

Mr. NUGENT: Is there any significant difference between arms control and control of disarmament?

Mr. GREEN: As I understand it, the difference is that, if you are aiming at arms control you are not aiming at complete disarmament.

Mr. NUGENT: Is there any significant difficulty in trying to implement one or the other?

Mr. GREEN: There is a difference in how far you go. If you have arms control you go part way and, if you have complete disarmament you go the whole way.

Mr. NUGENT: Is it not the question of controls about which the main difference of opinion is today?

Mr. GREEN: I think there we are mixing up the use of the word "controls". It has two different connotations. On one occasion it means "inspection" and on the other it means you will prevent arms being enlarged, or have them cut down to a certain degree.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Arising out of the question put to you by Mr. Martin, in which he indicated that in his view of the situation in the world today it was unrealistic to hope for disarmament, would that not be one of the main reasons which prompt us to work for a successful agreement at the present time? Is it not one of our tasks in the immediate future to resolve the disarmament question?

Mr. GREEN: That is my personal conviction, that the development of destructive weapons has now reached such a stage that the whole existence of humanity is at stake. I think this is a brand new situation which has never been faced by people before, and I believe that our thinking has got to be in line with those cold, hard, unpleasant facts. This is why we are doing so much, everything we possibly can, to further disarmament, further arms control, and further anything that will stop an increase in the production of destructive weapons and which will result, eventually, we hope in the elimination of such weapons.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I have a supplementary question, referring back to Mr. Hellyer's question. If the work of this committee is not successful, which we hope will not be the case, then will we not have to take a second look at our own position on nuclear weapons, so far as our own defence forces are concerned?

Mr. GREEN: I think our position has been made perfectly clear by the vote on the Irish resolution, and by our statements made at the time in connection with that vote. If the prospect of getting anywhere fades, then Canada and a lot of other nations will have to act accordingly.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Will have to what?

Mr. GREEN: Act accordingly.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): I should like to have that clarified. I agree with what Mr. Smith has said about the desirable objective of the committee, and we have always expressed our concurrence in the objective as stated by the minister, but I wonder if the minister does not feel that, while we want disarmament under conditions that will not in any way prejudice our security, the fact is that disarmament discussions have not succeeded. Delays have set in in the nuclear test talks and it is evident, from the expressions of opinion from those who will have something to say about this problem, in the great power countries at any rate, that they are not envisaging the possibility of a fundamental safe state of disarmament.

Do we further the cause of disarmament by overlooking the realities that are presented to us? Do we not make a mistake in saying the possibility of