

Well, we are friends of the United States. We are friends in spite of the fact that we are also neighbours. Canada and the United States have lived side by side for nearly two centuries. We have had our difficulties as neighbours do, but we know from a hundred years of experience that this great and this smaller nation can live together without fear and in mutual respect. We are proud of our friendship and proud of our example. Our only wish is that the United Nations could see established the same confident and friendly relationship between all nations. If such a basis of mutual trust and respect could be made universal, this body would be truly the United Nations.

By all odds, the most important, most explosive, and probably the most difficult question we face is Korea.

As we shall, before long, be discussing Korea in Committee, I think that the Assembly would do well to follow the example so wisely given us by Mr. Acheson yesterday. I shall therefore confine my remarks on this aspect of our problems to one or two general observations at this time.

Last year the Assembly voted to defer consideration of the Korean items on its agenda until a military armistice had been achieved or until other developments made further consideration of the problem desirable. The good sense of that proposal was realized by the overwhelming majority who saw that a solution would not be facilitated by an angry exchange of charge and counter-charge. Now that four of the five points of disagreement outstanding have been resolved, and only one issue divides the negotiators at Panmunjom, I profoundly hope that we at this Assembly will not complicate the task of the United Nations negotiators. Theirs is a thankless task, and yet one for which we should render thanks to those members of the Unified Command whose patience has been so sorely tried in these past months and in which they have ably represented the United Nations.

My delegation will take it as a fundamental premise that present hostilities must be limited to the Korean peninsula and that the search for an orderly settlement of those hostilities by negotiation at Panmunjom must be continued. The United Nations intervened in Korea for the sole purpose of resisting and defeating aggression. That was - and is - its sole purpose. We would regard that purpose as having been achieved through an honourable truce negotiated on the basis of the present battle lines and if I may say so again, addressing my remarks to the last speaker. Whose territory, whose security is threatened by this proposition? Why, then, can we not agree?

One issue alone is holding up a truce. Surely it should not be beyond the resources of human intelligence and patience on both sides to find, consistent with principle, a way to resolve this sole remaining sticking point if there is a real desire on both sides to come to an agreement. The most recent proposals of the Unified Command should have gone a long way towards convincing all who bring an impartial mind to the examination of the question that the desire for agreement is deep and genuine on our side.

From whatever point of view we approach this problem of achieving an armistice in Korea, we must never allow ourselves to accept the continuation of the fighting for one day longer than necessary to achieve the principles for which the United Nations went into Korea.