

their intentions, and whose armed forces and armaments are honestly defensive and not aggressive, should be able to accept this essential condition of disarmament. As my Prime Minister put it, "If you have nothing to hide, why hide it"? Canada, for example, has agreed to open its territory to whatever inspection may be mutually accepted by the parties to a disarmament agreement. We have explicitly agreed to aerial inspection of all or part of our country under a fair and equitable system for warning against surprise attack. Soviet spokesmen have rather sarcastically written off inspection of Canada's Arctic regions (included in one of the zones suggested), but this area is of course significant in this context, both as a possible route of surprise attack and as an area for a beginning of such inspection which would be free of some of the complications of more heavily populated regions.

Even if we are agreed in principle on the necessity for controls, there are innumerable questions of technical detail which would need clarification and agreement. The immense amount of work still to be done in this field was strikingly illustrated by the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom in his statement in the general debate when he listed many of the vital inspection questions to which we would need to find exact answers.

By the will of the United Nations, Canada has accepted the obligation to serve on the Sub-Committee in the hope of making some contribution to the disarmament problem. While the Great Powers represented on the Sub-Committee, which have the responsibility and power associated with the production of nuclear weapons, must play a decisive part in reaching an agreement, other countries, which like ourselves, do not produce such weapons, have the right and the duty to express their views on an issue which, as I said earlier, affects all mankind. To some extent, Canada, the only smaller country on the Sub-Committee, shares the point of view of the majority of member states which might be classed as middle or smaller powers. During the course of this debate we have already heard, from many delegations not represented on the Sub-Committee, thoughtful and important statements on disarmament. To name only a few, Mr. Chairman, the Delegations of Japan, Belgium, India and of Mexico in their interventions have called attention to significant aspects of this problem. We have also heard the significant statements of the Great Powers and in particular the lucid and cogent exposition of M. Moch yesterday morning.

Following the lead of some of these earlier statements, we must come to grips with the real difficulties which now beset disarmament negotiations. Recriminations and rehashing of old controversies, from whichever side put forward, are in our opinion inappropriate. The issue is too grave to furnish material for propaganda points.