

We think it would be a mistake if Mr. Nehru's condition were not met - a mistake from the point of view of the success of the Conference.

My Delegation will therefore vote for the participation of India. Without belabouring the point, however, I would earnestly appeal to, as the saying goes "absent friends" not to block the participation of any state whose presence is essential for the holding of an effective Conference. It is the responsibility of everyone of us to consider and urge the interests of our own government and people, but no one leader or nation today can, in this inter-dependent world, legitimately frustrate the will of most of its friends on an issue of not merely local but world-wide importance.

The rights and the position of every government which will be represented at the Political Conference are surely sufficiently protected by the flat statement in the terms of the resolution which we are co-sponsoring that governments "shall be bound only by decisions or agreements to which they adhere". In my opinion that is an iron-clad and unequivocal guarantee to any of the participants that there is no question of their rights and interests being disregarded, nor for that matter any question of the Conference, as we see it, becoming involved in procedural difficulties over voting. There will either be agreement or there will be no agreement. No government is going to be bound by decisions to which it does not adhere. The language I have just quoted seems to me to give full protection not only to the Government of the Republic of Korea but for that matter to the other side. I can understand the Chinese Communists and North Koreans having some misgivings at the prospect of entering a conference in which their side might be numerically inferior to ourselves. It looks on the face of it as if there was a risk of being outvoted by the majority. I do not know, whether or not these misgivings are present in the minds of the Chinese, the North Koreans and their friends, but if they are I hope that they will read carefully the language of Paragraph 5 (I) of our resolution.

Turning now to the Soviet resolution which Mr. Vyshinsky presented yesterday morning, I see that he has agreed with us on at least 7 of the participants of the Political Conference: United States, United Kingdom, France, U.S.S.R., Communist China, North and South Korea. That is already a modest step in the right direction. I would hope that as a result of our deliberations here, it might be possible to secure general agreement among all principally concerned that an eighth country, India, could also participate, in addition to those other members of the 16, not mentioned in the Soviet resolution, who may wish to come.

I find at least two major difficulties in the Soviet resolution in its present form and for these reasons, among others, I cannot accept it. The first major difficulty is that the final paragraph of the Soviet draft would seem to exclude the Republic of Korea from those whose consent must be given to all agreements reached at the Conference. As this is to be a Korean Political Conference, it is, I think, essential that the rights of the Republic of Korea should be protected and I have already shown how we on our side propose that this should be done.

My second objection is - if I may say so - that Canada is not included on Mr. Vyshinsky's invitation list. I should have thought that it was consistent with what has already been