

accepted. Any country, which has the best interests of the United Nations at heart, must struggle to maintain the necessary flexibility for movement and growth. It must frustrate efforts from all quarters to force member states into two or more camps. The principle of "parity" would freeze us into a strait-jacket of alignments, so rigid and so unnatural that paralysis would quickly set in. I fully agree that the many various schools of thought in the Assembly should be represented, and I admit that the proportions in United Nations bodies dealing with disarmament and other subjects have not always been justifiable. It was for this reason that my Delegation last year took a lead in seeking a more equitable distribution of seats in the Disarmament Commission. We see no reason, however, why we should distort the world to suit the Soviet Union. Adjustment of the balance of interests is one thing, but this so-called "parity" is something quite different. For our part, we could not agree to the principle of "parity", whether it was put forward by the Soviet Union or by any other great power.

It may be that the time has come for a new approach to the whole question of disarmament machinery in the United Nations. The Secretary-General, in his memorandum, has suggested the new responsibilities which will have to be accepted, if, as we trust, positive results are achieved in Geneva. We may be moving from a largely deliberative phase to a phase in which the United Nations will have administrative, along with deliberative, functions. If progress begets progress, then both aspects of our work may be much greater than anything previously undertaken. For this purpose we may well need new and different bodies. Countries participating in these bodies will have to be chosen for functional as well as geographical reasons. It seemed to me there was a creative idea in Prince Wan's suggestion that the Disarmament Commission might remain a consultative body with sub-committees composed for purposes of negotiation, in accordance with the function to be performed. These are questions which must be considered urgently, whether in accordance with the interesting suggestion made by the Foreign Minister of Mexico, or in some other way. We are not ourselves disposed to let old forms and traditional attitudes stand in the way of new measures to suit the times.

As for the Soviet resolution on the diversion of expenditures from defence to economic assistance, I shall be brief. The basic conception is an admirable one which we have been advocating for years. There seems to be widespread doubt, however, whether in its present form it is intended to be taken seriously. The less-developed countries have had little enough from the Soviet Union except tracts