

even report to the United Nations General Assembly as long as there was any possibility of the good offices committee completing its work satisfactorily. That was made clear by an amendment to the United States' resolution proposed by the delegate for Lebanon. Fourth, we were anxious to make it quite clear in this resolution that the work of mediation and conciliation could go on after the resolution passed, and indeed that that work would be given priority over any enforcement. We wanted to make it clear beyond doubt that, so far as the United Nations was concerned, we had not slammed any doors on anybody. And then finally we wanted to make it quite clear that this resolution did not give anybody any authority to take any action which he did not already possess. It certainly does not give the United Nations, or any agent of the United Nations in Asia, any power or right to use United Nations forces to liberate Asia from communism. The mandate of the United Nations in this operation remains the same, namely, to defeat aggression in Korea, and nothing else.

Having had these amendments put forward, and having received these clarifications from the United States delegation, which removed most of our doubts, we felt that to vote against this resolution, or to abstain in regard to it, would have been to refuse to accept as true the statement that the Chinese Government had participated in aggression--something we had no right to do without denying the justice of United Nations action in Korea. Furthermore, it would have meant breaking the unity of the western nations on an issue of timing and tactics. We did not take that course. We voted for the resolution, and I think we were right in doing so. Forty-four other countries, including every member of the North Atlantic alliance, agreed with us.

But we have made our view abundantly clear that this resolution does not give anyone on one side any shadow of excuse for rash and adventurous courses, or anyone on the other any shadow of excuse for refusing to discuss an ending of hostilities or a peaceful solution of this problem. Why should it? It was said at Lake Success by the Indian delegate, and it was said yesterday by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell): "You have now branded them as aggressors. How can you expect them to talk to you?" Well, they have been branding us in the United Nations as aggressors steadily for the last two or three months, and they have shown no reluctance to talk with us on their terms, or any feeling that we should not talk with them because they have called us aggressors in very rude and uncivilized tones. So I am optimistic, and I hope my optimism is justified, that the passing of our resolution will not be followed by the catastrophic consequences that some people sincerely believe will result.

We do not believe that by passing this resolution we are slamming the door to subsequent negotiation, or that the Government in Peking would have any justification for interpreting our action in this way. I hope, and I expressed this hope in my last statement at the United Nations before I came back to Ottawa, that whatever happened to this resolution--and it is now part of the law of the United Nations--the work of cease-fire, discussion and peaceful settlement, through the machinery provided in the