Eleventh Session

611th Plenary Meeting, 6th December, 1956

by MR. V.K. KRISHNA MENON

I join with so many others who have preceded me on this rostrum during the course of the general debate in conveying to Prince Wan Waithayakon, the congratulations and good wishes of my delegation, my Government and my country upon his unanimous election to the high office of the presidency of the General Assembly.

We would offer these congratulations to anyone who was the recipient of the confidence of the United Nations in this manner, but so far as Prince Wan Waithayakon personally is concerned, I hope the Assembly will forgive me if I take a moment to refer to the particular happiness and pleasure we feel in having, as President of the General Assembly, this year, the representative of a country which has been related to us in 4,000 years of recorded history. Our more recent relations commenced with the time of the Emperor Asoka, somewhere, in the third century B.C., when the teachers of Buddhism went out to the President's land, and their successors have had a very great and predominant influence in his country.

It is true that, in the last three or four centuries, the effects of modern Western imperialism have served not to bring us closer but to draw us apart in the lands of Asia, both in terms of physical and political application. Happily these bonds are being renewed, and both Thailand and Prince Wan Waithayakon have a pre-eminent place in the minds of our people. Not only India, but the countries that attended the Bandung Conference, will be ever ready to pay him a warm tribute for the great contribution, not so much in speeches, which he made at that conference, but by his very skillful and tactful approaches to very difficult problems.

I would also like to take this opportunity to recall the services of

his predecessor, Mr. Maza, who was one of the great presidents of the United Nations General Assembly.

The last session was momentous in many ways. It witnessed many crises. It solved a situation where the future of the United Nations might have been affected; and our President stepped into the breach where many people probably would have thought that it was better to stay away, in the comparative neutrality of the Chair. We have had the pleasure and the privilege of receiving him in our country as Prince Wan Waithayakon has in Thailand.

I would like to tell this Assembly that a visit by the former President has done a great deal, not only to bring the United Nations to our people, but to bring that great part of the world, the countries of Latin America, more to the living consciousness of our peoples. We would welcome many more representatives of that part of the world, because we believe they are people emerged from former empires, new lands with new destinies, peoples who have no racial or national prejudices as between each other, among whom prevails a great tradition of law and the right of the freedom of individuals, particularly in the case of sanctuary and the right of assembly.

Mr. Maza was succeeded by another countryman of his who had perhaps the most unenviable task of all those who have occupied the presidential Chair, namely, to preside over the emergency sessions, which was strenuous not only in regard to the time it occupied and the times in the course of twenty-four hours during which the President had to be with us, but also in regard to the very difficult, complex and vexing problems the Assembly had to consider.

Today, while the shadows of these crises overcast our land and the thoughts of our statesmen and of our people, there is also, in our country, another event of great importance to which I must refer, because it is so related to the conditions of world co-operation and peace-all of which means not merely the cessation of war, but the establishment of conditions between countries, between individuals and

between communities, where there is harmony, compassion and toleration. We celebrate in India this week what is called the Buddha Jayanti, that is, the birth of the Lord Buddha, which really is the date when he reached in his life his fulfilment. Now in that tradition, it is that day that is regarded as the birth of Buddha, as in the Christian tradition the Resurrection has its place.

In our land today are gathered peoples from far-off Japan, a Buddhist country within its own form, peoples from China governed by a Communist government, people from Thailand, people from other parts of East Asia and our very near and dear neighbours of Ceylon and Nepal. All these are gathered together in our land today, not in festivity, but to recall to the world the great message of the son of our soil who, 2500 years ago, preached the principles of tolerance, of mutual respect and of living together; and, what is more, proclaimed to the world that the only way of toleration was to find the middle way, that is to say, that no one had the complete monopoly of good or evil. It was necessary to find ways of adjusting and ways of accommodation; this was not a counsel of the practical as it is called, but an ethical conception which has been handed down to our people.

We are not today in formal terms a Buddhist country, nor was Buddhism a religion when it came to India, but these great teachings were absorbed in our life and our culture, and it remains the home of the great founder of these teachings which spread over the centuries to far-off Asia, where in those areas our country at no time conducted either conquest or depredation, and the only missionaries that went out either to Japan or to China or to Ceylon or to what is now called South-East Asia, or to the far corners of the then Western world, were these men who took the message of love and compassion. We say that in no spirit of national illiberalism, because we are conscious that we are but the poor inheritors- that is to say, that our capacity to live up to this inheritance is very poor. We are conscious of that, but at the same time we think it is useful to proclaim to the word that, in the midst of the strife and the shadows that cast their length over us, there is this recalling of this great tradition where there is no attempt toimpose a view by the one who gave the great edict to the world.

In this Assembly, again, we join with a number of speakers who have come to this rostrum before to welcome to our fold nineteen new Members. We are naturally happy that many of them come from under-represented parts of the world, namely, Asia and Africa. Again I hope the Assembly will forgive us if we think a little more intimately of our close and dear neighbours, Nepal and Ceylon, which, for a long time, through no fault of their own making, were kept out of the counsels of this gathering.

I am sure the Assembly will agree with us in these sentiments, that the entry of these new Members has strengthened our life and in fact has not lengthened the proceedings of the Assembly, as was once feared. We look forward to their intimate association with us in every way; in fact, that is the wrong way of putting it, because there are neither old Members nor new Members once they are here.

But there are two omissions of which we are very conscious; one is that great country of Japan which, but for its brief episode of aggression during the last war, is a country which has the right to claim to make a great contribution to human civilization. In any case, the establishment of the Far East here, the representation of Asia, would not be complete without Japan joining our ranks. Practically, all other what I call ex-enemy countries are now Members of the United Nations. The Charter of the United Nations and even the proclamation of 1942 contemplated their joining us. Therefore, we hope it will not be long before Japan takes its place side by side with us.

The other is the progressive and very brave little people of the small country of Outer Mongolia. In arguing for their admission at the tenth session of the General Assembly, before the Ad Hoc Political Committee [31st meeting], my delegation referred to our contacts with them and tried to dispel as far as we could, the idea that Outer Mongolia was a phantom that did not exist as a sovereign State. Here is a country in the fastnesses of the Gobi desert, where out of a barren and inhospitable soil their own people are building today the beginnings of

modern civilization, with industry, with hygiene and sanitation and education. Fortunately, the visitors to that country who have no predisposition in theirfavour have returned the report of the progress that this little republic has made.

It is a sovereign State lying in the neighbourhood of the Soviet Union and of China, and a small country even more entitled to have its voice heard.

My government has an accredited ambassador in Outer Mongolia, and an ambassador from Outer Mongolia lives in New Delhi. We believe that that State is as entitled as anyone else to take its place here, and we deeply regret that the use of the veto in the Security Council has prevented its admission. We hope that the influence of the other permanent members will be used this time to blot this out, so that the United Nations will become truly universal.

