

rehabilitation ranked third among the member nations. In the difficult negotiations that finally led to an armistice, our delegation supported the Indian resolution from the first because it provided an opportunity to overcome with honour the impasse that had been reached on this issue in the negotiations at Panmunjom. Canada has throughout viewed the Korean problem in a United Nations frame of reference and our role has been that of a country with a responsible appreciation of the duties of U.N. membership.

Today great uncertainties still attach to the forthcoming political conference provided for under the terms of the Korean armistice agreement. We should not, however, allow our pre-occupation with the problems ahead to obscure the significance of the achievement marked by the armistice itself. Let me recall the words I used in speaking to the Political Committee of the General Assembly at the historic special meeting of the United Nations called this August:

"The United Nations forces have done all they were ever asked to do by force of arms. It has been the first major application of the principle of collective security by an international organization, and it has been successful. We are thereby marking certainly one of the greatest achievements in human history. Had the United Nations failed to act, or had it acted and failed, not only would a brave and ancient people have lost their freedom but the United Nations itself would, I fear, already have become the dead husk of another great idea unrealized, not for lack of resolutions but of resolution."

#### The Principle of Collective Security

Collective security, as exemplified by the united resistance to aggression in Korea, is fundamental to the U.N. Charter. If the members of the League of Nations had accepted their obligations in this respect and, if, as Sir Winston Churchill recently observed, the United States had been an active member, there would never have been a Second World War.

To come back to the collective security principle, it was the hope of the founders of the United Nations that conciliation and negotiation would serve to prevent conflict between nations from developing into open war. Realism, however, dictated the view that occasions might arise when peace could only be preserved through the use of force. The mere threat to employ force is not a sufficient deterrent to aggression, as Korea has clearly shown.

The United Nations met its responsibility promptly and squarely when the North Korean aggression occurred. In determining to take collective action against the aggressor, the nations concerned accepted the fact that aggression in one part of the world constitutes a threat to every other part. Failure to face up to this issue would have made a mockery of the whole collective security principle and would have been an open invitation to international lawlessness. While it may be necessary at times to balance our collective security obligations against the limited resources at our disposal, no act of aggression can be allowed to go unnoticed.