

dealing with satellites has given the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union an authoritarian approach with which the free world is totally unfamiliar. In contrast, the Secretary of State of the United States, while admitting that from his government's point of view the Indian draft resolution was not perfect, that he was concerned about some parts of it which, he said, required clarification, nevertheless suggested that, if we worked in harmony and goodwill, a solution could be found. I think it has been found in the Indian draft resolution.

When I spoke to this Committee a few days ago my delegation, through me, was searching for some method of approach, consistent with the basic principles which have motivated the United Nations negotiators at Panmunjom, which might bridge the gap which had developed with respect to the prisoner-of-war issue. It was, therefore, with real enthusiasm and renewed hope that the Canadian delegation, from the first, viewed the Indian initiative. We believed when the Indian draft resolution was first introduced, as we still believe today, that it was a practical and positive effort to implement the more important ideas which have been brought before this Committee with respect to the solution of the problem of prisoners of war, and my delegation regards the Indian proposals as the possible bridge which may provide for communication between the opposing views and which may lead to an understanding upon which real agreement can be based, an armistice concluded and the fighting brought to an end.

I believe that Mr. Menon and the delegation of which he is a member, including that distinguished lady, Mrs. Pandit, should be congratulated for the contribution which India has made to the work of this Committee and to the larger task of providing a possible basis for an armistice in Korea. As a representative of Canada, I was encouraged that such an initiative should be taken by the delegation of India, representing as it does a great Asian country which has such close geographical, cultural and historical ties with China. We believe that India's role in these weeks of discussion and deliberation can only facilitate the understanding so necessary if we are to achieve an armistice.

Let us first consider whether the Indian draft resolution is consistent with the principle of non-forcible repatriation. In the 21-power draft resolution, which my country co-sponsored, this principle is stated in the following terms:

"... the rights of all prisoners of war to an unrestricted opportunity to be repatriated and"... the avoidance of ... "the use of force in their repatriation".

Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Indian draft resolution embody in plain and unambiguous terms the principle on which the draft resolution itself and the proposals attached thereto are based. The first paragraph affirms the right of all prisoners of war - under the Geneva Convention of 1949, the well-established principles and practice of international law and the relevant provisions of the draft armistice agreement - to release and repatriation. The right of repatriation is admitted without equivocation.

The right of repatriation is one thing; the use of force in its implementation is something else. It is inconceivable to admit that such force was contemplated by those