We meet this year in conditions which we did not expect. It is nearly eighteen months ago that we gathered in San Francisco on the tenth anniversary of the United Nations. That gathering, which had no agenda and at which we did not particularly conform to any rules of procedure, as it was not intended to transact any business, since the occasion was one of commemoration, appeared to us, as to many other delegations, as the sending forth of a clarion call for a new face on the United Nations. Speaker after speaker spoke about the outlawry of war and of how ten years of failures and debacles and checks and frustrations should lie behind. And we all thought, at San Francisco, with the Geneva Conference in the offing, that a new era was about to begin for the United Nations-although we were not romantic about it. In fact, many thought that, at San Francisco once again, we would begin to write a new chapter. I would not say that these hope shave been completely frustrated, but events in the last few months have been of mixed character.

My Government desires me to say that the great changes that have been taking place in the Soviet Union in the last eighteen months are, in its opinion, changes calculated to assist in the progress of humanity

and in the enlargement of human liberty. It has now been stated that, in the years before, there was considerable suppression of such liberty, and virtually a hypocrisy enthroned in that country. We would like to see the expansion of this trend not only in the Soviet Union, but also in all other areas in which the Soviet Union has influence or with which it has relationships, and we would not ourselves do anything to thwart that progress. It is our view that, in this Assembly, we ought to take this matter not merely as a development of internal consequence, because what takes place inside a great and powerful country is of very great importance to the rest of the world.

There have been other developments of a very important character. There has been much greater communication between the countries of Asia; our on capital is full of distinguished visitors, delegations, and people from all parts of the world. There has been a great deal of communication established between countries which had not formerly sent visitors, delegations, and people from all parts of the world. There has been a great deal of communication established between countries which had not formerly sent visitors to each other. Our relations with our own Commonwealth have drawn nearer in spite of the tragic events of the last two months. And I want to say here and now-which I shall repeat later -that our country does not take the view that because there has been an error of very grave magnitude, which still stands to be remedied, we shall throw the baby out with the bathwater.

But this is the brighter side of the situation. Against that we see today what appears to be a return to the "cold war" mentality, a return even in the United Nations to recriminations, a rebirth of the whole phenomena of fear and, generally, instead of the lowering of tension that had been noticed, an increase of tension. We had hoped that when, unfortunately, this session of the Assembly was postponed until November 1956, it would give the world a longer time in order to assist in the process of the lowering of tensions, but we met here this time in the shadow of two grave crises, to which I shall refer in a moment.

The United Nations in the last year has great achievements to its credit. In previous years my delegation has tried to convey to the

Assembly the work of the United Nations in our own country, largely because a great deal of this constructive work is never spoken about and, further, because we are an example of an underdeveloped country, an example of a large country in a far-off part of the world. However, I am the last speaker in this wide debate, and it is not my intention at this time to go into the activities of the various organisations that have been functioning-some of which have headquarters in our land -but merely to refer to two or three great developments in the world.

The Members of the United Nations-and, indeed, the world-have reason to congratulate themselves and to feel happy that, during the twelve months that have gone by, three great nations have achieved their independence. I would mention, first, Tunisia and Morocco. In regard to another part of the world, I cannot say that, formally, it has reached independence, but I am entirely confident of the independence that is to come in what is now British West Africa, or the territory which will be called Ghana in the future. Thus, in the African continent, there are three new sovereign States-two of which are already Members, and one which, no doubt, will be admitted to Membership before long.

We are also glad to welcome the establishment of the International Finance Corporation. In the economic field, the activity of the United Nations is so little known to the outside world, and in the Assembly, we give so little attention to it on account of the way our Organization is built up, these matters being considered in another place.

Now I refer for a moment, as briefly as I can, as has been the practice in the past, to our domestic situation, because the conditions of a country like ours, in an undeveloped part of the world, the emergence of its democratic and parliamentary institutions and the way they are functioning, and its economic development, are matters of international importance. This is not an invitation to anyone to interfere in the affairs of our country, but merely a wish to point out that the conditions which prevail have a great deal to do with the development of freedom as a whole and, what is more, with the establishment of

stability in our part of the world.

We have passed successfully the period of our first five-year economic planning, and now enter into the second phase. In that second phase we are faced, as other countries have been faced, with that factor to which the Secretary-General refers in his report [A/3137], namely, the balance between agricultural production and industrial production. The second five-year plan contemplates what the Western countries, particularly the United States, would regard as a small volume of expenditure, which runs into nearly $5 thousand million in five years.

The fact that our agricultural production is not keeping pace-it is perhaps the lowest in the world-and that, therefore, it is not enabling our people to reap the rewards of independence, has been borne in upon our Government and our community so that, from this year onwards, India plans to step up its agricultural production by 35 per cent-35 per cent in a country where modern methods of agriculture are difficult of introduction, partly because of physical and social circumstances, which take time to remedy, and even more because of the fact that, apart from blocking of the Suez Canal, the procurement of the necessary capital goods and the provision of that great capital in all economic development, namely, time, are not with us.

Our population increases at the rate of 4 million a year, which is about 1.5 per cent; so that, although the pro rata increase is small compared to other countries, our aggregates are much larger. Therefore this land of ours has each year to find the food to feed these new mouths, and so our economy must take into account this balance in agricultural and industrial production.

Our country has made great progress in what is called community development, to which the Secretary-General draws pointed attention in his report. Out of the 600,000 villages of India, 130,000 are covered by what has been called an experiment, but what is now part of our administrative and political system, whereby the village have come into an entire, integral relationship with the central and state Governments

and in social, political and economic organization. This part of our development has attracted the attention of the United Nations, and is to very considerable extent now being studied by other South-East Asian countries, and we hope that in the next five years all the 600,000 villages of India, where 80 per cent of its population lives, will be covered in this way.

We have at the present moment in India the meetings of the United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization, where seventy-seven nations and nearly 800 representatives are gathered in a conference of one of the principal organs of the United Nations. A country like ours, with its backward technique compared to the Western countries, has found it difficult to cope with this problem, but we considered that it was the right thing to do in the circumstances, and it was of very great value to us, because these visits and these conferences, and the discussions that take place in our part of the world, provide us with that degree of education and open the windows in our own house; for we are not so foolish, I hope, as to believe that we do not require a great deal of education and enlightenment from other parts of the world. These men and women from every continent who are now in our national capital are not only our guests, but also, to a very, very great extent, they are our helpers, and by their visit have made a great contribution.

