

it is clear that we are not agreed in principle and should not say that we are. Furthermore, we cannot talk about agreement in principle on such a commission unless we have determined not only its composition but also its function.

"If we are to agree to the principle of such a commission, we would agree only on the establishing of a commission with real powers to make certain that freedom of choice exists for the electors in all parts of Korea. This question of function is in no sense a detail which could be put off for subsequent discussion, because it is basic to the principle itself.

"What in this connection do the Communists mean by 'supervision'? Would the Commission which they envisage merely observe the elections or would it have the power and the means to correct conditions which interfere with the proper conduct of the elections? Would it be competent to appoint scrutineers? Would it assist the all-Korean body in maintaining law and order before and during the elections? In short would it be a powerless excrescence or would it have an active and useful role to play in ensuring fair play and a free choice of representatives by the electorate?

PEACEFUL DEVELOPMENT

"In his fifth point, Mr. Molotov has mentioned the possibility of states most interested in Korea accepting obligations for its peaceful development. The Canadian Delegation has listened with an open mind and not without interest to the repeated emphasis of the Communist spokesmen on this theme. The possibility of some kind of guarantee of the peaceful development of Korea by other powers is one which certainly could be considered, and a determination on the part of interested powers to assist Korea to rehabilitate itself ought not to be rejected. We have noted, however, that on each of the many occasions when this subject has been mentioned, the spokesman has, after a promising introduction, retreated into extremely obscure language when he comes to defining the purposes of such a guarantee or statement of obligations. . . .

"If as seems likely from Mr. Molotov's proposal, there is more involved than economic assistance, we can hardly be said to agree in principle when we really don't know what Mr. Molotov is talking about. He himself has said, 'The question as to what particular states should undertake the said obligations as well as the question of the nature of such obligations should be discussed additionally.' To agree in principle on this point would therefore make about as much sense as it would for us to issue a general statement that we are in favour of treaties without any indication of what kind of treaties or who were to be our partners. Once again we must emphasize the fact that the so-called details are not ex-

traneous to the principle but essential to it. . . .

"In conclusion, I should like to say that we of the Canadian delegation should like nothing more than to be able to register the agreement of this conference on the principles of settling such important points as those referred to in Mr. Molotov's resolution. We even like the idea of trying to register at this point what limited agreements we may have achieved and then settling down seriously to solve those problems which remain, and it is a considerable temptation to do so, even on Mr. Molotov's terms.

"We have given the most careful examination to this resolution in the hope that we could find a basis of agreement, but we are led to the inescapable conclusion that to do so at the present time would be dishonest. It would mean deliberate misrepresentation to the public of the world and could lead only, to charges of bad faith at a later stage. Insofar as there are in the resolution some fundamental principles on which we are said by Mr. Molotov to agree, such as the establishment of a united independent Korea and the ultimate withdrawal of foreign forces, these were agreed upon before this conference began and can hardly be said, therefore, to represent an advance.

METHOD OF APPROACH

"Mr. Molotov wants us to talk about broad principles which sound easy and attractive and to leave the difficult details till later. This, however, is a method of approach which could have disastrous results. I am sure that if Mr. Vyshinsky were here he could supply a good Russian proverb explaining what happens to carts when they are put before horses. However attractive it might be to reach agreement at this point - and no one is more anxious to reach genuine agreement than we are - nevertheless, we believe that in the long run it will be better if we squarely face the facts of our disagreement and acknowledge them than to delude ourselves with false hopes and lead the people of the world to believe that there is agreement when there is no agreement."

* * * *

Since the war 1,504 physicians and surgeons have emigrated from Canada to the United States, according to a special tabulation supplied by the U.S. Immigration Service. Of this number, 528 or 35% left Canada in the last three years. At the time of the 1951 Census there were 14,325 physicians and surgeons in Canada.

* * * *

Manufacturing firms employ one out of every four working Canadians, the same proportion as in the United States. In the United Kingdom two out of five work in manufacturing, and in Australia one out of five.