

democratic countries the popularly-elected governments reflect the wishes and sentiments of the people who elect them; they do not represent an elite corps of rulers dictating to an imposing upon a majority given no opportunity to express their free will.

To get back to the problem of Korea. We face, in so far as my delegation is concerned, no question as to our own course. We have made constructive proposals and we await a proper reaction to them from the Communist side. The stand of the United Nations on the Korean matter is known to all. It was formally enunciated at the last session and in the opinion of my delegation it requires no further resolution to reaffirm it now.

What is the situation? After very careful consideration this Committee approved by a huge majority a proposal; it was not the United States proposal, as one would think from the remarks of the Foreign Minister for Czechoslovakia, but a proposal put forward and bearing the sponsorship of India, a proposal designed in all honesty to end the war by offering a fair solution to the vital problem of prisoners-of-war, which seemed to be the sole obstacle to the conclusion of an armistice.

That resolution called for the release of all prisoners-of-war to a Repatriation Commission consisting of Switzerland, Sweden, Poland and Czechoslovakia, which would effect their repatriation in accordance with the Geneva Conventions, but would not apply force to them. It clearly involved some concessions on the part of the sponsors of the original 21-Power Resolution. Its sincerity is demonstrated by the fact that this is a compromise resolution arrived at under the guidance and sponsorship of India, a great Asian state whose impartial devotion to the cause of world peace is surely not to be questioned, even by the representative of Czechoslovakia. Our position was not rigid. The Canadian delegation and the co-sponsors of the 21-Power Resolution were glad to accept and act upon the counsel of our Indian friends since we respect both their wisdom and their motives.

I was looking last night at the record of the debate when the representative of India, Mr. Menon, put forward the reasons for the resolution standing in his country's name. Mr. Menon, explaining before this Committee the intent of the resolution which was ultimately adopted by the General Assembly on December 3, pointed out that it acknowledges the principle that the Geneva Conventions provide for the right of repatriation of all prisoners-of-war and place upon each detaining power the obligation to repatriate prisoners of war and lay no obstacle in the way of their repatriation.

This should be emphasized. The principle of general release and repatriation of prisoners-of-war is not denied. Mr. Menon could not see, and neither could I, that the Geneva Conventions obligate any power to use force to move the prisoners-of-war. The spirit of the Conventions makes it clear that no violence should be done to prisoners. Under the resolution, all prisoners-of-war, without exception, would be delivered to the neutral Repatriation Commission.