We are also happy to state that, for the first time in the history of the United Nations, the directors of one of its principal agencies, namely, the Food and Agriculture Organization, has now been selected from the Asian continent. It is particularly appropriate that agriculture, which has been our occupation over five millennia, should find a representative for its direction from our part of the world. We should therefore like to express our appreciation to all the countries which have made this possible, and more particularly the United States, which had a candidate in the field and then withdrew him in order to enable an Asian country to take the post.

This covers the observations I intend to make by way of introduction, which does not relate to the items that are on the agenda. I should now

like to point out to the Assembly the attitude of my government on the various items and the various problems that we are to consider, not in any great detail, but in so far as they represent the foremost things that are in our minds.

The Assembly will pardon us if we attach a great deal of importance to what are called colonial questions. The most important of these-and I hope no one will take offence by my grading them in his way-is that of Algeria, because of its international importance and of the problems of war and peace with which it is connected and its general stubbornness.

Algeria is part of the North African continent and belongs to all its people. And war goes on in that continent in the same way as war went on for eight years in Indo-China. We mean no offence to the French people, certainly, and not even to the French Government, when we say that we regard the situation in Algeria, ever since the suppression of the national movements by force-and that is a long time-as a colonial war.

We regret-and I do not propose to deal with any other aspect of the problem to which I am going to refer-that the membership of colonial countries in what is called the North Atlantic Treaty Organization gives them the economic, the political and the military strength to make their striking power against colonial peoples more potent. I do not for a moment suggest that NATO wages war in Algeria. But the weapons NATO supplies to its members or makes available to them, the economic resources, the skill and the expertise that comes to their disposal, enables them to release a very considerable part of their own strength for these purposes.

In Algeria, so far as our information goes-and I am subject to correction-there are nearly half a million French troops, I believe a good many of them are members of the Foreign Legion. These troops are engaged in military operations aimed at suppressing the desire for freedom of a people.

My Government desires me to say that our objective for Algeria is the same as has been our objective for ourselves: that is, the independence of that territory. We recognize that administrative arrangements ought to be established, on a basis of free discussion and free unity, for a relationship with its former rulers, so that both, afterwards, could become equal members of the world community. It is our experience, as indeed it is of our past rulers, that this association of free union out of free will is profitable to both sides. What is more, it is a small contribution in this distracted world of national strife.

Our relations with the United Kingdom in this respect stand as an outstanding example to other people in the sense that we have no quarrels with them. There are more British nationals in India today than when they were occupying our country. They are welcome. They have the same rights, apart from electoral rights, as our peoples. We do not discriminate against them, in connection either with their skill or with their capital. We do not discriminate against them on grounds of race as we were discriminated against, and I believe it is possible in other colonial areas at the present moment-we refer to Algeria- that if the French Government, in its wisdom, found it possible to bring to a close this chapter of violence and bloodshed, and if the Algerians, in their magnanimity, found it possible also to realize that violence was not the way to progress and therefore were willing in conditions of independence to seek friendship and co-operation, it would be good for both countries, and indeed for the world.

We have another problem where the phenomenon is of a slightly different character. It is an island in the Mediterranean called Cyprus, about which we have heard a great deal. This year the item comes on the agenda by the common consent of the two parties which in this Assembly- I repeat and definitely say "in this Assembly"- have been mainly concerned with this problem, namely, the United Kingdom and Greece. But in our respectful view, the people who are mainly concerned with this problem are the people of Cyprus.

I want to state here and now our approach to this problem. It is the solution of any situation involving violence, a situation which may lead to the widening of a conflict which may gradually develop into even more unbearable proportions. It is easy to say that there are difficulties, that there are adjustments that are not possible, and to find a hundred reasons why a thing cannot be done. The task of statesmanship, in which the United Kingdom has not been totally lacking in its long history, lies in finding a solution to this very difficult situation where there is a multilateral society in a territory in which the United Kingdom Government regards the establishment of its powers as necessary for its strategic requirements.

This is a contention with which we do not agree. We must find a method whereby the Cypriot people will be ensured their independence, a method whereby the international community will ensure the Cypriot people against any attempt to swallow them up.

There are other multilateral communities whose populations have their motherlands in other parts of the world. If they are all to be absorbed by the place whence their ancestors came, then I suppose my country would have to go back to Central Asia. We could not do that. Therefore, in this problem of Cyprus, my delegation finds itself in extreme difficulty in just saying "yes" or "no". We are glad it is going to be discussed, but we shall take our stand on the idea of an independent country of Cyprus. Cyprus has a population of a half a million people. Iceland, which is a very distinguished and valued Member of this Organization, has a population of 150,000 people. If a country of 150,000 people, also an island-probably in more inhospitable seas-can be a sovereign State, we do not see why the hard-working and industrious Cypriots, of Greek and Turkish and other origin, who, if they accept the principles of the Charter of the United nations, can make a contribution to their own economy, their well-being and their cultural advancement, should be denied their sovereignty.

Then we have another difficult problem in these colonial areas, the problem of West Irian. The position of our delegation is well-known on this matter. West Irian comes before this Assembly only because of the

action taken by the Netherlands Government in recent years.

Internationally speaking, West Irian is Indonesia; West Irian is as much Indonesia as Java is Indonesia. In the circumstances in which Indonesia emerged into freedom, in which both Australia and my own country had played some part, and where the Indonesians and the Dutch displayed a great deal of common sense and compromise, this matter was left on the desk for the time being. Therefore it is not as though a new country in the sense of a sovereign State has arisen. In other words, to us, the solution of the problem of West Irian is merely the completion of the independence of Indonesia.

We, ourselves, have very few colonial problems. There is a small part of our country which is still under colonial occupation by the Portuguese Government, who were the earliest settlers in our country. The Portuguese were followed by the Dutch, afterwards by the French and then by the British, which was the international fashion of those days. The French and the British having fallen out-though the French had better troops, the British were better diplomats, I suppose-the British established themselves in India. At that time, the Portuguese ruler occupied a part of India, although it had not been given to him by way of a lease from our people and was still a part of our sovereign territory. The British were not particularly concerned about driving them away. After all, you must expect empires, after the conditions of settlement, to hang together, because if they do not hang together they tend to hang separately.

So Goa remains as another pain in our neck, as a kind of unpleasant pimple on our territory. The population of Goa is in ferment, much cruelty goes on and its national leaders are either in prison in Goa or have been deported to Portugal. I say here that this Indian people will never become Portuguese, any more than the Algerians will become French.

That is the only problem we have. But we want to assure this Assembly that, we do not and we shall not approach this problem in terms of

violence. We attained our independence from the most powerful empire the world has ever known with only very small episodes of violence. But of course it must be said that on the one side was the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi which I hope we have inherited to a certain extent, and on the other side a liberal democracy with parliamentary opinion at home. I am afraid we cannot say the same thing in this particular case.

