

between delegations and governments, especially between those which were in disagreement over the matters in question.

And it is my feeling that the opportunities for such consultation at United Nations meetings seems to be diminishing, and a kind of "group" discussion is on the other hand increasing, the results of which are often in one form or another made public almost before the discussions have taken place. If we are not careful - useful as these discussions are - these publicly confidential discussions may cause the United Nations to lose in prestige as a place where opposing views can be constructively considered, and where their reconciliation can at least be attempted in an efficient and businesslike way.

But whatever methods we adopt, the fear and tension which now grips the whole world will not be reduced until some of the current international issues which divide us are successfully resolved; either by the United Nations, or by those states, acting, if necessary, outside the United Nations, who have the main share of responsibility for international peace and security.

In his penetrating address last Thursday, Mr. Dulles pointed to certain of these problems. If concrete progress and not mere talk about peaceful intentions can be achieved in solving some of these problems, here in the United Nations or elsewhere, we will then, but only then, have any real ground for hope; for only then will our words have been confirmed by actions.

The two principal issues which will test the reality behind the talk, are Germany and Korea. The latter issue, which is before us, Korea, has now narrowed down to the political conference to be held under Paragraph 60 of the armistice agreement.

The countries which fought in Korea on the United Nations side sent their troops there for no other purpose than to help repel aggression, declared as such by a United Nations decision.

So far as the Canadian Government is concerned, we will not support any military action in Korea which is not United Nations action, and we would be opposed to any attempt to interpret existing United Nations objectives as including for instance the unification of Korea by force. On the other hand, we are aware that the signing of an armistice does not discharge us from obligations we have already undertaken in Korea as a member of the United Nations.

To convert this armistice into peace, the Political Conference must meet. There is no other way. Less than a month ago the seventh Assembly made provision for the United Nations side of this meeting. True, this was done in a way which did not meet the full wishes of certain delegations, including my own. But the decision was made, and, after long and exhaustive debate, the composition of the Conference on the United Nations side was decided, which, if not perfect, should be satisfactory for the purpose we have in mind; making peace in Korea. Surely it would be wrong merely because the Communist Governments of Peking and North Korea demand it, to reopen at once the whole matter and try to reverse our decision after such a short interval.

Insistence, for instance, by the Communist side that the Korean Conference cannot convene unless the United Nations agree that the U.S.S.R. be present as a "neutral" member would