

principle by obscuring this essential matter, and so long as the Communists refuse to recognize the position of the United Nations forces, it would be misleading to talk about agreement in principle.

In the fourth place, Mr. Molotov has raised the question of a supervisory commission. As the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs stated recently in the House of Commons, we believe that Korean elections "should be supervised by an international agency agreed on, if possible, by the Geneva Conference but acceptable to the United Nations". Mr. Pearson went on to say "In order to ensure maximum objectivity - and that is going quite a long way to meet the views of the other side - we felt that this supervisory agency might consist of nations which did not belong to the Communist bloc and which did not participate in military operations in Korea". It cannot be said that our attitude on this is rigid - we are prepared to go a long way to make sure that such a commission is genuinely neutral. We believe that it is possible that countries which are accustomed to approach international problems freely and objectively can provide neutral supervision. The role played by the Indian military representatives in the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission is a good example of the kind of assistance which can be obtained from countries of good-will. In the NNRC the Indian members were by no means always in agreement with the United Nations Command, but we did not question the honesty of their intentions or their integrity. This is what we mean when we talk of international neutral supervision. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Molotov has betrayed what he means by supporting the proposal that the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission which at present exists in Korea should be duplicated for the purpose of supervising Korean elections. There is little further that need be said on the subject than has been said already by Mr. Bedell Smith and in the report of the Swiss and Swedish members of the Commission on the behaviour of their Czechoslovak and Polish colleagues. If by a neutral international commission Mr. Molotov means a commission which includes such totally unneutral nations as Poland and Czechoslovakia, it is clear that we are not agreed in principle and should not say that we are. Furthermore, we cannot talk about agreement in principle on such a commission unless we have determined not only its composition but also its function. If we are to agree to the principle of such a commission, we would agree only on the establishing of a commission with real powers to make certain that freedom of choice exists for the electors in all parts of Korea. This question of function is in no sense a detail which could be put off for subsequent discussion, because it is basic to the principle itself.

What in this connection do the Communists mean by "supervision"? Would the Commission which they envisage merely observe the elections or would it have the power and the means to correct conditions which interfere with the proper conduct of the elections? Would it be competent to appoint scrutineers? Would it assist the all-Korean body in maintaining law and order before and during the elections? In short would it be a powerless excrescence or would it have an active and useful role to play in ensuring fair play and a free choice of representatives by the electorate?