

providing there had been a lull in hostilities while the negotiation of a cease-fire arrangement was going on.

Paragraph 3 provides for the withdrawal from Korea of all non-Korean armed forces so that, without pressure from outside armies, the Korean people under international supervision could decide their own future. But the next paragraph, paragraph 4, made it quite clear that while this decision was being taken there should be international arrangements for the administration of Korea and the maintenance of peace and security there. Those arrangements were to be the subject of negotiation. United Nations supervision of some kind, however, would be essential if the decisions were to be free and not the kind that we have seen imposed on certain Eastern European countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Finally, there was paragraph 5, which has been by far the most controversial section of the statement. The first words of that paragraph read: "As soon as Agreement has been reached on a cease-fire...". That does not mean, as I understand it -- and this I think is very important in the light of the Chinese reply to our statement -- that all the details of a cease-fire arrangement had to be worked out before the political negotiations referred to in the paragraph could begin. There had to be prior agreement on the basic principle that the actual shooting must stop before the political discussions began.

Then in paragraph 5 we provided for a negotiating body which, while it mentioned four States, did not -- though some members of this Committee have interpreted it in that sense -- exclude any other State from membership. For instance, the inclusion of France in a body of this kind would be normal and natural and would certainly be supported by my delegation. That body, which would include the People's Republic of China, would attempt to secure a political settlement of Far Eastern problems, including those of Taiwan and Chinese representation in the United Nations, in conformity with existing obligations, which one assumes would include the Cairo Declaration for those countries which had accepted that Declaration. We also provided in paragraph 5 that any political settlement should be in conformity with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, whose priority over all other international obligations is naturally not affected by this paragraph.

That was our statement as I understand its terms and its implications. Will anyone say that we did not in that statement, which was accepted by fifty of our members, go as far as honourable Governments and men could go, and further than many people sincerely thought we should go to meet every legitimate point advanced by the Peking Government?

Any progress as a result of that statement depended, of course, on its acceptance by Peking. Have we received such an acceptance? Or have we any reason to believe that the note from Peking of January 17 provides a basis for further discussion with some hope of reaching a mutually satisfactory and honourable agreement?