It is not our intention, however, to bring this problem here. There is one aspect of it before the International Court of Justice, and therefore I have no desire to go further into the matter. But I want particularly my Asian friends to realize and that we regard this as a straightforward colonial problem. And if I may say so, the only way to look at a colony for all civilized people is in the words of a famous American, Abraham Lincoln, who said; "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my meaning of democracy."

So when we hear about the free world, when we hear about democracy, no one who is in possession of a colony or who imposes the rule of his country on another can claim that he has reached perfection or even the necessary modicum of democratic government. We used to hear about democratic imperialism in the old days. There can be no more democratic imperialism than there can be a vegetarian tiger; it is a contradiction in terms.

We are happy in the development that took place in our own country, and in spite of the deadlock that now prevails, in spite of the stalemate that exists between the Portuguese Government and ourselves, where we have served diplomatic relations and, to a very considerable extent economic relations, we are not without hope that wisdom will dawn and that we will be able to come to arrangements whereby, even as France did after seven years of patient negotiation, there will be the removal of this last vestige of colonialism from our country.

In the course of this debate, largely because my delegation has come in towards the end, very many references have been made to our various deeds or misdeeds, more than to almost anyone else, as I see from the

records. I should not like to refer to all of them, because we shall have plenty of opportunity in committee when we are discussing these items to refer to them as relevant. But there are two matters to which I should like to make a brief reference.

One is the question of our sister State in the Commonwealth, the Union of South Africa. I want to say as sincerely as I can that my Government and my delegation would deeply regret any action taken by any Member of this Organization, however much we may be opposed to it on any issue, which is a challenge to the Organization as a whole or in any way makes that Member feel that it has no place here. Therefore the statement of the representative of the Union of South Africa [597th meeting] is not one that gives us any kind of pleasure or glee.

We hope that the Union Government will reconsider this matter. Here we all come in for criticism-Heaven knows we do. I want to answer just two things. Mr. Louw, with whom I am happy to be in good personal relations, told this Assembly-and I hesitate to say this because he is not here, but that is no making of mine-that India has pursued a path of vindictiveness in these matters.

I want to ask this Assembly to read through the records of the debate. It is quite true that we might have had lapses, because the people of Indian origin have suffered very severely, not only physically but in their self-respect and dignity, under the conditions prevailing. I will not go into the details of the subject. All I want to point out is that if India was vindictive, so was practically every other Member of this Assembly. My staff has very kindly dug up the figures for me. I find that from the first session of the Assembly to the eleventh, on five occasions South Africa alone voted against the consideration of this item. In the first, second and third sessions of the Assembly, when Mr. Smuts led the delegation, no formal vote was taken-that is to say, no formal objection was raised to the consideration of this item. The same thing happened at the fifth session. From the sixth to the tenth sessions of the Assembly, one vote was recorded against the consideration of the item-the vote of South Africa itself.

I should like to say that we do not discount this one vote, because it is the most valuable vote. If I may say, so, we could do without some of the others. The vote we want is the vote of South Africa, and my country is not without hope that in the years to come South Africa will itself ask for the consideration of this item or make a report of its own in terms of the United Nations Charter. That is the approach we make to this.

This year, South Africa has been joined, much to our regret, by the delegation of Italy, the country of Mazzini which, but for the brief interval of Mussolini and mustard gas, has been a beacon of liberty and inspiration to us. We are on the most friendly terms with the Italian Government and the Italian people both in the economic, political and cultural fields. We deeply regret this one exception, although we do not for a moment question the reasons or the sincerity of the Italian Government in being against us in this matter.

The items are on the agenda, and so far as my delegation is concerned we shall pursue them with an even greater degree of restraint than we have exercised in the past, because the South African delegation-if it maintains its ultimatum to the Assembly and adheres to its communication to the Assembly-will not be present, and I believe in that event, since we are on the other side, as is most of the Assembly, we have a special responsibility to look after its interests there. While the case is being considered ex parse, we shall show no vindictiveness, because what we want is the settlement of this problem, for reasons which we shall make clear, which are more than national reasons, because this question touches on one of the three great and outstanding difficulties of our modern world.

Our neighbours from Pakistan also made reference to India in regard to Kashmir. Now Kashmir is still on the agenda of the Security Council. We put it there. We came here with a complaint of aggression. I have no desire, therefore, to go into great detail about it. I had the pleasure of hearing the distinguished lady, who was a countrywoman of ours until

ten years ago, for whom we have very great affection and regard, speak to us [592nd meetings and I can only echo her sentiments: we want to see the end of aggression in Kashmir.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has made certain references to our military expenditure. This is a matter of some concern to us, because we are discussing problems of disarmament, the attitude of countries in regard to military expenditure and things of that kind. There are two sets of figures available, one-the figures of the budget of the Government of India, and the other-the figures collected by the United Nations. They do not vary in substance; they are calculated upon a different basis, and, at the risk of boring the Assembly with figures, l think it is necessary for us to state this, because the Foreign Minister of Pakistan told us that 70 per cent of the national budget of Pakistan was devoted to military expenditure and that the same was the case in India. l do not question

the right of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to speak of his country; I have no objection to his speaking about us when the facts are right.

First of all, with regard to Pakistan, this 70 per cent is not the real figure, since it does not take into account the large volume of foreign military aid arising from Pakistan's military alliance with the United States, or whatever other amounts may result from its other military alliances. But assuming that it is 70 per cent, I would like that to be compared with our figures.

The total revenue budget of India for the year 1956 to 1957 is 5,500 million rupees, which works out at $1,100 million. Our defence expenditure for that period is $408 million, or 37.6 per cent of our budget, which is just over half of the 70 per cent that was mentioned.

But I think I shall be very unfair to the Government of India, and in part to myself, therefore, if l leave it at that. These figures do not represent the real picture, because the budget I gave was the revenue budget, without taking into account capital expenditure. If you take

the whole budget of India, including our capital expenditure, it comes to $1,400 million for the year 1956 to 1957, and the total defence expenditure, both current and capital, is $434 million, making 18.6 percent of our total budget.

These figures are available in the United Nations and anybody can check them. That is to say, if we take the capital expenditure on the nation-building side, as well as the capital expenditure on the replenishment of the army, navy and air force, then you will get the figure of 18.6 per cent. But if you say that we are trying to distort these figures or present them to our advantage, you can take the other ones, that is to say the merely current expenditure on both sides, without capital expenditure. But do not forget that this so-called capital expenditure is part of our national planning budget, and includes education and various community projects on which the Government of India spends somewhere around $300 million a year.

Therefore, the figures which have been given are entirely wrong and likely to carry a mistaken impression. It is all the more galling to us, because we are very stern advocates of the lowering of military expenditure and of disarmament, and in that connection I would like to read out the figures for the previous years.

