

international economic scheme would be very distorted indeed. Indeed, it would do a disservice to peaceful international relations by limiting the opportunities for the healthy interchange of goods, ideas and people which is the best hope for breaking down barriers of ignorance and prejudice.

Perhaps the most important argument against a resolution on sanctions is that it would run counter to the Charter principle that sanctions are intended solely for the purpose of preventing or stopping international hostilities. It would be a dangerous step to accept without the most serious consideration that the Assembly has the competence to call for sanctions in this situation. The distinguished delegate of Ireland made a very important point the other day when he said that punitive actions need to be scrutinized carefully and in detail before being undertaken, and this would be impossible at this session.

No one in the Assembly would deny that the South African problem is extremely difficult and complex and that it could not reasonably be hoped that a policy developed and intensified over a number of years could be eliminated overnight. Surely what the Assembly is trying to do is to impress on the Union Government that world opinion desires that the direction of their policy be reversed.

My Delegation thinks that it is opportune now, with the collaboration of many new member states from Africa, to take a very honest look at what our aim is, in any resolution which may come before this Committee. It is our view that the important consideration is not whether any action by this Committee or by the Assembly would relieve the feelings of member states, but rather what practical effect it might have in South Africa itself. We think that the resolution co-sponsored by India, Malaya and Ceylon meets the need of the moment, and we intend to support it with the express reservation that operative paragraph 3