

impose at this conference what it was unable to achieve by force of arms. This sordid interpretation of United Nations action and United Nations intentions is a distortion of the truth. The United Nations has not sought by force of arms to impose its will upon any country. It set out at the request of the Republic of Korea to defend the Republic of Korea from aggression, and this it was happily successful in doing. Having repelled aggression, the United Nations has resumed the effort, which it had accepted many years before 1950, to seek the unification of the two parts into which the country had been divided. It is not a question of the United Nations seeking to impose a settlement on either part of Korea but, in accordance with its practice in all disputes which have come before it, to seek by methods of conciliation to bring about a just and practical solution which will be accepted by the parties concerned.

The presence of Canadian troops in Korea and the presence of a Canadian delegation at Geneva attest Canada's unqualified support of the United Nations as the pre-eminent international agency for making and keeping peace; we have supported every step taken by the United Nations in its efforts to bring about the unification of Korea and we firmly believe that any agreement that is worked out to achieve this objective must be in accordance with the principles of the United Nations. If the Geneva conference is not able at this stage to reach an agreement on procedures for the establishment of a united and independent and democratic Korea, the Canadian Government is confident that the United Nations will continue to seek the attainment of this objective by peaceful means and that Canada will continue to support these efforts.

I should like now to consider the resolution which has been proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union. This resolution cannot, of course, be considered apart from the explanation which Mr. Molotov has given, and I shall direct my attention particularly, therefore, to the points in the resolution as defined in the body of Mr. Molotov's presentation.

In the first place, Mr. Molotov spoke of free elections. Mr. Molotov has spoken about free elections guaranteed by a secret ballot and universal suffrage; he has, we are happy to note, repeated the North Korean representative's previous assurance that the elections to an all-Korean legislature would be based on the principle of proportional representation. This is all to the good, and we would like very much to announce mutual agreement on this point. Unfortunately, however, we must ask ourselves whether the Communists and we, ourselves, do mean the same thing when we talk of free elections. Secret ballot, universal suffrage, proportional representation are essential to free elections, but they are by no means the whole story. While these three principles may be observed in elections in Communist countries, we consider elections are not free unless the voter is offered freedom of choice. We believe that in the elections in the Republic of Korea the voter has had greater freedom to exercise democratic rights of choice between different parties, principles and proposals than one would have expected in a country so recently free from long years of foreign domination. There can be no question in anyone's mind, however, that the voter in North Korea has no such freedom. A situation in which voters in North Korea could feel themselves free from threats and intimidations or that opposition leaders could feel safe to