discussion, and it was not accepted with any degree of enthusiasm by some of the bigger countries. The Russians finally said: "We do not want to talk about that; we will leave that for negotiation in connection with the treaty." In any event, this is one question we hope will be considered by this Collateral Measures Committee.

Another suggestion was a measure to reduce the risk of war by accident, miscalculation or failure of communication. Proposals have been made to reduce the risk of accidental war through improved communication between governments, advance notification of military manoeuvres, the establishment of observation posts and the exchange of military missions between East and West.

Another subject which is to be considered in that Committee is measures to prevent the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons. In the main negotiations on a disarmament treaty the Americans have put in a draft treaty and so have the Russians, and a lot of time has been spent trying to piece them together. Canada has aimed at picking out points where there was almost agreement and in stressing those points, trying to bring about agreement on those things in the belief that, once the two sides agreed on a paragraph of that kind, it would be easier to go on and agree on something a little more difficult.

We went back to the General Assembly last fall, and one thing that everyone was agreed on in New York was that the Disarmament Committee could carry on its work negotiating a treaty. There was no difference of opinion about that.

### A Canadian Initiative

There was trouble about nuclear-test banning. The Soviet side wanted one resolution; the Americans wanted another resolution. In fact there was a lot of difficulty in working out a resolution dealing with the question of a nuclear-test ban. Canada moved in on that, and in my judgment this was our main accomplishment in the last session. We were able to bring about agreement on a resolution on the question of negotiating for a nuclear-test ban.

We based our offensive on the letters which had been exchanged between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchov at the time of the Cuban crisis. They each wrote saying: "We must now get together and settle the rest of the problems. Why could we not do this about a test ban?" We picked that up, and with the impetus of those letters behind us, we were able to help bring about a resolution which became known as the "Canadian resolution", although we had only submitted amendments, and this resolution was endorsed by everybody except the Communists, who abstained.

The Disarmament Committee resumed on November 26 and worked until December 20, when it adjourned until January 15 and, as I explained a few minutes earlier, that date has been put back until February 12. In the meantime developments have taken place which may be, and I hope will be, of great significance. There has been this exchange of letters between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchov ... and the Americans, the Russians and the British are now meeting in Washington trying to bring about an agreement on the terms of a test ban. They have made considerable progress. The main difference between them at the moment is as to the number of automatic seismic stations which there will be in Russia and on the number of times an international team can be sent in to inspect those stations. The Russians have agreed to three inspections annually, although until a few days ago they were saying they would not agree to any inspection of any kind; the Americans have asked for eight or ten inspections.

It is of the utmost importance that agreement be reached on this question. If they could reach agreement on a test ban then it would stop radiation, and would lead to the possibility of making settlements on other disarmament problems. In any event, Canada will continue her efforts to bring about a reasonable settlement, and I think today Canada is generally recognized as the leader in the field of working out some disarmament agreement between the East and the West.

So much for Canada's activities in the field of disarmament. Then there is a related activity, and that is the field of peace keeping. Mind you ... if we are able to bring about a measure of disarmament, there will be more and more peace-keeping work to be done. The two together, and in my judgment peace keeping in the world under UN auspices is going to become steadily more important. Canada is ideally situated for this role and, with India, Canada is today the most experienced nation in the world in the peace-keeping field.

Take, for example, the Congo. We have been in the Congo from the start. The House authorized the sending of up to 500 personnel, and Canada has been running the communications system for the United Nations in the Congo, taking a very active part in the air services, and also in the staff work for the whole United Nations force. A lot of this work is done by bilingual Canadians, French-speaking Canadians, and all over the world there is a job to be done by Canadians, who are French-speaking. In the Congo they are the leaders in Canadian activities.

Canada is also represented on the Secretary-General's Congo Advisory Committee at the United Nations. There are only three Western countries on it -- Sweden, Ireland and Canada -- with 17 African and Asian countries. We are able to consult with the Secretary-General on Congo questions at any time, and are able to advise him and the other members of that Committee. I think those Members of the House who have been at the United Nations will agree that Canada's actions in connection with the Congo have been of great benefit. We have tried to keep tempers cool. We have tried to urge moderation, and I think we have been able to do quite a lot in that regard.

Our policy in regard to the Congo has been throughout, and is today, to support the United Nations. Some of the Western countries have not taken that stand. The French have been against the Congo operation and pay nothing towards its expense. The British have been very worried about it and have not been as energetic in support of the United Nations as Canada has been. But I repeat that our policy is to support the United Nations in the Congo.

We have also taken action to help in the financing of the Congo operation. Providing the money has been a tremendous problem. It is costing about \$10 million a month for that operation, and the United Nations has almost gone bankrupt paying for it. In passing I may say I thought the Globe and Mail of January 23, 1963, summed up our accomplishments in the Congo very well when it said in an editorial headed "The UN and International Co-operation":

"Many nations took a constructive part, and will continue to do so, in the Congo operation, but perhaps special mention should be given to India, Nigeria, Malaya, Ethiopia, Ireland, Sweden, Tunisia -- and Canada."

---

s/c