

In seeking to repair the "shattered state of Korea" the Canadian Delegate urged that the UN should not be forever bound by formulas established in the past and that in negotiating a political settlement all those in Korea who must be a party to the settlement should participate in the negotiations even though "we remain duly sceptical of the good faith of the North Koreans". In conclusion, Dr. MacKay stated that the United States resolution seemed consistent with the principles he had outlined. "It urges us to continue looking for a means of achieving the objective of unification; it insists on those fundamental principles which, as I have stated, must be the basis of a settlement; and it does not preclude negotiations for a settlement which should satisfy the legitimate demands of all concerned".

The resolution was adopted by the Committee by a vote of 56 in favour, 8 against (Soviet bloc) and 13 abstentions (Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan and Syria).

During the course of the general debate which followed the resolution's adoption, the Canadian position was frequently quoted with approval and the general tenor of the discussion was one of moderation. The resolution was approved on January 11 by a vote of 57 in favour, 8 against and 9 abstentions.

The text of Dr. MacKay's speech was as follows:

It is a matter of regret to us all, I have no doubt, that the prospect of the unification of Korea into a single free and peaceful state is not much closer this year than when we last discussed the subject. As we have said before, however, we must recognize that it will take time to reduce the tensions and allay the passions which are the inevitable result of so bitter and tragic a conflict. We should not relax our efforts to promote a settlement, but we should not despair because this has not yet been achieved. We may rejoice in fact that the armistice has been maintained and that the Korean people have been able to devote their remarkable energies to the economic rehabilitation and development of their country and—in the South—to hold elections, the results of which prove that there was a vigorous exercise of the right to vote freely. We only wish that it were possible to note with satisfaction economic and political progress in the North as well or even some reflection of the restless hunger for independence which has been a notable feature of many other Communist regimes during the past year. Unfortunately, it is still very difficult to note any thing at all about North Korea, but what little information does reach the light of day is not encouraging.

Last year the Canadian representative made a plea in this Committee for a practical and flexible approach to the problem of unification of Korea. I do not wish to repeat what was said at that time in detail, but I would like to say that my Delegation is as much convinced as it was at that time that the United Nations must not allow any unreasonable stubbornness to stand in the way of negotiations which might lead to a settlement. Stubborn we must be in insisting on certain principles fundamental to unification. This must be a union freely entered into and must establish in the words of the United Nations objectives stated in Geneva, "a unified, independent, and democratic Korea under a representative form of government". The United Nations cannot under any circumstances agree to a union achieved by political subterfuge or one in which the rights of the majority were less than that of a minority. On the means of achieving such a union, however, we need not be so rigid. It is the end result not the means of achieving it which matters.