

than the other way about. Were these two countries then aggressors against the Nazis? That fantastic conclusion would be suggested by the principles contained in the Soviet resolution. Surely we would be mistaken to adopt a resolution which would result in such sensational and topsy-turvy conclusions.

An equally unacceptable conclusion would be reached if we were to apply the Soviet criteria to the economic blockade of the western sectors of Berlin which was enforced against them during 1948. (Incidentally, why should a naval blockade be stigmatised in the Soviet resolution as aggression while a land blockade is not mentioned). One of the tests suggested in the Soviet resolution is "the landing or leading of its land or sea or air forces inside the boundaries of another state without permission of the Government of the latter or the violations of the conditions of such permission particularly as regards the length of their stay or the extent of the area in which they may stay". In order to bring succor to the citizens of the western zones of Berlin, it might have been necessary to move supplies by military convoy through the eastern zone of Germany to Berlin; action required also in order to maintain the status of the western power in Berlin which had been secured by quadripartite agreement. If the Soviet resolution had been in effect at that time, that action might have been branded as aggression, and attacked as such.

Nor would the Soviet resolution have been of any greater utility at the time of the outbreak of war in Korea last June. The United Nations Commission for Korea declared on June 25 that the forces of North Korea had attacked across the 38th parallel. It has continued, however, to be the claim of the Soviet Union that it was territory of North Korea which was first invaded. The criteria which have been suggested in this resolution would obviously be of no help in deciding a question of fact of this kind. As a matter of fact, the easy way to frustrate the purpose of the Soviet resolution is for the aggressor merely to say that he was attacked first and is merely defending himself - as was the case in North Korea.

As a result then of unsatisfactory experience in the past in attempting to define aggression and also as a result of the results of either a ludicrous or at least unhelpful character which are obtained if the criteria included in the Soviet resolution are applied to recent acts of aggression, the Canadian Delegation are more than doubtful of the wisdom of this method of approach to what is admittedly a serious and unsolved problem. We are inclined rather to place our trust in determination and judgment applied through United Nations in each case that arises, and in the principles of the Charter. This is one of the reasons that we have supported so strongly the resolution as "Uniting for Peace". One of the foremost bulwarks for states threatened by aggression in our view would be the presence within their boundaries of representatives of the newly established United Nations Peace Observation Commission who would be able with their own eyes to observe acts of aggression and report their findings to the Security Council or the General Assembly.