

and bad advice. We are pleased that somewhat belatedly the Soviet Union has begun to supplement this kind of intervention with economic and technical assistance, although it has been notably reluctant to divert much of this through even-handed agencies like the United Nations or other non-partisan organizations. It seems to me that it is incumbent upon the Soviet Union to begin correcting the enormous disproportion between its defence expenditures and its meagre contributions to needy countries outside its orbit, before calling on other countries with far better records to do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, there are always sound grounds for discouragement about the progress of disarmament. This debate has itself produced good cause for anxieties. Nevertheless, I still believe, as I said in my opening statement in the plenary session, that there are hopeful prospects. The reason I believe prospects are somewhat better than they have been is that we are coming closer to reality than we have in the past. Too often our debates on disarmament in this and other bodies have seemed more like the bandying of fine phrases and a contest for favourable repute, rather than an effort to adjust the gross facts of international life in the direction of disarmament. For this reason I have confined my remarks today to what seem to me to be the concrete issues facing us right now, rather than Utopian visions which have their rightful place in our thinking, but which have too often beguiled us from getting down to business.

As I have said, it is not unrealistic even to be optimistic about the trend of this debate. The Canadian Government, for its part, welcomes the fact that in spite of obvious differences there is a wide measure of basic agreement among us.

S/C