

that of the United States? I suggest it is unnecessary for this Assembly to decide that question.

In the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva, in the last General Assembly, and in the bilateral discussions this summer between the United States and the Soviet Union, there has been a drawing together of viewpoints, in spite of halts and setbacks; the main evidence of this is the agreed statement on principles which I have mentioned.

Now there are still important questions relating to disarmament on which the position of the Soviet Union and its allies differs substantially from the position of the Western countries. But I believe these questions can and must be resolved by a painstaking and business-like negotiation, in which concrete measures and related verification procedures will be examined in detail.

The United States plan is flexible and can accommodate reasonable proposals from the other side or in fact from any quarter. If the Soviet Union and its allies will demonstrate a similar flexibility and spirit of compromise, it will now be possible to make real progress towards general and complete disarmament.

In their bilateral talks, the United States and the Soviet Union could not agree on the composition of the body which should undertake these negotiations. Therefore it is incumbent on this Assembly to help reach a decision in this matter.

The disarmament conference at Geneva in 1960 was conducted by the Ten-Nation Committee. It seems to be generally agreed that its composition will require some modification. Canada believes that if disarmament negotiations are to be productive and realistic, the negotiating body must have adequate and balanced representation of the major military groupings in the world; this was the principle upon which the Ten-Nation Committee was organized.