Before 1939, the proportion of military expenditure was 33 per cent; in the year 1946 to 1947, that is, when we took over in the last year of British administration, military expenditure was 46 per cent; in the year 1949 to 1950, it came down to 29 per cent, and each year it has gone down a little so that we have now, in the year 1956 to 1957, reached the present figure of 18.6 per cent of our capital and current expenditure, or, as I said before, 37.6 per cent on the other basis. I mention this because we do not like to be presented to the world as a country that is armed to the teeth and is starving our people in order that we may acquire or keep weapons. Ours is perhaps one of the few countries of the world where from 1947 onwards military expenditure has gone down in spite of the fact that military equipment, the greater part of which has to be secured from other countries, is increasing in cost. All I desire to say now about Kashmir is that a third of the

territory is unlawfully, against the decision of the United Nations, occupied by Pakistan forces. In the interests of peace we have kept behind the cease-fire line-there are incidents now and then but nothing very serious, there are United Nations observers there-and I think the problem with regard to Kashmir is the vacation of this aggression. The fact that that part of India is now under foreign occupation-although it is under the occupation of a neighbour with whom we want to remain on very good terms-is still not very agreeable to us. I think I will leave it there.

There are some other items on the agenda of this session about which my delegation is very seriously concerned-and this is true above all of the item on disarmament.

We are happy to see that both in the statement made yesterday by the representative of Canada [609th meeting) and in the statement made this morning by Sir Pierson Dixon, there is an indication - despite the scepticism involved - of a general desire to consider all proposals that have been brought forward. I understand that that is also the position of the United States and the Soviet Union. The fact, however, remains that for eleven years we have talked about disarmament and yet, each year, the world's armaments either stay at the same level or pile up to greater heights.

It is time that the General Assembly should approach this problem in a spirit other than that of merely finding some verbal adjustment between the propositions put forward by each side. My Government fully agrees that the kind of paper disarmament which can lead only to what has been called surprise attacks, or to other difficulties, is to be avoided; such a paper disarmament would not be a secure agreement. It should not, however, be beyond the wisdom of statesmen to find ways and means of establishing the necessary machinery.

After eighteen months of delay, the Disarmament Commission invited my Government to present its views to the Commission. Reference to this fact is made in the Secretary-General's report. The approach that we

now take to this problem is the following. We should all welcome it if the United States and the Soviet Union, which are the countries mainly concerned in this matter, could come to some agreement by diplomatic negotiation and as a result of the common realization-which we are convinced exists-that the present situation can lead to catastrophic world tragedies. If, however, an agreement cannot be arrived at in that large, over-all way, we should at least make some kind of a beginning. The proposals submitted to the Disarmament Commission by the Government of India [DC/98] were not designed to be, nor are they in fact, a scheme for large-scale disarmament. Rather, those proposals represent an attempt to reverse the current of armament and to respond to that large volume of public opinion which does not want the armaments race in the world to continue.

We hope at the appropriate time to discover whether there are other approaches by the great Powers which are mainly concerned, in the sense that they are the States which are capable of delivering the goods. We hope that it will be possible this year for the Soviet Union and the United States to offer to the Assembly some agreement. There are, of course, three other member of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission, but it is my Government's view that the solution of these large problems really depends upon direct agreements between those who can deliver the goods. All of us may make our contributions in many ways. We may offer our vigilance, our criticisms and our constructive approaches. Unless, however, those who have the power to implement our resolutions are willing to implement them, they remain paper resolutions.

We should like to see a position in which the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission would not be divided into two camps. We should like to see the other three members of that Sub-Committee make their individual approaches-and, here, my country more particularly looks to Canada, which is a new entrant into this field and is in somewhat different circumstances, to make a new approach to this problem. Perhaps the present deadlock could be broken in that way. The Second Committee of the Assembly has before it the problem of the under-developed countries. Later in this statement, I propose, if I have time, to deal with this subject at greater length. We hope that this

session of the General Assembly will make a further advance in establishing the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development. In that connection, however, my Government desires it to be stated categorically that the establishment of the Fund would not in any way interfere with the bilateral agreements existing between countries. These agreements are the results of bilateral relations and special necessities. They will certainly continue, and they should continue.

My government is also concerned about the discussion being held in the Sixth Committee on the freedom of the seas. We think that it is necessary that the world community should establish the principle of the freedom of the seas and the air, in such a way that less powerful nations in the world may be afforded that freedom. We do not believe that any nation has the power to search or arrest ships on the high seas. We do not think that any country should pollute either the seas or the air through the explosion of weapons or the emptying of fuel- atomic or otherwise - which could contaminate these natural resources. We do not think that one country - or, in this case, one administration - has the right to shoot up merchant ships, are searched on the open seas-and this applies even to searches for arms - should be remedied.

The Assembly's agenda also contains an item which has now become a hardy perennial -that is, the problem of Korea. I desire to say very little on this subject, except that, if it were possible to find a solution, or to make a step towards a solution, Korea could take its place here in the United Nations. We feel sure that the United States, which has the main responsibility in this matter as the head of the United Nations Command, and which has wide influence in this Assembly, would be able to respond to some suggestions aimed at making a beginning in this direction. We agree that, if the Korean problem is to be solved, both parties concerned must recognize that they have to live together.

In the Far East, the main problem is that of China. In my delegation's view, the question of what the General Assembly should or can do about the problem of China is still pending before the Assembly. We have given notice of our intention to present a draft resolution with regard

to procedures already adopted. We hope that the President, when he is free from the troubles of the general debate and the subjects dealt with by the emergency special sessions, will bring this question up before the General Committee.

I do want to say this with regard to China. The time has come when this matter should receive less impassioned consideration. There are some 582 million people in China, and their voice must be heard. What is more, whether we like it o not, the co-operation of China is necessary in the consideration of economic and political problems, and the question of disarmament.

In the vote which was taken by the Assembly [580th meeting] on the question of the inclusion in the agenda of an item on Chinese representation twenty-four Members voted in favour of the inscription of the item. Those Members represent 1,036 million people in the world. The Members which voted against the inscription of the item represent 585 million people in the world. I am not for a moment suggesting that the legal or organisational representation in the United Nations should be in terms of population, with so many votes for so many people. I am suggesting nothing of the kind. We are here as sovereign States, large or small, with equal status and equal power. In an issue of this kind, however, everyone has to take into account that the vote to which I have referred represented two-thirds of the world's population: 582 million in China and 1,036 million in other places.

The negotiations in Geneva have, fortunately, not been terminated, but they have yielded very meagre results. At the time when I came to this session of the Assembly, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Wang, representing the United States Government and the Chinese Government respectively, had held their eighty-sixth meeting and had repeated, I believe for the forty-sixth time, the same thing; I do not know whether anything happened at the eighty-seventh meeting.

