



CANADA

## STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 60/25

### A PROCESS OF BALANCED CONCESSIONS

A statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Green, to the House of Commons on June 15, 1960.

Yesterday ... the Hon. Member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) asked about the disarmament conference, and today there may be further questions arising from the tabling by the Prime Minister yesterday of the exchange of letters between himself and Mr. Khrushchov about the latest Soviet disarmament proposals. Perhaps I could deal with this situation by making a brief statement on the Canadian position at this time...

In the Canadian view it is important that in these negotiations all ten nations represented on the Committee should lose no opportunity to explore every possible avenue of progress in disarmament. The Canadian delegation has constantly in mind, and tries to make certain that the whole Committee bears in mind, that not only two nations or ten nations but all the nations of the world have a vital interest in disarmament. It is certain that the members of the Committee will be held to account by the other nations of the world if they neglect opportunities for progress in disarmament.

It was in this spirit that the Prime Minister replied to Mr. Khrushchov's letter forwarding the latest Soviet proposals. The Canadian Government wants these proposals to receive a patient and searching examination in the Ten-Nation Committee, as marking the opening of a phase of detailed, business-like and uninterrupted negotiations. We believed there should be no hasty, ill-considered reaction to the new Soviet proposals, but the most careful and constructive examination of these proposals in the Committee which circumstances permit. General Burns has been instructed accordingly, and I am happy to say that the other members of the Western Five on the Committee fully share this view.

I am particularly glad to report this unanimous view of the Western representatives because, as the House is aware, the members of the Western group have had their differences from time to time in the past. The Canadian delegation for its part has, on several

occasions, been instructed to present views contrary to those expressed by other members of the Western Five, whenever this seemed warranted. We would not hesitate to authorize the Canadian delegation to follow a similarly independent line again if circumstances so dictated. But for the present no such need exists, and M. Moch has rightly stressed the solidarity of the Western Five ... The Western Five advanced their proposals some time ago and indicated their willingness to enter upon detailed negotiations. The Eastern nations are now speaking in support of the new Soviet proposals of June 2, and have indicated that these provide a basis for negotiation. These latest proposals are now being further explained by the Eastern countries, partly as a result of questioning by the Western members of the Committee.

In the course of this clarification, on June 9, General Burns pointed to several examples of ways in which the new Soviet proposals represent an advance over earlier Soviet positions; for instance, with respect to the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction in outer space; the control over launching of rockets for peaceful purposes; the provision for a joint study of the cessation of production of nuclear weapons and destruction of stockpiles; and the inclusion of measures for peace-keeping machinery in accordance with the United Nations Charter. In making this statement, General Burns emphasized that the Canadian delegation wished to approach the new Soviet proposals in the most constructive way. He chose the examples I have mentioned because they are among the measures to which the Canadian Government attaches special significance.

It is my view that the time has come, perhaps through an examination of equivalent features of new Soviet proposals and the Western proposals, to begin a process of negotiation of balanced concessions. This was the sort of package approach to which I referred earlier in the House when I reported on the NATO Ministerial Meeting at Istanbul. I should like to emphasize, however, that by "package", I do not mean that the one side or the other should hold out for its present proposals on an all or nothing basis; the packages I have in mind, as I have tried to explain, are smaller and would contain provisions of equivalent significance to both sides. The goal would remain general and complete disarmament under effective international control, but it would be accomplished by a stage-by-stage process throughout which concessions would be balanced in such a way that neither side would obtain a temporary military superiority.

For the first time in these negotiations the Soviet delegation had admitted that there will have to be some sort of international machinery to maintain peace in a disarmed world. The proposals are also considerably more detailed and therefore less obscure than the proposals Mr. Khrushchov made to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1959. They also make some provision for the initiation of a process of study before measures of disarmament

are actually taken. This is important, because no responsible government will agree to any disarmament proposal, much less a complex of disarmament measures, until it has reached a clear understanding with the other governments concerned of the exact implications of agreement.

Therefore I believe that attention should now be given to the possibility of negotiating on parts, if not on the whole, of the two plans. In the course of the next few days in Geneva General Burns will be making suggestions as to how this necessary process might be undertaken through joint studies.

---

S/C