

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



1335th
PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 24 September 1965,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Speech by Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Speech by Mr. Martin (Canada)</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Speech by Mr. Vidal Zaglio (Uruguay)</i>	<i>14</i>

President: Mr. Amintore FANFANI (Italy).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Mr. President, the Soviet delegation sincerely congratulates you on your election to this high office and wishes you every success in carrying out the important functions of President of the United Nations General Assembly. I should like to take this opportunity of referring to the admirable work done by your predecessor, Mr. Quaison-Sackey, the Ghanaian Minister for Foreign Affairs, who at the last session, with its specific difficulties, stood confidently at the helm of the good ship "United Nations General Assembly" as it made its way—if one may say so—through stormy political waters.

2. The present session of the General Assembly is not just an ordinary annual meeting of representatives of more than a hundred States from every continent. It marks for the United Nations the completion of the first twenty years of its existence and activities.

3. On anniversary occasions such as this, it would of course be pleasanter to hear about events of a positive character; and it would indeed be pleasanter to talk about them, too. But, as we see it, important dates of this kind should be regarded merely as an additional reason for surveying—without excessive formalities and in a realistic manner—the ground already covered and for studying how the work can best be organized today and tomorrow.

4. The United Nations came into being in the year of the historic victory over the forces of aggression and fascism in the Second World War. Even then, the nations which had experienced the countless hardships of the war years were turning their thoughts towards the future. They earnestly wished to set up an enduring system of international co-operation, which would protect succeeding generations from the scourge of war. That was the time of a powerful anti-fascist and democratic upsurge throughout the

world, and the spirit of that time naturally found its expression in the basic provisions of the United Nations Charter.

5. Today it is particularly appropriate to ask whether the United Nations is justifying the hopes which were placed in it and whether it is proving equal to the tasks proclaimed in its Charter. There are some who will maintain that the activities of the United Nations serve only to inspire illusions and nothing more, and that no useful achievements can be discovered in its record of service. They will even go so far as to say that the very idea of peaceful and fruitful co-operation between States with different interests, and different social orders and ideologies is unrealistic. There are others, on the contrary, who are prepared to see the virtues and the successes of the United Nations in its shortcomings, in the disruption of its work and in deviations from the Charter. Let the United Nations ignore acts of aggression, let it remain silent when there is interference in the internal affairs of nations, and on occasion let it even use its flag as a cover for such interference—this is what some people expect of our Organization.

6. Both the nihilism of the former group and the policy of the latter group of undermining the foundations of the United Nations are alien to the Soviet Government.

7. It was clear from the very outset that the United Nations would not be able to eliminate all the contradictions arising between States in a developing and changing world, and that it would be even less able—nor indeed should it try—to gloss over the fundamental differences in the social character of States and the consequent differences in the objectives and methods of their policies. At the same time, there was no doubt that a world-wide organization for the maintenance of peace and security would be capable of playing a useful role in world affairs if, in response to the appeals of the people, it were founded on the principles laid down in the Charter—the principles of equal rights, of respect for the sovereignty of States and of the freedom of each country to choose its own course of social development.

8. In fact, every time the United Nations has found the strength to project into international relations and transform into actual deeds the lofty principles proclaimed at its inception, it has proved that it is indeed able to serve the interests of peace, freedom and the independence of peoples. The adoption by the General Assembly of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)] is sufficient in itself to show that this judgement is correct.

9. It can definitely be said that the United Nations does have considerable possibilities, and that it does have a future, provided that it can absorb all the new and healthy elements which have been introduced into international relations by the whirlwinds of progressive social change and national liberation movements, and by the powerful action of the peoples to achieve their independent and free development and to achieve peace.

10. Without over-simplifying the position and without going to extremes, it must, however, be recognized that the United Nations has not yet become a genuine centre for co-ordinating the actions of nations in the interests of peace, international co-operation and the defence of the inalienable rights of peoples. The reasons for this do not lie in its Charter, for there the tasks of the United Nations are clearly and faithfully set forth together with the provisions necessary to carry them out successfully under present-day conditions. The real reasons lie elsewhere.

11. No charter will be of any use if the actual policies of States which have signed the Charter are completely at variance with what the Charter requires. And everyone knows that there are some States which have made it almost a rule to infringe the United Nations Charter, although they never lose any opportunity of holding forth about the sanctity of their international obligations.

12. No sooner does a nation in the Western or Eastern hemisphere take action against foreign domination or a corrupt puppet régime, or merely call for a restoration of constitutional procedures—and all these are domestic affairs—than foreign marines, aircraft, warships and every imaginable instrument of pressure and dictation are hurled against it.

13. What does this policy have in common with the principles of the United Nations or with the elementary rules of international law? The answer is: nothing at all.

14. The Soviet Union and the other socialist States, and indeed many countries which certainly do not in every respect share our ideology or our convictions about the future of society, base their policies on different foundations. In spite of all the nuances and the occasional differences in their positions, the socialist countries and the non-aligned countries are at one in agreeing that there is not and cannot be any place in international life for aggression, dictation and interference in the affairs of other countries. Ideological differences must not be a source of war and conflict between States.

15. The course which the Soviet Union is following in international affairs is one of upholding peace and the rights of peoples to independence and social progress and of striving to achieve disarmament and a broad and mutually advantageous co-operation between States on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. This course was chartered by the founder of the Soviet State, V. I. Lenin, and it is the course which the Soviet Government continues today firmly and consistently to hold to in determining its attitude to any given international problem, specific event or particular State.

16. The twentieth session of the General Assembly is starting its work in a complex and strained atmosphere, as military operations involving large amounts of war equipment are taking place in certain regions of the world, and human blood is being shed.

17. The war in Viet-Nam has, as we know, already spread over a territory larger than that of such States as the United Kingdom, Italy or the Federal Republic of Germany. Large units of the United States Army, Navy and Air Force have been brought into action, and barbaric bombing attacks are being carried out on the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. What the United States is doing in Viet-Nam has only one name, and that is "aggression".

18. Yes, the United States is acting in Viet-Nam as an aggressor and as a violator of the Geneva Agreements of 1954^{1/} which guarantee the peace, independence and neutrality of Viet-Nam and the restoration of its national unity. Whatever version of events the United States Government may give, it is clear to everyone that it is not the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam or the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam which has attacked the United States; rather, United States armed forces have invaded Viet-Name territory in order to impose a political order which suits the United States in a land where the Viet-Name people alone is entitled to be master.

19. The Soviet Union resolutely condemns United States aggression in Viet-Nam. The cause of the Viet-Name people is a just one. They are defending their native land. The Soviet people sympathize with the heroic struggle being waged by the people of South Viet-Nam under the leadership of the National Liberation Front. We have been providing, and shall continue to provide, the necessary fraternal aid to the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

20. Is there any way out of the situation that has developed in Viet-Nam? There is. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam have advanced a reasonable and fair basis for a settlement. This means, of course, the cessation of the bombing of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the strict fulfilment of the 1954 Geneva Agreements. The war was brought to Viet-Nam from across the ocean. In order to put an end to it, the forces of the United States of America and its partners in aggression must withdraw from foreign soil and take their weapons with them. The Viet-Name people must be given the opportunity to determine their own future. The Soviet Government fully supports the just demands put forward by Pham Van Dong, the Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, on 8 April 1965, in the form of the four points with which we are familiar.

21. It is frequently said that the United States has made serious efforts to initiate talks on the question of Viet-Nam but that its approaches to various organizations and Governments have been to no avail. Such statements will not, however, deceive anyone

^{1/} Geneva agreements on Indo-China (Geneva, 20 July 1954).

and will not lessen United States responsibility for its present actions in Viet-Nam. Aggression does not cease to be aggression because its organizers start talking about peace and political settlement. What the United States must do is to stop the aggression completely and without previous conditions.

22. If for some reason or other the authorities at Washington are not asking themselves what the continuation of aggression against the Viet-Nameese people can ultimately lead to, then we can only say that this is a great mistake. They should ask themselves that question.

23. In addition to the continuing armed interference by the United States of America in Viet-Nam, the international situation, and more particularly the situation in South Asia and South-East Asia, has been made considerably more complex by the armed conflict between the two large neighbouring States of India and Pakistan. This conflict is of no benefit to either side. Whichever way the fortunes of war may swing at any particular moment, neither India nor Pakistan stands to gain. There are, of course, third parties whose purposes would be suited only too well if India and Pakistan were to become more deeply involved in mutual enmity, since that would weaken each of them and make them more susceptible to foreign influence and dictation.