There are ten American prisoners in China. I do not hesitate to say that the Chinese Government would make a great contribution to the

lowering of tension and the alteration of public opinion in this country and in the countries of some of its close friends-and I would say that, although we do not share the Chinese Government's opinion on this particular subject, we regard ourselves as its close friends-if, in its wisdom and, if one wishes to put it this way, out of its magnanimity, it would release these prisoners, thereby clearing the way for the consideration of other difficult problems without this barrier.

It would also mean that the reciprocal problem, which China claims, of Chinese nationals in the United States, could also receive consideration, even though the United States Government-and I think that it is only fair to say this-has stated categorically that it has no desire to retain any Chinese national in the United States. But the Chinese Government has its own views about this and its own interpretation of it, and these things could be considered.

I wish, then, that my voice would carry farther than this room and that, in the short time before us, during which other problems will come up for consideration between leading statesmen of Asia and this country, it might be possible to hear of the release of those ten remaining prisoners so that this psychological, emotional and political barrier would not exist in the solution of this problem.

In Indo-China there has been vast improvement. We have here two of the Indo-Chinese States concerned in the Geneva agreement admitted as Member States-Laos and Cambodia. There have been outstanding difficulties between the Kingdom of Laos and another party, called Pathet Lao, for a long, long time. After months, or almost years, of patient negotiation, in which the Laotian Government has displayed wisdom and statesmanship, and in which the others have shown forbearance at times, I believe that we have now come to a situation where there has been marked progress in this connection, and I should like to take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of the Government of India not only to those two parties but also to the Governments of Canada and Poland which have made very great contributions in resolving the situation.

In the rest of Indo-China, however, partition remains, and we deeply regret that the Government of South Viet-Nam, in spite of all the pressures or, rather, all the persuasions- in which we are not the only parties, and in which the Foreign Ministers of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union have made appeals to it-has not yet recognized the conditions under which the agreement at Geneva was reached. But the International Commission for Supervision and Control, which is composed of Poland, Canada and ourselves, is patiently plying its way, so that there is no outbreak of hostilities in the place, and the cease-fire line is being maintained. We believe that the future of Viet-Nam rests in free elections in the country, internationally supervised and held under conditions of secret ballot and free speech. That should not be impossible, and we would like to hope that the vast influence of the Western countries with South Viet-Nam, and the influence of China and others with the North, would be used in this direction.

Now we come to the more urgent problems before us- the two great shadows that have been cast on this Assembly. The first is the question of Egypt, and here it is possible for me to make my observations shorter than they would otherwise have been, because we have been discussing this for a very long time. However, it is essential for my Government to write into the record certain matters, and we want to do that without introducing any bitterness, and with a feeling at the back of our minds that, whatever the Egyptians or the Anglo-French side may think

about it, the past has to go into the background some day, and the sooner the better. For those reasons we have no desire to add to the complications, but it is necessary for us to say that the causes of the Anglo-French invasion and its origins should not be forgotten by this Assembly.

The Anglo-French invasion of Egypt was prepared for several months, because when the London Conference met there were vast concentrations of Anglo-French forces in neighbouring areas. Our Government was told that this was for the purpose of security, and we accepted that statement. It was the very same forces which formed part of the

invading armies. I have not the record of the proceedings in the French National Assembly, but both in the British Parliament and in this Assembly various reasons have been given for this attack. In the days of the London Conference, the threat to security arose with regard to the development of the Suez Canal.

When the attack actually was launched we were told that it was in order to separate the other invader of Egypt, namely, Israel, from Egypt so that world war might not begin. Then we were told by Mr. Pineau that the purpose of the attack was to destroy the Egyptian military potential. That is a matter for which there is no provision in the Charter - for one country to go and destroy the military potential of another. In fact, I think that that is the way wars are made. So that this way of disarmament of one country by the attack of another is not provided for.

The third ground that had been put forward was that the attack was made in order to prevent Soviet intrusion into this area and the extension of the conflict on a large scale. My government firmly believes that nothing should be done to enlarge the area of conflict in Egypt or anywhere else, and it expressed itself publicly on these matters when, after the cease-fire, there were newspaper reports of Soviet volunteers going into Egypt. Thus, while legally it is largely a matter between Egypt and the Soviet Union, we hoped and expressed the view that, the cease-fire having been obtained, nothing would be done to enlarge the area of the conflict. But I say, with great respect, that his holy duty of containing the Soviets in Egypt, where they do not exist, had all the appearances of an after-thought. Of course, everybody is entitled to have an after-thought; but we are also entitled to examine its relation to the facts as they exist.

And now we are told what had been denied in the beginning - that this attack has something to do with obtaining the necessary conditions with regard to the Suez Canal. If that is the position, then I think that the invasion sheds all characteristics of any other type of action. That is to say that since what had been attempted in the London Conference and afterwards incorporated in certain resolutions which

themselves were compromises, was not obtainable in that way, an attempt was made to obtain them by a war.

My Government is happy to note that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the United Kingdom has announced in his Parliament that the British troops are about to be withdrawn, and I believe that we have all also seen the communications by the Governments of France and the United Kingdom [A/3415] relating to the withdrawal of those troops. We hope that these withdrawals will take place without delay, as promised, and we like to believe that plans are being made for that purpose. But that takes us into the consideration of the United Nations Emergency Force.

My Government wants to place it on record that the United Nations Emergency Force for Egypt is not the kind of collective force organ contemplated by the Charter. It is not a kind of nucleus of a future force, but an ad hoc arrangement which the Assembly fostered- primarily on the initiative of Canada, which afterwards was taken up by everybody else- for the specific purpose of supervising the cease-fire and the withdrawal of foreign troops from Egypt. That is its function, and it is on those grounds that my country has agreed to participate in it.

We also want to place on record our view that no foreign forces-either forces of the invading armies or forces sent for any other purpose-can be on the territory of a sovereign country except with its consent. We have communicated to the Secretary-General [A/3302/Add.4/Rev. 1] our view that, as far as our understanding and our agreement goes, the Emergency Force is not a kind of force to hold the ring for the Suez Canal, but that its function is as I have stated it before.

There are various other matters in connection with this Force to which I referred a while ago, but there is one thing on which I should like to lay stress. It is that this is the beginning of a heterogeneous force drawn from different countries and from different parts of the world with different political and even military traditions. It is essential, therefore, that the direction of the Force should also

represent those different points of view, so that there may be no political complications arising in the matter thereafter.

