

others who have gone beyond the colonial status.

In those disputes many resolutions are put forward which do not provide an easy problem for a delegation such as the Canadian delegation.

I should like, if I may, for a moment or two, to try to explain some of these difficulties and the principles upon which in our delegation we have tried to act, principles which have been approved by our Government.

In the United Nations Charter, the administering powers accepted as a binding international obligation a concept of progress toward self-government for all dependent peoples, which they had long recognized as a moral imperative. Their acceptance was completely voluntary. At the time of San Francisco there was no external power which could have forced the victor states to surrender the smallest portion of this aspect of their sovereignty. Their response was not due to outside pressure, but to their own consciences; and if world opinion played a part in their decision - and this it did - it was able to do so only because it reinforced those irresistible currents that were already at work within the democratic states.

That is the inevitable consequence of the acceptance of colonial responsibilities by a democratic state. Yet, can anyone believe that these same consequences would ever have been accepted by a totalitarian state? Would they have been accepted by totalitarian states which at the United Nations Assembly attack, and very often viciously attack, what they call colonial powers?

Would India and Burma have won their freedom from a totalitarian system, with its slave-labour camps and its secret police? Would world opinion have been of the slightest help to Indonesia if it had been in the grip of such masters?

For that matter, has dialectical materialism any way of explaining how such advances to freedom could possibly take place, not merely with the assent but with the positive co-operation of the administering powers?

We have watched the exponents of this totalitarian philosophy in the United Nations and elsewhere in their assiduous efforts to capture such noble words as freedom and democracy and put them to slave labour. We have seen them reduced at this session of the United Nations Assembly to denying all evidence of colonial advancement in the face of the plain accomplished facts.

On their side, the administering powers have pledged themselves to work towards the progressive replacing of their own authority by that of the peoples hitherto subject to them. The Charter accepts and establishes them as the instruments for achieving this end. In doing so it recognizes what is called colonialism as an integral aspect of the effort to establish peace and stability. But it gives no comfort to the illusion that the immediate and unconditional abandonment of the dependent territories would be a good thing for the international community.