

resolutions were tabled on this subject, one by the United States for the seating of a representative of South Korea, and one by Syria for the seating of representatives from both the North and the South. The United States resolution was adopted by a vote of 44 in favour (including Canada), 5 against, (the Soviet bloc), and 9 abstentions. The Syrian resolution was defeated by 14 in favour, 34 against, and 10 abstentions, (including Canada).

### Question of Unification

The subsequent debate on the question of unification was based on a draft resolution sponsored by the United States Delegation. This resolution which started the broad objectives of the United Nations, provided as follows: it noted the report of UNCURK; recalled that in approving the report of the 15 nations participating for the United Nations in the Geneva Conference of 1954, the General Assembly had expressed the hope that it would soon prove possible to make progress toward a unified, independent, and democratic Korea under a representative form of government; noted that the Armistice Agreement of July 27, 1953 would remain in force until it had been expressly superseded by mutually acceptable amendments or by an agreement reached at a general political conference; reaffirmed the Assembly's intention to continue to seek an early solution to the Korean question in accordance with United Nations objectives; and urged that continuing efforts be made to achieve these objectives. Finally, the resolution requested the Secretary-General to place the Korean item on the provisional agenda of the Eleventh General Assembly.

Speaking in favour of the United States draft resolution, the Canadian representative, Mr. Paul Martin, said that while Canada was disappointed that more progress on the unification question had not been achieved, it was necessary to recognize that quick solutions could not be expected. He pointed out that the fundamental difficulty regarding the conduct of free and democratic elections as part of the unification process could be traced to the system of government in North Korea. It had to be recognized that so long as totalitarian Communist principles obtained these in undiluted form, it would be extremely difficult to arrange free elections—the essential act in the formation of truly representative government. He did not wish to imply, Mr. Martin said, that it was impossible to unify by free elections countries in which one part was under Communist domination, but only to point out that it would be inadvisable to ignore the difficulties that arose from the nature of the situation in divided countries, and to establish positions which did not take the existing realities into consideration. Canada stood by the position which it took at the Geneva Conference in 1954 but was prepared to examine the problem with an open mind, and stood ready to consider any new proposals which might be advanced by either side in the dispute. Mr. Martin thought some distinction could and should be drawn between conceptions of the United Nations as the organizer of the armed defence of Korea and that of the United Nations as a peace-maker. It would not amount to the condoning of aggression for the United Nations to take into account the position of both sides in its endeavour to bring about unification.

Another draft resolution, which was submitted by India, was concerned with the problem of the resettlement of ex-prisoners of the Korean war. This