



# STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 60/13 ISSUES CONFRONTING THE MODERN WORLD

A speech by Mr. Howard C. Green, Secretary of State for External Affairs, to the Annual Meeting of the Board of Evangelism and Social Service of the United Church of Canada in Toronto, February 26, 1960.

... This evening, of course, I can't go into all the issues confronting the modern world, but I shall endeavour to touch upon some of those subjects which I know to be of special interest to you.

Inevitably our thoughts turn first to the grave problems posed by the rapid development of nuclear weapons and the menace to civilization inherent in their very existence. The search for some satisfactory system of controlling this deadly new force is obviously the most urgent requirement facing statesmen and governments today.

It is not, however, a task which can be tackled in a spirit of despair. I refuse to believe that the human genius which has led to the mastery of the atom is unequal to the far more compelling necessity of controlling and ultimately outlawing its annihilating capability.

Nor is it a problem which we should expect to see solved in one comprehensive conference or agreement. Already the outlines of man's multiple approach to the problem are becoming apparent in a series of related fields: improvement of the state of scientific knowledge of the effects of radiation; prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons to outer space; and the development of an enforceable ban on the testing of such weapons.

In most of these hopeful endeavours -- each of which testifies to the ultimate desire of nations to restore sanity to a world on the brink of disaster -- Canada has been an active participant. In the field of radiation research we can claim to have been in the forefront. The Canadian authorities have long recognized that one of the causes of the deep public concern felt in this country over the development and testing

of nuclear weapons arises from the conflicting assessments of the risks to human health and future generations caused by exposure to radioactive fall-out. Throughout Canada, there has been for some time a well-developed programme of scientific investigation into the effects of nuclear radiation. Canada has been fortunate in having adequate scientific resources to conduct these investigations. But many other countries lack of the necessary resources and satisfactory international standards do not exist which would permit accurate correlation of the results of national studies.

With these considerations in mind, Canada took an important initiative at the last session of the United Nations General Assembly in proposing more intensive studies on a world-wide scale of the effects of nuclear radiation. As its special contribution to those studies, the Canadian Government, as an initial offer, declared its readiness to receive and analyze on a regular basis, samples of air, soil, water and food from 20 to 25 sampling stations in each of these four categories.

I am gratified to say that our initiative was warmly welcomed and unanimously supported by the Assembly and that a number of countries with scientific resources for conducting studies of this nature have followed the Canadian lead in offering to make their facilities available to countries lacking the technical capacity to undertake a sampling programme of their own.

The Canadian effort is being followed up by individual discussions with potential user countries and plans are in hand to extend Canadian scientific facilities to the extent which may be required. Out of this world-wide scheme, we hope to perfect knowledge of the consequences of radio-active exposure to the point where all mankind will be made aware of the exact hazards to which he is already being exposed.

#### Test Ban Urgent

The problem of radiation would, of course, become far more tractable if the testing of nuclear weapons could be banned. For more than a year now, representatives of the United Kingdom, United States and the Soviet Union have been negotiating in Geneva with a view to drawing up a treaty which would enforce an agreement on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. The opposition of the Canadian Government to any further nuclear tests is a matter of public record. Government spokesmen have returned to this theme time and again, both in the United Nations and elsewhere. Now, there are those who purport to see some incompatibility in the Canadian desire to see an end to testing and our support for the efforts of the United States and United Kingdom to achieve a workable inspection and control system in the Geneva negotiations with the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the Government welcomes the progress which is being made in these

talks because it agrees, of course, that the present voluntary cessation of nuclear testing should be reinforced by a treaty prohibiting such tests. Without such a treaty backed by a system of verification which will ensure that its terms are being observed, nations will continue to live in the fear of a resumption of clandestine testing. But in the meantime, Canada has made it perfectly clear that she believes there should be no more tests, whether by the Russians, the British, the Americans, or the French, or any other people.

If there is need to assess accurately and, if possible, eliminate the risks which have already arisen on the earth and in the atmosphere through the testing of nuclear weapons, there is an equally pressing need to prevent the use of such weapons in outer space, for it is, of course, in this relatively new medium that weapons of the greatest destructive power would be utilized in any future war. Here again Canada is making its contribution through service on a United Nations body, the 24-nation Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. We are in the fortunate position of bringing to the work of that Committee the special scientific experience acquired through the work of the National Research Council.

There are two ways of approaching the problem of outer space. One is to develop its peaceful uses through international co-operation, including the establishment of a rule of law designed to secure universal acceptance of the proposition that no part of space or of any celestial body may be appropriated by or subjected to the jurisdiction of any state. The other approach is a natural corollary of the first -- the prohibition of the warlike uses of outer space.

