

In the statement which I made on behalf of the Canadian delegation on 3 November I expressed the opinion that some provision would have to be made for the disposition of those prisoners of war who would forcibly resist repatriation. I said in part:

"...those prisoners of war who refused to leave the neutral area would still retain the right to have their repatriation completed if and when they wished, and meanwhile they would be held by the Protecting Powers, in a manner to be determined".

I am completely satisfied that paragraph 17 of the Indian proposals offers an acceptable method of approach to this problem. It proposes that if, at the end of a stated period, the Political Conference has not been able to provide for the future of some prisoners of war

"the responsibility for their care and maintenance and for their subsequent disposition shall be transferred to the United Nations which, in all matters relating to them, shall act strictly in accordance with international law".

This is a task for which the United Nations should and can take responsibility. Such a provision should satisfy all of us that no force, physical or mental, will be brought to bear upon an individual prisoner of war to cause him to be repatriated against his will.

A few days ago, the Prime Minister of India, commenting on the draft resolution, referred to it as

"a step in the right direction which, if accepted in the spirit in which we have put it forward, might well lead to the lightening of the tremendous burden that is oppressing humanity".

He continued:

"We have offered this resolution in all humility of spirit and I am happy that distinguished representatives of nations assembled in New York are viewing it with favour".

Commenting on the same draft resolution in this Committee, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union flatly rejected it and, if I may use the adverb, sarcastically referred to the discussions of the draft resolution as an academic exercise since, according to his information, the Chinese Government had already shown a negative attitude to the Indian proposals as a basis for an armistice.

On the one hand, therefore, we have the comments of a disciple of peace who, horrified at the mounting casualties of the Korean war, supports in all good faith and deep anxiety proposals which, if implemented, could lead to an honourable armistice; on the other, we have the Foreign Minister of a great power who, confronted with the same problem and the same solution, refuses to co-operate in the search for a peaceful settlement in Korea. Last year in Paris that same Foreign Minister laughed all night, he told us, over suggestions made for the solution of another problem. This year - and one can only say this in the light of his remarks during the last