

Third, because in our opinion the Asian resolution gives too much room for further long-drawn-out and inconclusive discussion before a cease-fire can be arranged and subsequent political discussion takes place.

Fourth, because it does not give previous recognition to United Nations resolutions or action in respect of Korea and in that respect may be interpreted as placing the Peking Government and the United Nations itself almost on the same moral and political footing.

Fifth, because reasonably satisfactory machinery for cease-fire and political negotiation is included in the United States draft resolution.

We cannot vote against the Asian resolution however because, although it does not embody, as we see it, a suitable and definite programme for a cease-fire and effective discussion which would minimize delay and evasion, it nevertheless does emphasize the necessity of discussion and peaceful settlement and it does embody the principle that a cease-fire must precede discussion. Therefore my delegation will abstain on this resolution either as a substitute for or as supplementary to the United States draft resolution.

We shall vote for the United States draft resolution for the following reasons:

- (1) Because the Lebanese amendments, which we strongly support, remove our doubts about the wisdom of certain provisions of the unamended draft;
- (2) Because its finding that the Peking Government, by helping those already designated as aggressors in Korea, has engaged in aggressive action itself in Korea, states in moderate terms facts which we cannot reject without condemning our own intervention in Korea; nevertheless we still feel that it is premature and unwise to confront the Committee with the necessity for a decision on these facts at this particular moment and, as we see it, the methods of peaceful negotiation before condemnation have not yet been completely exhausted;
- (3) Because this resolution with the Lebanese amendment does not close the door to peaceful negotiation; on the contrary it very rightly emphasizes that even a report on collective measures is to be subordinated to the work of the Good Offices Group; it supports the doctrine of the Charter that mediation, conciliation and peaceful settlement should always have priority over enforcement action;
- (4) Because the statement of the United States representative last Saturday was frank and unequivocal in agreeing that this draft resolution gave no one any authority in Korea or the far east which he did not already possess under United Nations resolutions;
- (5) Finally, because, 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 that way.