24. The position of the Soviet Union is based on sincere goodwill towards India and Pakistan, and is well known; it has been stated here in the United Nations. The Soviet Government has appealed to the Governments of India and Pakistan to put an end to hostilities and to seek a reasonable settlement of their differences at the conference table. It has offered India and Pakistan its good offices if both sides desire to employ them. Anxiety over the armed conflict between India and Pakistan and an awareness of the need for a peaceful settlement of their differences have been displayed by many States represented in this hall.

25. Hostilities along the Indian-Pakistan frontier have now ceased, to the great satisfaction of the Soviet Union. It is a sensible step on the part of both Governments. An important factor in halting the bloodshed was the part played by the United Nations and, personally, by Secretary-General U Thant. I should like to express the hope that further efforts will be made by India and Pakistan to bring about good-neighbourly relations with one another.

26. The acuteness of the situation in South-East and South Asia, and the heightening of tension in various other parts of the world, must not blind us to the significance of the problems relating to the strengthening of security in Europe. Let no one forget that Europe was the starting point for the two world wars which have convulsed our planet.

27. In the post-war period a special kind of situation developed in Europe. For one thing, in place of the defeated Hitler Reich there came into being two independent German States, with different social systems and contrary political policies. One of them, the Federal Republic of Germany, does not recognize either the existence of the other State—the peace-loving German Democratic Republic—or the new

European boundaries, or, in general, the consequences of the Second World War. The situation is further aggravated by the fact that the tasks of a post-war settlement have not been fully carried out as was envisaged by the Potsdam and other agreements between the Powers making up the anti-Hitler coalition. This in turn has left the door open to the intrigues of the militarist and revenge-seeking forces of West Germany, which long to rewrite history.

28. Regardless of the attitude of any State towards the German Democratic Republic or the Federal Republic of Germany, and regardless of its assessment of the present situation in central Europe, the conclusion of a German peace settlement has been and remains the key problem of European security.

29. Shots, it is true, are not ringing out in Europe today, but verbal clashes and loud arguments are taking place which may prove more fatal than shots. The question of giving West Germany access to nuclear weapons, either through a multilateral force, as proposed by the United States, or through an Atlantic force, as proposed by the United Kingdom, is a perennial item on the agendas of the various conferences and consultations among some of the NATO Powers.

30. If anyone still had any doubts about the designs which are harboured at Bonn with regard to participation in a NATO nuclear force, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has itself dispelled them by its official statements. Either participation in a NATO nuclear force or possession of nuclear weapons of its own—that is how the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany puts the question, thereby actually equating the one with the other.

31. To those who are hurrying to clear the way for the possession of nuclear weapons by West Germany, we say: would it not be better to stop? You apparently do not mind throwing to the winds the fruits of the victory over German fascism and militarism, a victory won through the efforts of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, the United States, Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and other States. But who will allow you to do it?

32. Today there are many people, even in Western Europe, who fully realize the danger of such plans. The Soviet Union and the other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty^{2/} have firmly declared that, should the members of NATO flout the interests of peace by taking steps to carry out plans for the establishment of a multilateral nuclear force, in whatever form that might take, then, in view of the grave consequences which this would have for the security of Europe, they would be obliged to take the necessary defensive measures for their own security.

33. There is yet another question which serves to separate the States which stand for peace and security in Europe from those which are charting plans for new military campaigns and already trying on the boots of Hitler's generals. This is the question of the post-war frontiers in Europe. It is not a question to be approached lightly. No responsible Government can fail to realize that the question of frontiers is a ques-

^{2/} Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance, concluded on 14 May 1955 at Warsaw.

tion of war and peace—and not only of war and peace in Europe. With the advent of modern means of warfare, the barriers between continents have ceased to exist.

34. The Soviet Union, which made untold sacrifices for the sake of victory over Hitler Germany and for creating the conditions for lasting peace in Europe, will not allow the established frontiers to be altered. They have been definitively fixed and are not subject to revision. There can be no question of this whatsoever. The Soviet people, our allies and our friends are capable of standing up for their interests.

35. The paramount lesson of the Second World War—and the twentieth anniversary of the victory in that war has just recently been celebrated by our peoples—is that the lack of unity among the peace-loving European countries and the absence of a system of collective security in Europe made it easier for the forces of aggression to violate the peace. The aggressor tore to shreds treaties which bore his own signature, and in place of the language of international negotiations on disarmament and the prevention of war, he preferred the language of steel and the clang of weapons forged for his war machine. That is why the Soviet Union consistently calls for agreement and concerted efforts on the part of the European States in the interests of their security and the development of co-operation among them on an all-European basis.

36. As a European and at the same time an Asian Power, the USSR is fully cognizant of its role and responsibility in matters affecting the security of Europe and Asia. Every worth-while effort to this end will always meet with the understanding and active support of the Soviet Government.

37. The present session of the General Assembly must take an important decision on the convening of a world disarmament conference to be attended by all the nations of the world. The idea of such a conference has been gaining ground for many years, and the Soviet Government is gratified to note that it is now close to fulfilment. We suggest that the world conference should be convened in the middle of 1966 at Geneva or at some other place acceptable to all the participants.

38. Such a conference will provide an opportunity for trying out new approaches to the solution of the most important and difficult problem of our day, that of disarmament. Everything must be done to avoid any repetition of the mistakes and omissions which have marked previous discussions of disarmament problems. That means that we must invite to the conference States which do not at the present time take part in the work of the United Nations, or are excluded from disarmament talks on one pretext or another. We cannot turn our backs forever on the indisputable fact that the elaboration of effective agreed measures on disarmament, to be carried out by all States, including the nuclear Powers, demands the participation, at the very least, of the largest countries in the world, regardless of whether they are represented in this hall or not.

39. A world conference would be a serious test of the goodwill of States and of their readiness to take

practical steps, attitudes which so far have certainly not been shown by some of the participants in disarmament discussions.

40. Whether we consider what took place decades ago, at the time of the first disarmament talks, or whether we look at the very latest meetings of the Eighteen-Nation Committee in Geneva, we are inevitably confronted with a clash between two opposing policies. The proponents of one policy maintain that, since men have produced armaments, they can also destroy them. Those who follow the other line apparently want to spread pessimism and disbelief in men's ability to put a stop to the armaments race. This is no mere argument between optimists and pessimists. It reflects diverse interests and basic policy differences.

41. States can establish special agencies and even ministries for disarmament, but so long as there is no genuine desire to demobilize a single soldier, let alone dissolve whole armies, disarmament talks will not move forward. What is paralysing the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee is not the technical difficulties involved in achieving disarmament, but conflicting political positions.

42. As we weigh the results which the United Nations has achieved over the past twenty years, we are justified in casting blame on those who pile obstacle upon obstacle in the way of disarmament; no manoeuvring on their part can disguise their unwillingness to scrap their national war machines. No arguments can conceal the chasm which lies between the paltry interests of those who favour the armaments race and the interests of the peoples, which long for peace and for deliverance from the burden of armaments and military expenditures.

43. The USSR Government considers, as it has always considered, that one of the principal objectives of its foreign policy is to do everything in its power to promote agreement on disarmament under effective international control. We have no preconceived notions as to where to start the process of reducing and disbanding the armed forces of States, into what stages that process should be divided, and how to organize control of disarmament—of disarmament, I repeat, not of armaments. The only thing that matters is that real disarmament should take place, that the danger of nuclear warfare should be removed, and that the measures of implementation should not give military advantages to any one side.

44. However hard and full of obstacles the road to disarmament may be, the Soviet Union will not relax its persistent and vigorous endeavours to achieve appropriate international agreements. A standstill in the matter of disarmament is of advantage only to those who cling to the policy of positions of strength, and for whom the armaments race turns into a shower of gold.