So far as the other problems are concerned, and even so far as the clearing of the Canal -the Egyptian Government has happily asked the United Nations to undertake this task, and arrangements are in hand- because the clearing of the Canal and the restoration of traffic through it is a matter of great importance to the world at large. So far as the other problems are concerned, and even so far as the clearing of the Canal is concerned, therefore, a factor that would assist in this matter is speedy evacuation. If Britain and France in this particular matterare in a state of war with Egypt, then the solution of the problems arising in this connection calls for the binding up of the wounds and for the creation of a set of circumstances in which the past can be forgotten and, on the part of Egypt, forgiven. We have supported all procedures adopted by the Assembly to speed the clearing of the Canal, and we shall continue to do so.

So far as the settlement of the Suez Canal question, so called, is concerned, it is a problem that has arisen from the attitude taken by certain countries in regard to the nationalisation undertaken by Egypt, on which we have already expressed our views. We do not believe that what are called the Eighteen-Power proposals [S/3665], or any other proposals made prior to the war, are a basis at the present moment on which to proceed with the matter. I think that what we should do is to try to restore the Canal to use and that the Egyptian Government, in its wisdom, and others, should recognize, first of all, the obligations under the 1888 Convention 2 to maintain freedom of navigation, and also the interest of the users-by which I refer not to any vested interest but to the benefits that the users may derive and therefore the conditions that are necessary for this purpose. These have been set out in various documents at various times.

My Government hoped at one time that this could be settled on the basis of co-operation. It is no secret that if that idea had been pursued- that is, that the future of the Suez Canal should be seen in terms of co-operation and not of imposition-there would have been a settlement

long ago.

The other problem I want to discuss is the problem of Hungary. I have stated and restated the views of my Government on this question. We believe that a grave responsibility rests on the Soviet Government to bring about a change of affairs in Hungary. Irrespective of all the arguments that may be put forward, the fact is that when a people is not in co- peration with a government, when the government at best is in a state of perpetual tension and is not able to make the economic or the social machinery of a country function, when there has been grave tragedy of the kind that has happened in Hungary, it is the bounder duty of a great Power that is involved in the matter-even if all the arguments that have been advanced were correct-to use its initiative, to use its wisdom, to use its forbearance and everything else, to alter this situation.

We believe in the right of the Hungarian people to have the form of government they desire. We want to see foreign forces withdrawn from every country. We certainly object to the use of foreign forces for internal purposes. Our sympathy with the wounded and the killed and the suffering in Hungary, and with those people who had to leave their home, has already been expressed by our Government, and we have taken steps, in so far as it lies within our capacity, to give them assistance. We will support any attempt in this Assembly to bring about a change in the situation.

In this connexion, I should like to say that it is our view that the Soviet Union would make a great contribution towards peace initiatives, towards the solution of the problem of disarmament, towards the lowering of tensions in the world, towards preventing the renewal of the cold war, towards maintaining and promoting the feelings of understanding that have developed, certainly in our part of the world, in regard to the Soviet Union, and towards enabling its own forces of liberalisation to go forward- irrespective of whatever legal arguments

may be raised-if it would use its undoubted influence in this question to ask the Hungarian Government to invite the Secretary- General to go

to Hungary without delay.

It is not a question of what the Secretary-General can find out. It is not a question of what an observer can find out. I do not believe they can find out any more than the 500 or 600 people who have already been there from other countries. But it is a question of making a contribution to the relief of tension and of paying some attention to the expression of opinion overwhelmingly made in this Assembly. Therefore, while we have not been prepared to subscribe to certain formulations, we want to make it clear, as we have indeed made it clear to the Soviet Government, that it is our view about this matter that the Soviet Union bears a great responsibility and that there is a duty incumbent upon it as one of the great Powers, as a Power of the greatest influence and authority in that area, and, what is more, as a Power that surely realizes that if there were continued difficulties in the powder-keg of Central Europe, if there were developments of a character which meant the use of greater military force, it could lead to a conflagration.

Therefore there are times when even extreme legal consideration should be put on one side, the necessary reservations made, and the consideration shown to this Assembly of responding to the suggestions and the proposals made the other day by the Secretary- General [A/3403].

It is our hope that the expression of views being conveyed to the Soviet Government and the Hungarian Government in this matter will find a response in that quarter. It will, in the long run, contribute to the shortening of the sufferings of the Hungarian people, irrespective of political views; it will enhance the reputation of both countries in the comity of nations, in spite of the bitterness that has been created; and, what is more, it will enable this Assembly and the great nations of the world to address themselves to other problems without having this problem intrude itself as a barrier.

Sir Pierson Dixon referred to the conditions in Port Said. I am glad he

did so. My Government has been very concerned about it, as indeed his Government knows. But we have not raised the question in this Assembly in a public way because the priority in this matter must be the withdrawal of forces and the prevention of the renewal of war. Quite obviously, there are differences in the points of view and the estimates of the Egyptian side and the invading side in this matter.

We take the same view on this question as we did on the Hungarian question. We are not prepared to endorse either of these positions but we think that there is an overwhelming case, an imperative case, for inquiry. Therefore, this Assembly should now proceed as soon as possible to find out the extent of damage, how it was caused, and what can be done about it. This is not by way of an inquest, in order to stir up trouble, but so that these statements and counter-statements should not go unchallenged and, what is more, that the people who have suffered, the people whose homes have been broken up and who have lost their nearest and dearest, should be provided for in some manner, and those matters should be taken into consideration.

Furthermore, we agree that all this propaganda of war, from whatever country it comes -and psychological warfare is the beginning of other kinds of warfare-should come to an end and the binding up of the wounds as between the two parties should take place.

I have made no reference to the other aggressor against Egypt. It is a much larger problem-and the view of my Government at the present moment is that first things should come first. While a solution of this problem must be found, the Assembly should address itself more to the machinery that will prevent conflict in the future, accepting the present armistice line as the basis on which these things can be done. Therefore we have no desire to enter upon any speculation on these matters.

I should like now to make a reference to the United Nations Organization. The emergency special sessions of the General Assembly, and even the normal work of the General Assembly, has placed an

enormous burden on the staff of this Organization. Tributes have been paid to the Secretary-General for his skill, for his perseverance and for his devotion to this task, and also for the great knowledge and ability that he has displayed. My delegation has already expressed its views on this subject, but it is something which will stand reiteration.

We wish him success in the further tasks which he may have to undertake. But it is not inappropriate, indeed it is necessary at this time, that we should think of the large numbers of people who have worked all kinds of hours and made the work of the emergency special sessions of the Assembly possible. refer in the fifth Committee to the question of the United Nations Organization in the sense of its administration. Representatives have no doubt read the paragraph in the Secretary-General's report which relates to this matter. We think the time has come for serious consideration to be given to adjusting the administration of this Assembly to its newer purposes. We believe also that greater attention should be paid by the General Assembly itself to the conditions and the general state of morale of the people who work for us. The Secretary- General has taken the initiative in this matter, and has pointed out that, in the newer political responsibilities that we have undertaken, other considerations and other methods may have to be tried out. I have already made reference to economic questions.

