

Everything in India is laid out on a scale of unequalled splendor and grandeur, from the thousands of mosques and tombs built by the Mogul emperors to the magnificent Parliament Buildings and fine universities of modern India. Wherever you go in India today there is construction—of roads, bridges, irrigation, power works, schools, universities and fine public buildings. And a tremendous amount of the work is being done literally with naked hands. The almost complete lack of modern equipment is amazing. When one asks Indians why they do not use more mechanical equipment, they give two reasons: First, we cannot afford it; and secondly, if we could afford it, what would we do with our people? In India even poverty is on a magnificent scale. But everywhere there is enthusiasm, creativeness and a great sense of nation-building, leading to a new feeling of national pride and achievement and a growing belief in the dignity of labour.

If I may digress for a moment, I should like to remind honourable senators of what happened in Denmark in the 1860's. After Denmark's disastrous defeat at the hands of the Germans in 1864, its people were in the depths of despair and depression. But into their lives came the philosophy of the great historian, preacher, reformer and poet, Nikolai Frederik Severin Grundtvig. He preached a national awakening, the dignity of labour and the importance of doing things with the hands, and in this way he brought about a complete regeneration of life in that country. As I listened to some of the songs of the students at the universities in India and saw documentary films being made—some of the finest I have ever seen—I felt that if the Indians could be inspired as the Danes were to develop their own standards of citizenship, dignity and respect for labour, it would be one of the great constructive happenings of our present generation.

Much of the spirit of the new India is attributable to a man who is looked upon as a saint today, Mahatma Gandhi. Gandhi's work is being ably carried on by his disciple, pupil and collaborator, Jawaharlal Nehru. My opinion, for what it is worth, is that Nehru is one of the great men of our time, and that without question he is the leading figure in Asia today. In my view, it is fortunate for us that this leader of a great civilization and people is a man whose mother tongue is English, whose whole education was in the schools of the British tradition; and a man who is thoroughly conversant with and has a deep respect for our traditions of liberty and of law. He even has an unusual

and first-hand knowledge of our penal institutions, in which he laboured for fourteen years.

Associated with Nehru are many others, parliamentarians, members of the judiciary, the civil service, and the army, all trained in the British democratic tradition. I say it is fortunate for us that this is so, because with the rapid growth of nationalism throughout the Asian world and the present revolt against so-called colonialism it could be disastrous for us if such a potentially great power was under the leadership of a lesser man and with associates who knew not our way of life. My view is that Mr. Nehru and the Indian people are on the side of democracy, and if they should ever leave that side the fault would be ours as much as theirs because we had not tried hard enough to understand their background, their psychology or their problems. To say that Mr. Nehru is on our side does not mean to say that he will always do what we want him to do, or that he will always do the things we would like in the way and at the time we may like them done. But in spite of this I feel he represents a great constructive force in the new world which is abuilding in South Asia. One more thing: Mr. Nehru and the Indian people will not be intimidated from doing what they consider right by name-calling or innuendo by certain elements on the North American continent.

So much for the Indian background of the conference.

Now may I say something about the conference and the Suez crisis? The conference opened on Monday, November 5, which it will be recalled was the first Monday after the outbreak of hostilities in Suez. Picture in your mind a great conference hall packed with 700 delegates and advisers and many more hundreds of visitors. The delegates represented 79 nations, each of which had one vote. The vote of tiny Monaco could cancel out that of Great Britain or the United States or the U.S.S.R. While we are dedicated to the democratic principle, one man one vote, that use of it does seem to stretch the principle a bit far.

The chairman elected by the conference was Dr. Malauna Azad, Minister of Education for India, who always spoke in Urdu. The introductory speeches of welcome by both Dr. Azad, and Dr. Rada Krishnan, the Vice-President of India, were gracious in their welcome to the delegates, but extremely critical of the "intervention" in Suez. They were particularly critical of the British; the attitude was something like that which members of a family might adopt if an old and respected uncle who had always done the