45. Since the position of certain of the western Powers makes it impossible to move forward in the elaboration of an agreement on general and complete disarmament, it is essential, without abandoning that effort, to strive for the implementation of partial measures which would help to limit the armaments race, decrease international tension and thereby pre-

pare the way for radical measures of disarmament. The memorandum presented to the States Members of the United Nations on 7 December 1964 by the USSR Government^{3/} set out our proposals on this subject, such as prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, dismantling of foreign military bases and withdrawal of foreign troops stationed in alien territory, establishment of denuclearized zones, reduction of military budgets—in the first place those of militarily powerful States—and prohibition of underground nuclear weapon tests. A number of valuable ideas have also been put forward by other countries, including Asian and African countries. All these proposals must be carefully weighed, so that no opportunity is neglected to halt the armaments race, particularly as regards nuclear weapons.

46. The conclusion of the Moscow Treaty,^{4/} to which the USSR Government continues to attach considerable importance, resolved part of the problem of the cessation of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, and indeed, the most substantial part, by prohibiting nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. It is quite natural that the world's peoples should also want underground nuclear testing to be prohibited. The United Arab Republic recently proposed the cessation of underground testing of nuclear weapons of a given capacity, accompanied by a moratorium on all other underground nuclear testing.^{5/} In the view of the USSR Government, that proposal of the United Arab Republic, supported by other non-aligned nations on the Eighteen-Nation Committee, deserves the most serious consideration.

47. One of the crucial problems of international life, which is closely linked with the problem of disarmament, is the question of dismantling foreign military bases.

48. In many cases, foreign military bases in alien territory are a legacy of the war. But twenty years is more than long enough to do away with them.

49. For the most part, however, military bases are a relic of colonialism; they were established in times when no one took any account of the views of the indigenous populations. Such establishment may have been accompanied by formal agreements, but to recognize their validity would be the same as recognizing as valid the transactions of a usurer, whose victim is bound hand and foot with debt and is kept in lifelong servitude.

50. The USSR Government fully endorses the conclusion of the Cairo Conference on Non-Aligned Countries^{6/} that "foreign military bases are in practice a means of bringing pressure on nations and retarding their emancipation and development,

based on their own ideological, political, economic and cultural ideas".^{7/}

51. We think that the General Assembly has every justification for demanding that States which maintain military bases in alien territory should dismantle them forthwith.

52. It is the duty of the United Nations, and that includes the General Assembly, to help the peoples to shake off the foreign yoke once and for all. Does it possess the practical means for so doing? Yes, such means exist, and they increase from one session of the General Assembly to the next.

53. The Declaration adopted by the United Nations in 1960, which we all remember, solemnly proclaimed "the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations" [resolution 1514 (XV)]. We may also cite the United Nations Charter, which enunciates the lofty principles of the equality of nations, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. Above all, the majority of the Members of the Organization are avowed opponents of colonialism and neo-colonialism. What is more, many of the States that have joined the United Nations in recent years have themselves gone through the arduous experience of struggle for independence.

54. Today colonialism is retreating all along the line. It is retreating, but it has not yet completely capitulated. Like a glacier which in bygone ages covered whole continents, it leaves deep scars and fissures even as it retreats.

55. A people fighting for its freedom and independence has a sacred right to use all means of struggle, including arms. Colonialism is the very embodiment of violence and arbitrary rule, and whatever is done to eliminate it is just and humane. The manifold aid which a people receives from friends in its struggle is aid in achieving the purposes of the United Nations. Hence it is also aid to the cause of the United Nations.

56. The United Nations has on more than one occasion censured Portugal's brutality against the inhabitants of its colonies, and the racists of South Africa for their savage policy of apartheid. Unfortunately, that has had little effect on the situation. If we were to show timidity in the face of the challenge hurled by the colonialist States we would not only be shirking our duty and ignoring the dictates of our conscience; we would also undermine the authority of the United Nations. The General Assembly, in my view, must seriously examine the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

57. The present sharp aggravation in the relations among many States and the deterioration of the international situation squarely confront the United Nations with the question: where lies the root of the evil? Indisputably, the principal reason for the mounting threat to world peace is the interference of certain States in the domestic affairs of others, and, above

^{3/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Supplement No.9, document A/5827 and Corr.1.

^{4/} Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, signed in Moscow on 5 August 1963.

^{5/} Official Records of the Disarmament Committee, Supplement for January to December 1965, document DC/227, annex I, section F.

^{6/} Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo, 5-10 October 1964.

^{7/} Document A/5763, section VIII.

all, armed interference. Examples are the events in Viet-Nam and the recent gross display of force against the Dominican Republic, which merits not only the gravest censure, but also vigorous counter-action by the United Nations. Other examples are furnished by the events in the Congo and in many other parts of the world.

58. In the days of colonial conquest and imperialistic reappportionment of the world, when the peoples of whole continents were regarded by the developed industrial Powers as tempting prey for expansion and inhuman exploitation, foreign interference in the domestic affairs of those peoples generally took the form of annexation, of forcible attachment to the metropolitan country. In our day, in a period of profound changes in the balance of world forces and in the conscience of the peoples, even those whose appetites match those of the old-time colonialists would not risk setting themselves such objectives.

59. Consequently, those who continue to pursue a policy of interference in the domestic affairs of others endeavour to give new shape to the "big stick" policy; and, in addition to time-worn and hackneyed references to the protection of the rights of foreign nationals, they produce what I would call refurbished arguments, such as the defence of "moral values" or "kindred ideals". But even to admit that there might be some justification—and, however ingenious the arguments, there is none—for interfering in the affairs of others, would be to deliver small and weak States to the arbitrary rule of the strong, and to assent to constant breaches of the peace.

60. There can and should be no justification—ideological, economic or any other—for interference by States in each other's internal affairs. Whether we speak of the people of Viet-Nam or the people of the Dominican Republic, the people of Cuba or the people of any other State, the people concerned, and it alone, is entitled to decide upon matters concerning its domestic development, and to choose the path it wants to follow. No outsider has the right to choose that path for it. That is a fundamental principle of international law and of the United Nations Charter. It has also been repeatedly emphasized in the decisions and declarations of the Bandung,^{8/} Belgrade^{2/} and Cairo Conferences, in which many States Members of the United Nations took part.

61. Who, then, more than the United Nations, should be concerned to ensure proper respect for the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of others, to see to it that it becomes law? There can be no two opinions about it—this is a direct obligation of the United Nations, arising out of the principles and purposes proclaimed by it in its Charter.

62. Desiring to contribute to making the twentieth session of the General Assembly justify the hopes placed in it, and to arrive at decisions called for by the serious international situation, the USSR Government proposes that the General Assembly should examine an important and urgent new item

entitled "The inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty" [A/5977]. We are also submitting to the General Assembly a draft declaration on the matter which, we are sure, will be carefully studied by States Members of the Organization.

63. The adoption by the General Assembly of a special declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty would constitute a new and vigorous step by the United Nations towards ensuring international security. It would be a good service to the peoples which have cast off the fetters of colonialism, established national States and now see as their primary objective the strengthening of political and the achievement of economic independence. Such a declaration would be of particular value to small countries, which are not always capable of repelling foreign expansionism and defending their independence and sovereignty by their own efforts.

64. It would be altogether wrong to see in this initiative of the Soviet Union merely a wish to embarrass a particular Power or group of Powers. We are not trying to take advantage of a situation in order to square accounts; our goals are higher than that. To those who nevertheless see in a declaration forbidding foreign interference a condemnation of their own actions, we would simply reply that they, of course, should know best.

65. We consider it essential to condemn all foreign interference in the domestic affairs of States and peoples, and to prevent any future possibility of such interference. The approval of a declaration which would not only confirm but also spell out and develop one of the most important provisions of the United Nations Charter, would undoubtedly be of great value in safeguarding the interests of world peace. The USSR Government calls upon all States Members of the United Nations to take that step.

66. There is another important matter which merits foremost attention in the work of the twentieth session of the General Assembly. That is the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. We all know the circumstances in which such weapons came into being, how the first mushroom-shaped clouds from nuclear explosions rose over our planet, and why it was not possible to outlaw the nuclear bomb immediately. The Soviet Union was forced to develop its own nuclear weapon; we had no other choice.

67. No matter how many words of condemnation, how many curses, may now be uttered concerning this weapon of mass destruction, the fact is that it has appeared, it exists. But will the present nuclear arsenals breed new ones? Will nuclear weapons gradually proliferate, as have weapons of other types? That is the question which disturbs the peoples and those statesmen who are alive to their responsibility towards them. Their anxiety is fully understandable and natural, for the risk of a war in which nuclear weapons would be used will only continue to grow, and to grow in a geometric progression, if possession of such weapons becomes wide-spread.