The main problems which face us in this world of ours today reside in the danger of a conflict between East and West, by which I mean our East and West, that is, the world of the Orient and the world of the Occident.

My country does not regard the world as divided between great racial groups. It is quite true that there are racial concentrations in various areas and that there are mixtures of races in certain continents. But nothing could do greater harm to this planet and to human society than the outbreak of war or of a conflict on racial grounds.

In that seething cauldron of Africa, the greater part of its 200

million people do not live in conditions which correspond to human dignity. It is necessary that steps should be taken so that a more serious situation does not arise.

The position of India in this matter is not that it does not belong to the Orient, for there is nowhere else that it does belong. But we believe that the division of the world on the grounds of race, complexion or creed is likely to lead to ultimate annihilation. In this Assembly, therefore, we have to take very good care that we do not divide ourselves in this way.

Reference has often been made to the Asian-African group of countries. I can only speak for my delegation, but I am sure that others will speak in the same way. So far as I know, these countries have never attempted, and indeed it is clear from the proceedings of the Banding Conference, to set themselves up as a racial group. I would appeal, in particular, to the new European members, that care should be taken so that we do not divide ourselves in this session.

This kind of racial conflict can come about unless the problems in Africa are solved, unless colonialism there comes to an end and unless the situation which exists in the southern part of the continent comes to an end, a situation in which, I repeat, human beings in modern times live in conditions which correspond to slavery.

Slavery does not mean ownership by the payment of money; slavery means the disregard of the human personality, where the human being is a chattel. The fact that people are not sold in slave markets does not alter the conditions of those people.

I ask anyone to look at the laws and the conditions that prevail in the copper mines in the south, and to look at the conditions of the Negro, particularly in the African areas, and at the conditions of civil liberty that obtain in great parts of East Africa, where forced labour

prevails. I invite anyone to read the report of the United Nations on the conditions of forced labour [E/243].

The situation there will become more serious unless steps are taken quickly, as steps have been taken in British West Africa and as steps, I hope, will be taken in other parts of East Africa. Unless we try to reach a position where a multilateral society is established, this great problem, which is one of the three great problems that challenge the world today, will defeat us.

The next great concern of the world is its economic conditions. In the under-developed countries of the world, the standards of life of the people and the average national income are going down rather than up. While that is the primary responsibility of those countries, we have to create a situation in which commodity prices can be stabilized so as to check inflation and to allow the building up of these areas to something like the level which exists in other countries.

The tragedy that has taken place in Egypt and the blocking of the Suez Canal have been very adverse factors in this matter. I believe that, for a country like ours, economic and industrial progress will now be retarded over a period of several years, because not only the costs but the time will be considerably more. That is another reason why the clearing of the Suez Canal and its use for world trade should become possible by the establishment of conditions of peace.

We hear references to ideological conflicts. We have never taken the view that these conflicts are merely conflicts of ideology. They arise from what is, in our view, the fallacious idea that the peace of the world can rest on the balance of power. The balance of power is merely an attempt to balance oneself; it is not an equilibrium.

We must get over the idea of making military pacts all round and of piling up arms, one against the other. On the one hand, Western Europe

is armed to the teeth in one way, and, on the other hand, the so-called Warsaw countries have another pact.

What is more, we now have various nuisance pacts in our area, which only serve to dismember the unity of peoples and to take the apparatus of war into regions where it is possible for the peoples concerned to build up their economies without being involved in these conflicts. That is not to say that they could lead a sheltered existence.

In all these matters it is my duty to tell the Assembly that the view of our Government is that the relations between the countries must continue to be based on the principles of the Charter, and that we should not seek to make exceptions in the case of some, to allow some people to assume powers of sanction and security, to allow the interpretation that either the Warsaw Pact or the other regional military agreements are agreements under Article 51 of the Charter, because they are not. We believe that any attempts to attack or any attack of a member of the United Nations is the common concern of everybody else. Therefore, as we said in San Francisco, we must move from this era of the balance of power to an era of universalism.

We are happy to think that in the countries of Asia, and certainly in our country, as I said a while ago, there has been greater contact with other parts of the world. With the Western world also, my government and country stand in relations where we are able to understand to a certain extent the differences of outlook, and is our desire to promote this understanding.

In connexion with the Egyptian question, it would be an understatement to say that the United States, by the stand which it took on the whole of the issue and by the way in which the republics of Latin America and the European countries rallied to the issue of finding a settlement by obtaining a cease-fire, has created a great deal of confidence and a feeling of assurance in the powers of the Assembly. But I would be wrong if I did not point out that we must carefully warn ourselves that the security functions of the United Nations do not willy- nilly and

forever shift to the Assembly. There are dangers inherent in this, and it is for us to consider them carefully.

We are happy to think that between the United States and ourselves the relations of co- operation and friendship will be promoted further by the visit of our Prime Minister to the President of the United States in a few days, at which time I hope our Prime Minister will have the opportunity of meeting large numbers of delegations in the United Nations itself.

We are also deeply beholden as a country to the members of the Colombo Plan, which in the last five years have expended something like $4,000 million in the development of the countries of South-East Asia in the main. Canada particularly has taken an important part in the provision of an atomic reactor in India. India has made more advance in this respect than any other country in that part of the world, and in the circumstances now prevailing, where our food supplies are short, the United States has come forward, on the basis we have arranged with it, of a business character, to furnish the necessary food supplies, part of them at any rate from its surpluses.

Our economic development has been assisted by drawing on the technical and material resources of the Western world as well as of Eastern Europe. For example, in our attempts to discover oil deposits in India, Soviet engineers are working in India. The same applies to certain parts of our heavy industry. But in none of this is there any sacrifice of our sovereignty or in any way the mortgaging of our independence for a mess of economic pottage.

This is the general outline which I would like to place before the Assembly. We want to say here that in spite of the shadows that darken this world, if our efforts are directed towards the practical implementation of the provisions of the Charter, and if we are able to cast our votes with a full consideration of the issues, without predetermination, without taking sides, but guided by the reality of events, we shall strengthen this Organization and create greater

confidence in everybody.

I referred in the beginning to the fact that in our country today the anniversary of the Buddha, 2500 years ago, was being observed. Religious leaders in the past have given maxims about devotion and dedication. But the thought I would like to leave for myself at the end of these observations is that the future of the United Nations largely depends upon ourselves. As was said by this great man- and

he did not regard himself as a god: "Not even a god can change into defeat the victory of a man who has vanquished himself." And the only person who can vanquish a man is man himself..