The second approach will clearly fall at some stage within the competence of the ten-nation Disarmament Committee - of which I shall be speaking further in a moment - and there will then need to be some co-ordination of the Ten Power Committee's activities and those of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. This United Nations Committee, I might mention, is to meet in New York early in March to arrange the details of a scientific conference to be held this summer. Canada will, of course, be one of the participants.

#### Ten-Nation Disarmament Body

I have been discussing the efforts being made to bring under international control the most modern weapons and their means of delivery. Any progress in this field is to be welcomed, not only because there is a special urgency to the problem of weapons of mass destruction but also because it will help to maintain the impetus towards general disarmament - the main responsibility for which will fall upon the ten-nation Disarmament Committee which is to begin its work in mid-March. For over a

month the five Western members of that Committee, of which Canada is one, have been engaged in intensive preparations for the forthcoming negotiations.

I am not, of course, at liberty to divulge any of the details of the plans which are being developed for presentation in the ten-power talks. However, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss for a moment the relationship between the new Disarmament Committee and the United Nations, which under the Charter is responsible for developing plans for universal disarmament. I believe it useful to emphasize, particularly because there is some public confusion on this point, that the new ten-nation Disarmament Committee was not established as a United Nations body, although the four-power agreement to set it up has been endorsed by the United Nations. Moreover, the Committee will avail itself of United Nations conference facilities and services in Geneva; the United Nations Secretary General will be represented at the meetings; and the Committee, on the recommendation of the United Nations General Assembly, will consider the United Kingdom and Soviet disarmament proposals made at the last session of the General Assembly. Thus there is a close connection with the United Nations, even though the new Committee was not set up from New York.

It is obvious that the problem of disarmament involves primarily the countries of the Warsaw Pact and the members of NATO. Under these circumstances, it was logical that representatives of these countries should have been given the initial responsibility for dealing with disarmament. The ten-power Committee is balanced between the East and West with five NATO countries and five Warsaw Pact countries represented.

In the light of abortive efforts in the past to make progress towards general disarmament in United Nations groups, which were either so large as to be unwieldy or so unbalanced as between East and West as to frustrate genuine negotiation, there is, I believe, justification for assigning the initial responsibility for a new effort to a small group of balanced composition.

For the time being, its link with the United Nations will be enough to ensure that the concern of the whole membership of the United Nations in disarmament will be kept alive. During this phase, it seems to me that Canada has a special responsibility to keep in mind the interest and anxiety of all member states in the question of disarmament, and Canada intends to bear this in mind.

As progress is made in disarmament it will, I think, become necessary to set up an international disarmament body under the United Nations. At the outset, any disarmament body would almost certainly be preoccupied with the verification and control of agreed measures of disarmament. In the first instance, these control procedures no doubt will have to be in the hands

and under the direction of those powers which agree to adopt such measures, but, at an early stage thereafter, however, there will almost certainly arise a need to bring the control machinery under the authority of the United Nations - which after all, is the body charged with the responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security.

### Defences Essential

While Canada attaches the utmost importance to the pressing search for an adequately controlled and verified system of international disarmament, we must not blind ourselves to the fact that Soviet military strength continues to grow and that pending agreement on disarmament the obligation to maintain our own defences remains. I would remind you that Mr. Khrushchov, in announcing the recent cut-backs in Soviet conventional forces, made a point of stressing that over-all Soviet military strength will not be diminished, but will be improved through the introduction of new weapons of all kinds into its forces. The dilemma of our times is when and how and in what circumstances we can safely make the transition from necessary measures of defence to real measures of disarmament.

We should not forget that the major deterrent to aggression in the post-war years has been the collective military strength of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization - a defensive alliance of free nations who seek only to preserve peace and to maintain freedom. There is no doubt in my mind that peace in the world today depends not only on the willingness of both sides to resolve outstanding differences through negotiation but also on the continuing preparedness of the nations of the Western world in the meantime.

In the present situation Canada's policy is clear. There must be no weakening in our support for NATO. The members of that Alliance must maintain their collective strength while at the same time being ever-watchful for progress which can lead to an ultimate settlement of differences with the Soviet bloc.

For historical, geographical and other reasons, a policy of neutrality has never been acceptable to the Canadian people. We believe in independence but not in the sense that independence means detachment from the responsibility which we share with other members of the North Atlantic alliance for the maintenance of freedom in the Western world. Canadians have shown by their participation in the cause of freedom in two world wars that they want to stand by their friends. I am confident that their attitude in that respect has not changed. Support for the alliance remains a corner-stone of both our defence and foreign policies. I believe that the Alliance continues to provide not only the best possible insurance against aggression but also the most effective political instrument we have yet devised for consultation with like-minded Western nations in respect of the highly important issues which divide the world today.