^{8/} Asian-African Conference, held at Bandung, 18-24 April 1955.

^{2/} Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries (Belgrade, 1-6 September, 1961).

68. If, in addition to the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the People's Republic of China, which already possess nuclear weapons, and which are permanent members of the Security Council, other States embark on the development of their own nuclear weapons or are given access to them, then it will be too late and, in fact, impossible to arrest the process. An even keener nuclear rivalry will ensue.

69. Essentially, mankind is now faced with the alternatives of letting things slide or of taking steps to ensure that nuclear weapons should at least be contained within the frontiers where they already exist, by concluding an appropriate international agreement. The Soviet Union Government favours such an agreement, since under present conditions no better solution can be found.

70. Needless to say, an agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons cannot be an end in itself. It is a step—and a major step—towards banning and destroying nuclear weapons, and not simply a means of limiting the number of nuclear Powers or, as some say, of ratifying the present nuclear monopoly of the five great Powers. That is what the Soviet Union holds to be the purpose of such an agreement.

71. Hence the prevention of the further spread of nuclear weapons is part and parcel of the struggle for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war, that being the unalterable purpose of USSR foreign policy. The achievement of agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons would be to the advantage both of the nuclear Powers and of the States which do not possess such weapons. For a country will be far better advised to rely, for its future, on steps aimed at curbing the threat of nuclear warfare, on disarmament, than on weapons of mass extermination or the hazards of military rivalries in the context of a nuclear arms race.

72. Of course, an agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons can have a real rather than an imaginary value only if it closes tight all the loopholes and thus prevents the spread of nuclear weapons.

73. We speak of this because at every step we come up against attempts to legalize the proliferation of nuclear weapons under the guise of international agreements on their non-proliferation. Examples are not far to seek. Thus the United States draft,^{10/} recently submitted for the consideration of the Eighteen-Nation Committee at Geneva, while referring to the prohibition of some forms of proliferation of nuclear weapons, nevertheless leaves a loop-hole large enough to permit the unobstructed passage of no less than a whole multilateral fleet, equipped with hundreds of rockets with nuclear warheads. The purpose is well known to everyone. Behind such stratagems are the nuclear appetites of the West German militarists.

74. An agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons worthy of the name must include undertakings by States which possess nuclear weapons not

to transfer those weapons in any form whatsoever—whether directly or indirectly, through a third State or group of States—to the possession or control of States or groups of States which do not possess nuclear weapons, and not to grant to those States or groups of States the right to take part in the ownership, control or use of nuclear weapons.

75. Moreover, nuclear weapons, or control over them or over their emplacement and use should not be transferred to units of the armed forces or military personnel of States not possessing nuclear weapons, even if such units or personnel are under the command of a military alliance.

76. For their part, parties to the Treaty not possessing nuclear weapons must undertake not to create, manufacture or prepare for the manufacture of nuclear weapons either independently or together with other States, in their own territory or in the territory of other States, and must likewise undertake to refrain from having anything to do with nuclear weapons in any form—directly or indirectly, through third States or groups of States.

77. My delegation has been instructed to request the inclusion in the General Assembly's agenda of a new item—"non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" [A/5976]—as an important and urgent question. We are submitting a draft treaty on the subject which will be circulated to all delegations. The Soviet Union is prepared to sign such a treaty here and now. We should like to believe that the States Members of the United Nations will approach consideration of the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the draft treaty submitted by us, in all seriousness and with a sense of responsibility for the fate of the world.

78. The Soviet Government has advocated and continues to advocate the development of co-operation among States in the interests of preserving peace, guaranteeing security and solving economic, cultural and other international problems.

79. No one, I think, would go so far as to say that the present state of international economic relations is normal and satisfactory. Flagrant discrimination, unequal conditions, trade embargoes and other abnormalities are encountered at almost every turn. Many States are sustaining great losses and having difficulty developing their independent economies while their riches are being syphoned off into other countries. Such a practice is intolerable.

80. The ice of the "cold war" with which economic relations among groups of States have become encrusted must be chipped off.

81. In seeking a normalization of conditions the Soviet Union is not pursuing any narrow objectives or special advantages for itself. The world capitalist market is the last thing that affects our economy. The development of sound and mutually profitable economic relations, as called for recently by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development^{11/} is a great undertaking which is in the interests of all peoples. At the same time it provides an excellent natural

^{10/} Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January to December 1965, document DC/227, annex I, sect. A.

^{11/} United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, held at Geneva, 23 March—15 June 1964.

basis for bringing about a turn for the better in political relations as well, for politics cannot be divorced from economics.

82. The Soviet Union for its part, has been working consistently and intently to develop friendly relations with all States. Close and many-faceted co-operation between the Soviet Union and its fellow socialist States is being expanded and strengthened. We have established relations of friendship and mutual trust with a large number of non-aligned States.

83. A gratifying development of the recent past has been the further improvement of our relations with virtually all our neighbours. The Soviet Union is ready to broaden its contacts and the areas of its co-operation with France, the United Kingdom, Italy and other capitalist countries if they so desire.

84. We should also like to have good relations with the United States, but, it need hardly be said, with due reciprocity and not at the expense of other countries.

85. The Soviet Union is doing and will do everything in its power to help to bring about a constructive settlement of the questions which the United Nations has before it. Clearly, however, the United Nations can become more effective—which is what the peoples expect of it—only if all the States concerned are faithful to its purposes and strictly abide by the undertakings they have assumed under its Charter. For that reason States Members of the United Nations cannot overlook the attempts made—at different times and at different levels, but originating as a rule from the same source—to circumvent and undermine its Charter. These attacks, as everyone knows, have been and are being directed primarily against the principle of the unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council, notably in connexion with peace-keeping operations, i.e. with the question of United Nations armed forces, their recruitment, use and command. The key to the solution of these truly important questions, we repeat, can be found only in strict observance of the United Nations Charter.

86. It would not be out of place to caution once again that if we allow any part of the United Nations Charter to be damaged we may be unable to repair it, for the structure of the United Nations will not, I fear, withstand such a test.

87. As in the past, the United Nations is seriously impairing its authority and lessening the impact of its pronouncements and actions by failing to this day to restore to the People's Republic of China its lawful rights in the United Nations. The sooner justice triumphs and the People's China takes its rightful place in all United Nations bodies, the better it will be for the interests of the United Nations itself and the interests of peace. The Soviet Union strongly supports the inclusion of the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the agenda of the General Assembly and urges that it should be settled promptly and positively.

88. The prevention of aggression and interference in the affairs of others, the pacific settlement of disputes between States, compliance by States with obligations

assumed under international treaties and agreements—these tasks are perhaps more urgent now than ever before. If the United Nations wishes to keep pace with the demands of the times it must address itself to these tasks in earnest.

89. Any Government which takes a stand in favour of peace and the lessening of tension and which really wants the United Nations to be an effective instrument for the safeguarding of international security can count on our co-operation and our support. However, the Soviet Union is, as it has always been, an irreconcilable opponent of the policy of imperialistic tyranny and aggression, and of the hypocrisy which so often characterizes the words and deeds of certain States and which conceals not only the absence of any desire to work for peace but also actions undermining peace. In short, at this anniversary session of the United Nations General Assembly too the Soviet Union will bring all its efforts and all its influence to bear on the side of peace, genuine international co-operation and friendship among peoples.

90. Mr. MARTIN (Canada): Mr. President, I should like, first of all, to congratulate you on your election to the Presidency of the Assembly. The overwhelming support which you have received testifies to the high esteem in which you are held. The Assembly is fortunate in having as its presiding officer a statesman of world stature and a political philosopher of international renown. As a member of the Government of Canada, which has many close and friendly links with Italy, it gives me great pleasure to greet her distinguished representative at this time.

91. I wish also to welcome to our company the delegations of the Gambia, the Maldives Islands and Singapore. It is essential to the welfare and future of this Organization that it should represent the peoples of the world wherever they have attained sovereign independence. The addition of these three new Members marks a further step towards the achievement of its goal.

92. I listened with great interest to the address of Mr. Gromyko, the Foreign Minister of the USSR. Mr. Gromyko is one of a very limited number—and I happen to be among them—who attended the first meeting of the United Nations in Church House in London in 1946. Indeed, Mr. Gromyko was one of those who likewise participated in the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations in London in 1945, and he has been a persistent attendee at our deliberations since that time.

