

Even cursory examination of a plan of this kind makes its unacceptability quite obvious. It looked to us like a snare and a delusion. Indeed we wondered whether it was really meant to be accepted, at least in that form. It is certainly unrealistic to the point of absurdity to think that two sides which fear and hate each other as much as do North Korea and South Korea, after fighting each other viciously if indecisively for years, should sit down amicably and work together for an all-Korean commission, on a fifty-fifty basis, with each side having a veto over the decisions of the commission and in that way produce a new Korea by free elections. Of course we pointed out the weakness and indeed the impracticability of this plan, but the questions which we addressed to the other side were unanswered.

Indeed it is clear that this is a scheme designed to provide for the establishment of an interim government, along the pattern of the communist proposals in Germany, in which the communist representatives would hold the power of veto. In other words, the commission would operate as the communist members wished it to operate or not at all. We all know, of course, that this is the familiar first step in the establishment of communist dictatorship through the perversion of democratic procedures.

We might have accepted the impossibility of this scheme without any further argument and, pinning the responsibility squarely where it belongs, namely on the communists who were putting forward this scheme, called the conference off on that issue. But most of the United Nations delegations--indeed, I think all of them--felt that they should put forward their own proposals and their own views as to what would constitute a good Korean settlement. For that purpose, Mr. Chairman, I should like to put on the record the Canadian views of what should be done to reach that desirable objective, or in other words the basic principles which we think should underlie any agreement for a free democratic and united Korea. If I may just enumerate them briefly, those principles are as follows:

First, a unified Korea should preserve the state structure for Korea which has been endorsed by the United Nations, with such constitutional changes as might be necessary to establish an all-Korean government.

Second, the people of Korea should be given an opportunity to express their views as to their future government and for that purpose there should be held, with a minimum of delay, free and fair elections for a national assembly and possibly also for a president.

Third, the conditions for such elections should include equitable representation by population over the whole of Korea.

Fourth, to ensure that such elections should be fair and free, they should be supervised by an international agency agreed on, if possible, by the Geneva Conference but acceptable to the United Nations. In order to ensure maximum objectivity--and that is going quite a long way to meet the views of the other side--