

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. We have never been given any clear indication at all of what the representatives of North Korea, the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union really have in mind. If, for example, they are interested in outside assistance to Korea in its economic development, as has been implied in several statements, we must point out that the United Nations accepted such an obligation in the early stages of hostilities in Korea, that members of the United Nations have contributed substantial sums to this project, and that the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency has established itself in Korea and has already made important contributions to the economic life of that country. It was clearly understood when UNKRA was established that its activities might be extended into North Korea. This is no partisan activity; it is intended for the benefit of all the people of that unfortunate country. It is a most substantial effort to assist in the peaceful development of Korea, and it is not the United Nations which stands in the way of its operating in the entire country. 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 extraneous to the principle but essential to it.

One other matter in this connection. In his fifth point Mr. Molotov has mentioned the importance of creating conditions which would prevent the violation of the armistice agreement in Korea. That agreement has been approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Its conclusion marked the accomplishment of all that the United Nations ever undertook to do by armed force in Korea. The aggression had been repelled. Our business is to work for the establishment of a unified, democratic and free Korea and we must not be deflected from it. The armistice agreement is not an issue here. Its preamble clearly set forth its objective to "insure a complete cessation of hostilities and over all acts of armed force in Korea until a final peaceful settlement is achieved...."