93. I noted with great satisfaction that, as the spokesman for his country, Mr. Gromyko said that the USSR will do all within its power to bring about a fruitful solution of the questions facing the United Nations at this time. It is the judgement of my country and my Government that this Assembly is one of greatest importance not only for the peace of the world, but for the continued successful operation of the United Nations, and certainly at this time, in this century. We in this room today represent Governments pledged to the principles of the Charter, Governments capable of decisions and actions which could change the course of human history. It is with a sense of both our opportunity and the dangers that

will flow from failures to take advantage of this opportunity that I would like to discuss, at this start of the twentieth session of the General Assembly, some of the problems which I regard and my Government regards as being of uppermost consideration at the moment. So I propose to direct my attention to five of the major problems facing the world at the present time—the dispute over Kashmir, the war in Viet-Nam, the maintenance and strengthening of the peace-keeping and peace-building capacity of the United Nations, disarmament and the containment of the nuclear threat and, finally, means of maintaining the momentum of the international assault on poverty, ignorance and disease.

94. I would begin by saying that, in my Government's view, the primary concern of the General Assembly must be with the disputes which at this moment are disturbing international relations with incalculable consequences for world peace. It is a sobering reflection that, twenty years after the foundation of an organization intended to establish and maintain peace and security, we should have been confronted with wars tragic in their reality and alarming in their implications.

95. How can we devote the attention which we all want to apply to economic and social developments and to the promotion of fruitful international co-operation when before us is the appalling spectacle of death and waste in war? Our spectrum of anxiety is world-wide, for war in any region of the world is an affront to our insistence on peace and challenge to our crusade for collective security and human betterment.

96. Are we in danger, I ask, of forgetting the harsh lessons of the past? How many times have we heard it proclaimed here and elsewhere that war must no longer be an instrument of national policy? Pressures and temptations exist to breach this high principle: temptations to extend an area of influence or to intervene in the internal affairs of other nations, even to seek to obtain an objective by use of force.

97. The conflicts with which we are faced in Asia at this moment differ in important and obvious respects. Their most significant common characteristic is that either situation could widen the area of conflict and create danger of spreading war in Asia and beyond. The elimination of that risk is the supreme task of the international community, the supreme opportunity that lies before this body now; and that is the view not only of my Government but of the vast majority of the people of my country.

98. I turn now to the events which have gripped the world's attention in recent weeks: the conflict between two close friends of Canada—India and Pakistan.

99. The news that the cease-fire between India and Pakistan has come into effect has been received with profound relief throughout the world, and nowhere more so than in my own country. During the previous seven weeks the Canadian Government and the Canadian people had been saddened and dismayed by the rapid intensification of this tragic conflict between two countries, partners in the Commonwealth, with which we have formed increasingly close bonds since they attained their independence. The Secretary-General,

who in this matter has again served this Organization with energy, imagination and wisdom, received widespread support for his first appeal for a cease-fire. The support that his appeal commanded was demonstrated by the readiness with which a number of world leaders offered their services to assist in bringing about the cease-fire. The Prime Minister of Canada—a well-known figure in this Assembly, a former President of this Organization—was among those who offered his assistance, and I have his authority to say now that should that assistance be desired by the parties in the search for a negotiated settlement, it will be forthcoming.

100. The unanimity with which the Security Council adopted its resolutions 209 (1965) of 4 September and 210 (1965) of 6 September reflected the determination of all Members of the Organization that fighting be stopped. The broad endorsement for these resolutions and the firm support extended to the Secretary-General as he carried out the mandate entrusted to him by the Council gave further evidence of the fervent wish that bloodshed cease.

101. The cease-fire which has been achieved is, of course, the first and paramount necessity. The world can now breathe more easily; but the cease-fire, as we have been told by others at this podium, is not enough. The United Nations and the Indian and Pakistani Governments now have a new opportunity, which they must not fail to grasp, to search for and achieve an honourable and equitable and lasting settlement.

102. The consequences of failure to find a lasting settlement have never been more clearly evident than during the past few weeks. The Secretary-General stated the dangers starkly when he said:

"Inherent in this situation are all of the phenomena—the aroused emotions, misunderstandings, long-pent-up resentments, suspicions, fears, frustrated aspirations and heightened national feelings—which throughout history have led to needless and futile wars."^{12/}

103. In its resolution 211 (1965) of 20 September the Security Council reaffirmed its responsibility to bring about a settlement of the political problem underlying the dispute. The Council has, of course, made attempts before. Indeed, sixteen years ago, General McNaughton, the Canadian representative to the Security Council, in his capacity as President of that organ played a special role in the search for a solution to the Kashmir problem, which was then two years old. The imperatives of the situation demand new efforts which should be pursued not only by the Security Council but also by every Member State in a position to make a contribution to a solution.

104. The settlement, if it is to be durable, must carry the assent and the acceptance, difficult though they may be to achieve, of both Pakistan and India. An arrangement which meets the aspirations of one side only will never provide a stable solution. Perhaps—and I say perhaps—and in an explanatory way, a most promising course might be for the United

^{12/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twentieth Year, 1239th meeting para. 13.

Nations to assist the two Governments to return to negotiation at the point where they last had agreement, picking up from there the difficult task of bringing an end to this grave dispute.

105. So far as Canada is concerned, we have, since the establishment of the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan in 1949, provided military officers to serve along the cease-fire line in Kashmir. During the past forty-eight hours, since the cease-fire was agreed in the Security Council, the Canadian Government has been considering certain additional requests which have been addressed to us by the Secretariat. I have already announced the dispatch of ten additional Canadian observers to the Observer Group in India and Pakistan itself. We shall also provide twelve observers for service with the newly-established United Nations India-Pakistan Observer Mission, and, in addition, a number of aircraft, a senior staff officer, and air crew for service with both observer groups in the region. In undertaking to meet these requests, the Government of Canada expects that the new Observer Mission will, of course, be withdrawn as soon as changing circumstances in the area make this possible. Furthermore, as I have already indicated, if there are any ways in which Canada can assist in facilitating the initiation, continuation and, as we devoutly hope, completion of negotiations, we stand ready to do whatever we can.

106. I come now to the situation in Viet-Nam. This situation has not arisen from any lack of clear international directives for achieving stability. If the cease-fire provisions agreed to in 1954 had been fully observed, the tragedy and danger we now face in that part of the world would not have occurred. But they were not observed.

107. One of the two basic provisions of the Geneva Agreements was non-interference between the two zones of Viet-Nam and it has been progressively disregarded. The ensuing instability, and the measures introduced to correct it have not resulted in any new and more satisfactory balance. Instead, as we all know, the situation has spiralled upwards, imposing untold suffering on the Viet-Nameese people and creating an increasing threat to the peace of the region and of the world.

108. There are obvious reasons why, up to now, the Security Council has been able to act over Kashmir but has been powerless to intervene usefully in Viet-Nam. Speaking for Canadians, I can say that it is a matter of deep concern that the United Nations has been prevented from effective action in the crisis in Viet-Nam. This is a test for the General Assembly of the United Nations. We cannot abdicate this responsibility in this grave situation. It is the duty of this Assembly, in our judgement, to express clearly and forcefully the collective conviction of the United Nations that the war in Viet-Nam must be brought to a negotiated settlement.

109. There can be no doubt of the right of the people concerned to settle their destiny free of intimidation, subversion and military pressure called liberation. Surely this is a cardinal principle of any settlement.

110. I can only trust that as the real issues in the Viet-Nam war become clearer to everyone, and as the realization of the common interest in ending the war grows, there will emerge a desire for compromise and negotiation. The United States response to the appeal of the non-aligned nations last April established, in the view of my Government, the willingness of the United States to negotiate without preconditions for a settlement.

111. This Assembly of the United Nations must use whatever influence it has to help to bring about a negotiated settlement. Intransigence must yield to the appeals of justice and humanity. A military solution alone is neither practicable nor desirable. Once that is recognized, we can seek a mutual accommodation of interests and objectives and above all a guarantee that the people concerned will be able to proceed with the support and encouragement of the international community to choose for themselves the path they wish to follow.