## New Nations

In our preoccupation with the problems posed by the division between the Communist and non-Communist world, we must not lose sight of a development of no less far-reaching implications -- the emergence of a host of former colonial territories as independent nations, each struggling for the material betterment of the standard of life of its citizens. Much of this development is taking place in areas in which Christian missionaries have made such a valuable contribution. Our Commonwealth of Nations has been outstanding for the guidance and leadership given in this field.

It is in Africa that this process is now most significant, with former British territories in the vanguard of those attaining nationhood through peaceful transition. You will have heard it said that 1960 is "Africa's year". The reference, of course, is to the great revolution which has rapidly been gaining momentum in that great continent. You will realize more than most just how extensive and significant is the political change which has taken place there in the last two years. And the end is not yet in sight. Two years ago there were but four independent states south of the Sahara -- Ethiopia, Liberia, the Union of South Africa and Ghana -- the latter, launched in 1957, being the first truly African state to assume independence following the colonial period. Ghana's independence was in a sense an African turning point starting a movement which will have far-reaching consequences.

By the end of this year the role of independent states will include such giants as Nigeria, the Congo and probably the Mali Federation. Looking ahead five years, it would perhaps be simpler to list areas where the African will not be in control of his own destiny than to list those where he will.

The African revolution will profoundly affect the world, Canada included. As a nation which endorses the right of all men to be ultimate arbiters of their own destinies, we can only welcome the change. At the same time, we have the greatest respect and admiration for the British, French and Belgians who have done so much to help Africa prepare for the eventual responsible exercise of sovereignty. This they have done through the years at a cost to themselves which few of us have ever stopped to consider. The transfer of sovereignty can be a painful experience unless it is accomplished in an orderly and careful manner. Canada is watching the change with sympathy and the profound hope that in all cases it will be accomplished successfully and peacefully.

In a material way we are extending help to the emerging states. During 1959, for example, 18 Ghanaians were brought to Canada for training and 7 Canadian experts were sent to Ghana. Nigeria sent one trainee to Canada and I fully expect that with the opening of a Canadian mission in Lagos this spring our assistance will be expanded.

To other Commonwealth countries and territories in Africa Canada is providing aid through a programme of general assistance to education and through the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan. That Plan, you will recall, was a Canadian proposal approved at the Commonwealth Education Conference at Oxford last summer which led to the establishment of a scholarship and fellowship exchange programme encompassing in all about 1,000 students from all parts of the Commonwealth. Of this total number, Canada has undertaken to provide for 250, of which a portion will come from Commonwealth countries and territories in Africa. In the general field of education, African members of the Commonwealth indicated at Oxford their pressing need for assistance in teacher training and in the supply of teachers. Canada responded to these needs by undertaking to send out teams of teachers who would train African citizens in teaching techniques and by offering to receive trainees in Canada for the same purpose.

Our programme of assistance to Africa is still new but the Government is very much aware of Africa's needs. We are determined to do whatever we can to assist them.

#### Far East Relations

In a different context, may I turn for a moment to another area which I know to be of special concern to this audience -- the Far East and, in particular, Japan and China.

Our relations with Japan are excellent - in fact she has proven to be one of our best friends both at the United Nations and in the international arena generally. Recently her Prime Minister, Mr. Kishi, and her Foreign Minister, Mr. Fujiyama, visited Ottawa and the discussions with them were of a most friendly nature.

Japan has made a remarkable recovery since the war and her leaders have shown determination to rebuild their nation as a progressive and forward-looking democracy. In this they are achieving great success and I have no doubt that here again the efforts of Canadian and other missionaries are over the years bearing fruit.

As you know, the situation with regard to Communist China is completely different. This problem is made particularly difficult by the attitude of the Peking Government itself. There is no doubt in my mind of the validity of the proposition that recognition on the part of Canada, unless accompanied by explicit acceptance of Peking's claims to occupy Taiwan (Formosa) would in all probability serve only to bring about a worsening in our relations with Communist China. That is the only interpretation that can be placed on the words of the Communist Chinese Prime Minister, Mr. Chou En-lai, when he said last April:

"Taiwan is an inalienable part of Chinese territory. We are determined to liberate Taiwan, . . . All U.S. armed forces in the Taiwan area must be withdrawn. The Chinese people absolutely will not tolerate any plot to carve up Chinese territory and create two Chinas. In accordance with this principle, any country that desires to establish diplomatic relations with our country must sever so-called diplomatic relations with the Chiang Kai-shek clique..."

