

a well planned full-scale invasion, that the Southern forces were deployed on a wholly defensive basis and were taken completely by surprise.*

On June 26, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson, made his first report to the House of Commons on what had happened in Korea and the action taken by the Security Council on June 25. Mr. Pearson also reported that steps were being taken to ensure that the safety of Canadians in Korea was being cared for.

At noon on June 27, President Truman issued a statement which said that "the attack upon Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that Communism has gone beyond the point of subversion to conquer independent nations and will make use of armed invasion and war."† Because the resolution passed by the Security Council in an effort to restore peace had been defied the President stated that he had "ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support".

At 3.00 p.m. on June 27 the Security Council met again to consider the reports received from the Korean Commission. In view of the failure of the North Koreans to heed the Council's resolution of June 25, a further resolution was passed by a vote of seven to one (Yugoslavia), with two abstentions (India and Egypt) and one absence (U.S.S.R.), recommending that "the members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area."‡ India later gave its support to this resolution.

On June 28, Mr. Pearson reported again to the House of Commons on Korean developments.** He said that, although Canada did not have a vote in the Security Council, "the House will support, as indeed does the Government, the action taken by the Security Council because it represents collective action through the United Nations for peace". The United States had acted "not only in accordance with the spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations, but also in pursuance of the resolution which was adopted by the Security Council on Sunday (June 25)". Mr. Pearson explained that the Charter of the United Nations had intended that such an act of aggression be met "by the despatch of forces put at the disposal of the Security Council by member governments as the result of prior agreements". Since agreement on the forces to be put at the disposal of the Security Council had proved impossible, the responsibility for checking aggression had to be shouldered "by individual members of the Security Council acting within the terms of the Charter, but on their own initia-

*See Appendix 8.

†See Appendix 5.

‡See Appendix 6.

**See Appendix 7.