112. The third point I wish to discuss is that of peace-keeping. We are all aware that, because of disagreement among Members over the financing of certain peace-keeping operations, the General Assembly has passed through a painful period of frustration. I will not recall the circumstances or attempt to ascribe now the responsibility. What is important is that the General Assembly is functioning normally again. A new period of creative action lies before us. This prospect is a matter of satisfaction to my Government. For notwithstanding the acknowledged importance of the Article 19 issue, we have to consider that the vital need for the United Nations and for this Assembly is to come to grips with compelling world problems. We must not permit this Assembly to be paralysed in the light of these contemporary issues.

113. Let me give you my Government's view on the future of peace-keeping and I think we have a right to give some advice on this matter because we have participated in every one of the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations. First, we cannot accept the proposition that the Charter reserves the preservation of peace and security exclusively to the permanent members of the Security Council, although, I would point out to Mr. Gromyko, in the light of what he had to say a few moments ago on this subject, we do not for one moment question that co-operation among the great Powers is fundamental to the full implementation of the Charter. But, in the absence of such co-operation, the membership as a whole must, in our view, have the opportunity to recommend what is to be done when no other course is open.

114. The Charter explicitly provides that the maintenance of international peace and security is a collective responsibility. This means that when the United Nations acts to keep the peace a general responsibility rests upon the membership to support that action. We have always believed that the logical consequence of this is an equitable system of sharing the financial burden. If it is right and proper for the Security Council to have the primary responsibility for decisions to establish peace-keeping operations, it is equally to be expected that the members of the Council, and particularly the permanent members,

should pay their rightful share of the cost, preferably on the basis of collective assessment. But if this is not possible, then contributions must be forthcoming voluntarily from each Member, to the best of its ability, in common acknowledgement of the obligation we all share to help keep the peace. The alternative is that the burden of peace-keeping will fall upon a few Member States. I have no doubt that this alternative will be categorically rejected by most countries and that the United Nations peace-keeping operations will not falter through lack of the necessary resources. But I would remind the Assembly that it nearly did falter when the Security Council, by its unique arrangement, provided an opportunity for the establishment of a force in Cyprus.

115. Our first and most immediate challenge is to restore the Organization to solvency. A number of countries, including my own, have already demonstrated their faith that the membership as a whole will respond to this need, and contributions approaching \$20 million have been forthcoming. I am sure that in the course of the next few weeks the balance of the membership will respond in full measure to the appeal of the Secretary-General.

116. What further practical steps can be taken by this body and by its individual Members to reinforce the capacity of the Organization to keep the peace? Last year the Secretary-General, in the introduction to his annual report,^{13/} proposed a study of advanced planning of peace-keeping operations. No action has been possible on this proposal, but I would hope that the Organization will be able to come to grips with this problem in the months ahead.

117. As we all know, a small number of countries have earmarked military units for United Nations service, but without central planning and without additional offers the effectiveness of such measures is necessarily limited. Canada continues to believe that the earmarking of units with appropriate central co-ordination is a technique of value to our Organization in its task of keeping the peace.

118. But peace-keeping by itself is not enough. Peace-building is even more important. The Charter outlines a whole range of procedures for use in achieving the pacific settlement of disputes. The United Kingdom Government has requested the inscription in the agenda of an item on this subject [see A/5964] and I wish to record the readiness of my Government to collaborate in studies to develop this important aspect of the activities of this Organization.

119. But machinery for peaceful settlement will be of no avail unless Governments are determined to make use of it when disputes arise. The time has come to ensure that peace-keeping is intimately linked with peaceful settlement. The former, essential as it is, should not be permitted to obscure or divert the purposes of the latter. The precedent of providing for mediation at the same time as for the dispatch of a force, on the model of the first Security Council resolution on Cyprus, resolution 186 (1964), is a good one. But it is important that the related measures aimed at achieving a political settlement be vigorously

pursued. The parties to a dispute should not expect to enjoy the benefits of United Nations intervention without accepting responsibility to settle their differences and thus facilitate the earliest possible termination of peace-keeping measures.

120. Mr. Gromyko spoke of disarmament. I should like to say something about this matter likewise. Turning from peace-keeping, I think it is to be recognized that this is another field of the greatest importance. We are all agreed in this room that general and complete disarmament is the goal we must reach in order to have a secure and peaceful world. This goal was spelled out in a resolution adopted by the General Assembly in 1959 [1378 (XIV)]. It remains our goal, notwithstanding the measure of the limited achievements of our discussion. We have tried over the years to make progress. When agreement on general disarmament eluded us, we turned our attention to collateral measures. We have come to recognize that while we have been exploring this path the underlying peril has been growing. Nuclear weapons are now in the possession not of one Power or two, but five, and many other Governments are acknowledged to have the capacity to make them.

121. The Secretary-General, in the Introduction to his Annual Report, has described the spread of nuclear weapons as the most urgent question of the present time [A/6001/Add.1, section II]. He has urged that it should remain at the very top of the disarmament agenda. My Government fully supports this judgement. Although it has the capacity, it has not engaged in the building of nuclear weapons.

122. Last August, the United States presented to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee a draft treaty designed to stop spread of nuclear weapons.^{14/} Canada had a share in the preparation of this document. We hoped that the submission of this draft, which had been called for by many non-aligned nations, would open the way to progress, but we were disappointed. I listened with great care a few moments ago to what the Foreign Minister of the USSR had to say on this point. I should point out that the USSR refused to discuss the draft treaty and has sought to place the onus for its refusal on members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). This position of the USSR does not seem to me to be a reasonable one. While the European members of NATO are under threat of potential nuclear attack themselves, it cannot be argued that they should have no right to participate in decisions on how such an attack is to be deterred.

123. It has been made clear by the representatives of non-aligned nations in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee that the world cannot be permanently divided into nuclear and non-nuclear States. Why, it is asked, should States which do not now have nuclear weapons give up in perpetuity their sovereign right to take such action as may be necessary in order to preserve their national security, if the nuclear Powers do not begin to exercise restraint in the manufacture of nuclear weapons and their vehicles, to reduce their stockpiles and thus embark

^{13/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Supplement No. 1A (A/5801/Add.1).

^{14/} Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January to December 1965, document DC/227, annex I, section A.

on a course leading to general disarmament? I think that the proposal made yesterday by the representative of the United States is one that will be carefully studied and I hope that it will produce a corresponding agreement. While agreement on non-dissemination should not wait on such action by the nuclear Powers, it cannot long be maintained unless the great Powers begin to reduce their nuclear armaments.

124. It is of cardinal importance to press vigorously for the extension of the partial nuclear test-ban Treaty to cover nuclear tests underground. From the outset, Canada has consistently supported moves to ban the testing of all nuclear weapons subject to arrangements for effective verification. We shall continue to support sensible proposals leading to the attainment of this important policy objective. Important advances have been made in recent years in the detection of underground events by seismic methods. Some progress has also been made in distinguishing between the seismic waves caused by earthquakes and other events, and those caused by nuclear explosions underground. This field—the detection and identification of seismic waves transmitted through the earth's crust—is one in which Canada has a special interest. Because of our geographical position, favourable rock formations and seismic detection facilities, Canadian scientists are in a position to make a positive contribution to experimental work which, after further investigation and study, may create the conditions for progress towards a treaty which would prohibit nuclear tests underground.

125. At the recent session of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, Sweden and other countries made important suggestions for international co-operation looking to further progress in the field of verification.^{15/} In Canada's view these proposals deserve serious consideration and study. The Canadian Government is willing to join with other nations in international efforts linked in an appropriate way with the United Nations to help to achieve a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

126. On 15 June of this year, the United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted a resolution requesting this Assembly to give urgent consideration to the holding of a world disarmament conference.^{16/} My Government accepts in principle the idea of a world disarmament conference. We believe that such a conference will require careful and thorough preparation. Over the years certain principles have been accepted for the conduct of disarmament negotiations. It is the view of Canada that the agreed principles adopted by the Assembly in 1962 should continue to govern discussions at the world disarmament conference.

127. The Secretary-General has suggested in a recent speech that progress on disarmament, whether general or nuclear, would hardly be possible so long as one of the major military Powers, which has recently developed some military nuclear capacity in its own right, did not participate. He went on to indicate that when the world disarmament conference is held it should take place under conditions which

would make it possible for all countries, if they so wished, to participate in its deliberations. This is the view also of my Government. If a world disarmament conference takes place, Canada hopes that the People's Republic of China will be invited to take part in the discussions.