I have said that the Canadian Government is not prepared to take any step that would facilitate the Communist occupation of Formosa. The reasons for this are fairly simple. There has been evidence that Peking is willing to use its growing military power against its neighbours in Asia in what it evidently considers to be its national interests. The occupation of Formosa by Communist China would be an important victory in that country's attempt to achieve a dominant military position in Asia.

Finally I turn for a moment to another subject in which this group has played a prominent part -- Canada's role in World Refugee Year. As you know, the Government agreed, as a special contribution to World Refugee Year, to waive certain immigration requirements in order to admit 100 tuberculous refugees and their families for treatment and rehabilitation in Canada - and to pay the costs of transporting these people to Canada, as well as the cost of establishing the families in suitable accommodation and of maintaining them until they were able to support themselves. The Government also undertook to pay for hospitalization costs of the tuberculous cases if these were not borne by provincial governments. As it turned out, most provinces volunteered to accept treatment costs.

#### Refugee Year Programme

This project will cost the Federal Government several hundred thousand dollars and represents one of the major contributions by governments to the World Refugee Year programme. Aside from the substantial cost involved, it represents an important contribution toward the solution of one of the most tragic aspects of the refugee problem, the rehabilitation of the so-called "hard core" cases. The Canadian project has been hailed by the High Commissioner for Refugees as a humanitarian programme unique in the annals of post-war refugee migration. It represented the first time that tuberculous refugees from the European camps had been admitted by any country outside Western Europe, with full financial responsibility being accepted by the Government. On February 9, to mark the completion of the Canadian programme, I received a telegram from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees which read as follows:

"Am pleased to inform you of the remarkable interest which has been aroused generally in Canada's one hundred t.b. refugee family scheme. The successful completion of this scheme which has now provided haven for a total of 344 persons otherwise debarred from emigration overseas under normal criteria marks new achievement in the field of governmental action. Could not let this occasion pass therefore without reaffirming my personal thanks to you for the support you have steadfastly given me in solving the problem of refugees who are my concern."

But I want to remind you that other refugees, in addition to the tuberculous cases, are being admitted to Canada during World Refugee Year. Since it began at the end of last June, Canada has admitted close to 2,000 refugees ( including the 344 persons selected under the tuberculous refugee programme). It is my expectation that during 1960 Canada will provide increased opportunities for refugees within its regular immigration programme. In addition it is our hope that a substantial number of handicapped refugee families will be admitted under private sponsorship arrangements. As you know, the Government has broadened the categories of sponsors during World Refugee Year so that voluntary agencies and municipalities may act as sponsors. The Government certainly desires to cooperate fully with the charitable organizations who wish to assist refugee families to begin a new life in Canada.

I have been surprised to see reports in the press and elsewhere which have suggested that Canada may be doing less than other countries in a comparable position to assist refugees. I have seen comments to the effect that during World Refugee Year such other countries have admitted many hundreds of refugees afflicted with tuberculosis. Information which we have received from official sources indicates that these statements do not provide a full appreciation of the situation. The official figures which I have seen indicate that the Canadian effort during World Refugee Year compares favourably with those of other countries. In some cases the figures quoted for other countries covered the last five years or referred to various other categories of handicapped refugees - many of which cost less to rehabilitate than do tuberculous cases. I would point out also that the cost to Canada of accepting a refugee and his family tends to be more, because of high transportation costs, than in the case of the European countries whose contributions have been compared with that of Canada.

In addition to the special contribution for World Refugee Year, Canada in 1959 contributed well over \$2 million in cash and kind to continuing refugee programmes. She was the third largest contributor to the regular programme in 1959 of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (\$500,000), and the second largest contributor to the regular

programme in 1959 of the High Commissioner for Refugees (\$290,000). In addition, we contributed \$60,000 to the Far Eastern Programme of the Inter-governmental Committee for European Migration - by which refugees of European origin are removed from China to new homes elsewhere. To these same programmes an amount of \$850,000 is pledged for 1960.

Although I believe that Canada's contribution to refugee assistance does not merit the criticism which it has received in certain quarters, I do not wish to give the impression that the Government is not concerned with the need to make special efforts to overcome the refugee problem. I am not in a position this evening to say what the Government may be able to do in future, but I can assure you that we shall do whatever we reasonably can to assist the refugee programmes in attaining their objectives.

S/C