128. I should like to come to some aspects of economic and social development. For, in our anxiety over the great questions of war and peace, we must not overlook the connexion between those matters and the economic and social circumstances which are the preconditions of order and stability. The past twenty years have witnessed the awakening of man's social conscience and the start of an unprecedented assault on poverty, disease and ignorance.

129. But that is not enough. The gap between the per capita incomes of the developing and developed countries has been widening; the population explosion demands a rapid increase in the momentum of economic development; and debt repayment problems are threatening programmes already launched. The fact is that the flow of development assistance has been levelling off at the very time when the need for it is quickening. This requires resolute action by all of us, collectively and individually. Speaking for my country, I can say that our recognition of this need is indicated by our response. Last year, we more than doubled our bilateral aid programme. This year, we are increasing it again. I can state today that, provided a satisfactory charter can be worked out and subject to parliamentary approval, we will join the Asian Development Bank and make a contribution of up to \$25 million to its subscription capital. Elsewhere, we are prepared to embark on the second stage of our special arrangements with the Inter-American Development Bank whereby earlier this year we made available for lending in Latin America the sum of \$25 million. I am now glad to announce that an additional \$10 million will be put at the disposal of this bank for lending at terms which may extend up to fifty years at no interest charge.

130. In addition to official governmental contributions, it is significant to note that the people of Canada are becoming increasingly involved, in a more personal way, in helping the developing countries. With government support, more and more funds are being mobilized, and a growing number of trained and talented young Canadians is working in a variety of ways in overseas countries where help is needed.

131. I want to affirm our strong support for the amalgamation of the United Nations Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance on satisfactory terms in a co-ordinated United Nations Development Programme, and for the continuance of the World Food Programme. Canada wants to see the projected new targets for these programmes adopted. I would expect that our own contribution will be in keeping with these United Nations objectives.

132. Aid alone, however, cannot suffice to meet the growing needs of the developing countries. All countries—developed and developing alike—must redouble their efforts to find ways and means of expanding trade and foreign exchange earnings to support es-

^{15/} Ibid., document DC/227, annex 1.

^{16/} Ibid., document DC/224.

sential development programmes. This is why Canada has strongly supported the establishment of the permanent new machinery of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which is starting on its tasks with vigour, imagination and patience, and under able and imaginative direction.

133. There are no easy or simple answers to the trade problems of the developing countries. One thing, however, is clear. Collective and co-operative answers are better than solutions sought in isolation. This is not a matter of idealism but of practical realism. Things which it would be difficult or impossible for countries to do individually can often be done more satisfactorily if many States take concerted action and share the necessary adjustments. This is true whether one is talking of tariff reductions or of improved access to markets or commodity arrangements or the many other important and complex subjects being discussed in the Trade and Development Board.

134. A modest but promising start has been made. The task calls for the best efforts of both developed and developing countries, and it is one which we must pursue relentlessly.

135. I cannot leave this podium without referring briefly to the question of human rights, which is of the greatest interest to my fellow countrymen. We cannot concentrate only on material progress, as if this were the only key to human welfare. The dignity and unique value of the human spirit are even more fundamental and can flourish only under conditions of equality and freedom.

136. The determination we therefore express in the Charter "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights" is a vital part of the total crusade in which we are engaged. Canadians attach particular importance to the maintenance and extension of individual rights, to the protection of the institutions of family and faith, and to the removal of all forms of discrimination based on race, colour, sex or religion.

137. Our concern for human rights arises also from our diverse national origins. Many Canadians still retain a profound interest in the lives of their kinsmen in other lands. Where respect for human rights and freedom and self-determination is not fully assured, or where it is deliberately denied, Canadians deplore these conditions—believing as we do that those rights and freedoms must be of universal application.

138. Because of these convictions, we are particularly concerned that the role of the United Nations in the human rights field should be enhanced and that recent proposals to this effect should be pursued. We support the appointment of a High Commissioner for Human Rights, as proposed by Costa Rica [see A/5963], and will join in co-sponsoring any resolution to this effect. Human rights are of universal significance; their violation must be of universal concern.

139. In speaking of human rights and freedoms and the general interest in peace and welfare, I am particularly aware of the parallel interests of the United Nations and of churches and other organizations. The institutions in which the religious and philosophical beliefs of mankind are embodied have

much to contribute on the many issues we are debating.

140. Canada notes with the greatest satisfaction, therefore, the intention of His Holiness Pope Paul VI to visit the United Nations Headquarters and to address this Assembly. He will be welcomed not only as the leader of his own church but as a man whose breadth of sympathy for those of other religious persuasions has been welcomed and reciprocated.

141. His decision to come can be understood in the context of the developments initiated by his illustrious predecessor, John XXIII, who, in his encyclical Pacem in Terris, expressed with perception and prophetic vision the inherent rights of man in his relations with human society and his longing for peace. Pope Paul's visit bears witness to his confidence in and support for the vital role which the United Nations is called upon to play in world affairs.

142. I have reviewed some of the major international issues with which, in our opinion, this Assembly must now concern itself—and I do so, jubilant at the thought that procedural controversy does not stand in the way of our getting down to business. What we do about these issues, and how effectively we respond to the responsibilities and opportunities confronting us, depends on our ability and willingness to reach a consensus on policies and actions.

143. How do we bring this about? What is the most promising approach to decision-making in the General Assembly of the United Nations of 1965? There seem to be two possible answers to this question. One is for the Members to think in terms of debating points, votes, and victories for the record. That path, in our opinion, leads to cynicism and sure frustration.

144. The other approach is for the United Nations to think in terms of undertakings and shared responsibilities—to strive, in other words, to realize in their collective deliberations that same sense of achievement and responsibility which Governments demonstrate in the conduct of their own domestic affairs. That way, in our opinion, lies promise and progress.

145. A key element in the search for effective consensus is the relationship between the great Powers and the balance of the membership. It is a fact, of course, that the special status of the great Powers is generally acknowledged. The Charter makes provision for this. But this recognition is accorded with the expectation that those who enjoy the capacity for effective action will accept its accompanying responsibilities; that they will persist in their continuing search for reasonable accommodations; and that the great Powers will, in turn, recognize that the remaining Members each have a role to play which, although differing in degree and sometimes in character, is of great importance. The caste system which characterized the world community of the nineteenth century is vanishing. In its place, we are creating a new collaboration among the nations of the world. And I hope that as events in Asia unfold, it may prove possible, in the interests of this Organization and of mankind, to make progress towards what the

Secretary-General in the Introduction to his Annual Report has described as "the imperative need for the United Nations to achieve universality of membership as soon as possible" [A/6001/Add.1, section XII].

146. Finally, we have arrived at a crossroads in the history of mankind's efforts, through the League of Nations and the United Nations, to develop international institutions capable of providing peace. We have come a long way since those unhappy days earlier in the century when faith in collective security appeared to have collapsed with the outbreak of a Second World War. We have been impeded, however, by major clashes of national interest, by the competition of political systems and by our own failures to realize how much had to be done.

147. We have abandoned, seemingly, the disposition to vituperative debate for more objective discussion. There is no doubt that we have made progress both in our manner and in our posture.

148. Now we have the opportunity to resume our advance towards the goals set forth in the Charter of the United Nations by a resolute attack upon the chief problems before us. We have it in our power, in this Assembly, to arrest the dangerous course of events and to move on to that peace to which our generation solemnly committed itself after the bitterest episode in human history.

149. Mr. VIDAL ZAGLIO (Uruguay) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, I wish first of all to congratulate you on your election to the Presidency of the General Assembly. May you successfully guide this session towards achievement of the aims of the United Nations Charter, aims which, today as yesterday, are the indispensable foundation for the peace and security which will enable mankind to look forward to the future without fear. I salute in you not only an illustrious statesman, but also the representative of that Italy which is linked to my own country by so many physical and intellectual bonds, and which is so enduring and magnificent an example of civilization and achievement.

150. I also extend my welcome to the new Member States which have just joined the United Nations: the Gambia, the Maldives Islands and Singapore.

151. This session of the General Assembly, held on the twentieth anniversary of the signing of the Charter, represents a kind of rebirth. The fortunate solution which has been found to prevent a repetition of what happened last year leads us to hope confidently that the activities of the Organization will now go forward without interruption.

152. For twenty years, the United Nations has been the strongest bulwark of peace and international security. There have been, it is true, localized armed conflicts, but the general peace has been maintained. World public opinion, informed and critical, follows international problems closely and the United Nations is a forum for that opinion. A world unbelievably different from the one which saw the birth of our Organization understands that peace is inseparable from the maintenance of the United Nations and that without respect for law, without repudiation of force, without recognition of the dignity of man,

without the sovereign equality of all States, and without striving against poverty, which always brings hatred and resentment, the future of our world will be dark and uncertain rather than bright and clear as we would have it be.

153. Uruguay, which unites to an unshakable tradition of peace, a repudiation of the use of force and faith in justice and law, the conviction that poverty, hunger and illiteracy are more dangerous than the ideological or political differences between Member States, has during these twenty years given its sincere and wholehearted support to the work of the United Nations.

154. We do not want a world characterized by the permanent confrontation of two antagonistic groups who hold mankind in a precarious peace based on the tension of the atomic terror. With all its complexity, and all the difficulties that it entails, we want an active and creative peace, based on law and international co-operation and born of the conviction that without such co-operation, uniting States of different systems in a common effort for peace and economic and social progress, nothing great or permanent can be created.

155. Uruguay is a member of the Organization of American States, a regional body whose existence dates back to the final years of the last century. We live within the inter-American system, convinced of its usefulness and of the fact that the system of juridical guarantees it establishes is complemented by those of the United Nations. We have never been able to imagine that these two systems—the universal and the regional—can be in opposition. On the contrary, they must work together for the achievement of the aims of peace and security which are common to both.

156. Without the sovereign equality of States, without full acceptance of the rule of international law for all States, great and small, powerful and weak, there can be no true peace. My country, which has made respect for international law a fixed rule of conduct, has recently—and on more than one occasion—shown the extent to which it is prepared to state its point of view with the independence that comes from the conviction that in doing so it is defending a just cause.

157. The United Nations Charter clearly prohibits the use of force except in legitimate cases of individual or collective self-defence. From this stems our repudiation of any aggression, our constant criticism of any use of force, whatever its source and of any action not in keeping with the rules of the Charter.

158. Together with this primary objective of maintaining peace and security by prohibiting the use of force as a means of resolving international conflicts, the United Nations—and the Charter is very explicit in this respect—has other objectives which are not only valid in themselves but indirectly constitute essential prerequisites for the existence of that peace and security. The process of decolonization, the work of strengthening the principle of self-determination for all peoples, has been one of the most outstanding and successful chapters in the history of the United Nations. The task of imple-

menting the General Assembly's historic resolution 1514 (XV), a task to which my country has contributed with a steady devotion of which we think we can be justly proud, has culminated in the virtual elimination of the political colonialism which, until only a few years ago, darkened vast areas of the world and of which only the last vestiges now remain. In this respect the work which the Organization must do has not been completed.

159. The world-wide struggle against poverty, both of States and individuals, must continue with renewed vigour in order to achieve economic collaboration, fairness in the prices of raw materials and a system of international trade based on justice rather than spoliation. The unimaginable resources that are devoted today to the creation of almost diabolical weapons of destruction and to the outer space competition—which in many cases is but a pretext for perfecting and increasing the means of man's destruction—should be fundamentally directed towards the promotion, with the powerful means at the disposal of modern science and technology, of the economic development of a world community which understands that no one, in any part of the planet, can consider himself secure and happy while knowing that there are hundreds of millions of men who lack a roof over their heads, food in their stomachs and all hope of a worth-while future.

160. Today the United Nations is ecumenical in character; it is an association of peace-loving States which, regardless of their ideological, political or economic systems, have united to achieve their objectives through acceptance of its principles. Uruguay, a Latin American State founded upon a democratic political conception which seeks the happiness of man through respect for his freedom and recognition of his economic and social rights, strengthened, too, by a philosophic tradition that nourishes our culture and way of life, has shown that, without in any way renouncing these ideals, it is able to collaborate loyally with all other States. For all political forms must ultimately be directed towards the human being, whose future must be assured, a future of peace and happiness regardless of colour, race, religion or the political or economic system under which man lives.

161. This year the United Nations will receive the visit of His Holiness Pope Paul VI. May I salute in advance this illustrious figure, the representative of one of the noblest, greatest and purest of religions, a figure who is a symbol of peace and love and who, like his great predecessor, Pope John XXIII, has striven and continues to strive for the realization of the principles expressed in the encyclical Pacem in Terris, and which are shared by all men of goodwill regardless of creed or race.

162. I trust that his words of peace, in a world convulsed as it is today by social and philosophic problems, by internal and international differences, will be received as a truly significant message that will renew the hope of all the inhabitants of this earth for a better future.

163. Unfortunately, while the presence of His Holiness will fill this hall with a special solemnity and a particular devotion as we listen to his symbolic words,

a devotion as we shall all feel, believers and non-believers alike, the account that we have to offer on the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations is not precisely the fulfilment of the great hope of those who planned and created it.

164. It cannot be denied that the United Nations has accomplished much in the years that have elapsed since the Charter was signed in San Francisco. The work now being carried out is important and it can be regarded with satisfaction and even pride. But it remains far short of what we must aspire to.

165. At a time when we hear the word peace on every side no false constraint need deter us from saying that, in our everyday language, we still use the word "peace" to mean a goal which has not yet been achieved. We speak of peace, while staggering sums continue to be spent, day by day, on instruments of war; we use the word "peace" as a symbol while we squander our resources on arms, at a time when the world in which we live is suffering from hunger, a hunger which in some parts of the earth truly constitutes an accusation against the civilization of which we speak with such exaggerated pride. While we hoodwink ourselves by using the word "peace" like a handsome cloak, half or more of the population of the world can neither read nor write. In other words, the human being whom we claim to be defending is not receiving from us the true weapons of peace, the weapons of intellectual and cultural developments which would justify a civilization whose benefits are enjoyed by some to the point of excess while others suffer from want amid an indifference of which we are all guilty.

166. As a counterpart to the words of love and goodwill which His Holiness may offer us, it might be pointed out that today, in the year 1965, twenty years after the creation of this Organization which we should all like to be a model, there are in the 117 countries comprising it more than 500 million adults who are completely illiterate. That is surely not a symbol of which we can be proud.

167. As it has always been our aim, within the modest part we play in the concert of nations to preach by example, Uruguay has always acted in the regional organizations, the Organization of American States, as a firm opponent of any plan that might lead to conflict—as if the conflicts we are already enduring were not enough—and which, albeit unintentionally, might jeopardize peace. We have striven and shall continue to strive to prevent the creation, in nations like ours of the Americas—out of good intentions, we grant—of an armed force which today may appear under the symbolic and apparently irresistible designation of being organized for pacific purposes. For no one can assure us that such a force will not tomorrow be a source of discord and of violation of the fundamental rules we have all undertaken to respect under the Charter.

168. To sum up, I should like to say that in my country we are tired of seeing the flag of freedom waved while the basest crimes are committed and while the principles of non-intervention and the self-determination of peoples are hypocritically flouted in the name of that freedom.

169. In the face of so much misunderstanding, Uruguay, on its own belief and as a non-permanent member of the Security Council, is doubly glad to welcome the sanity shown by two nations with whom we have friendly relations, Pakistan and India, which, understanding our good intentions and adding to them their own goodwill, have agreed to a cease-fire in their dispute. In that dispute our brethren on both sides were falling in a struggle which, for the very reason that it was a dispute between those we consider as brothers, was most distressing to us. The cease-fire must also be regarded as another and laudable triumph for the international Organization.

170. On 1 October Uruguay will assume the presidency of the Security Council. In that high office we intend to strive to convert what today is a truce into a lasting peace agreement between those two countries which are our friends.

171. I should like to conclude my statement today on behalf of my country, Uruguay, which though small in area stands for complete respect for the fullest freedom of thought—and that, we believe, makes it a force in the universal community—by quoting the words of the great Spanish philosopher, Ramón y Cajal: "The only men who deserve glory are those who, by intelligent and unselfish deeds, have beautified, improved and enlightened in some way the world in which we live".

172. With that goal in view, and with that just saying in mind, Uruguay will work in this forum of the United Nations, which should be a symbol of peace and freedom.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.