

in good faith offer proposals which could achieve a cease-fire and therefore make possible a political settlement.

This unity of purpose cannot be ignored or challenged, no matter how able the advocate in opposition. It has been strengthened by a frank interchange of ideas within and outside the Fifth Committee, during the course of the past two weeks or so. If the Chinese and North Korean Command at Panmunjom - and those who profess to speak on their behalf in this Committee - are realists to any degree, they must recognize the strength of this unity.

It seems to us that there is no better indication of our good faith and desire to reach an armistice than the eagerness with which we have been willing to explore all possible avenues which might lead to the settlement of the prisoner-of-war issue. That open-minded approach was taken by the first speaker in the debate on the Korean question, Mr. Acheson himself. Twenty-one powers - one third of the states members of the United Nations - agreed to sponsor a draft resolution affirming their belief in a moral principle. Mexico submitted a draft resolution inspired by the highest humanitarian motives. Peru also offered its contribution to the common cause. Other delegations - one thinks, for example, of the Israel delegation - offered suggestions the purpose of which was to assist the Committee in its attempts to find a solution to the central problem of the prisoners of war.

We also have before us certain Soviet Union amendments. I do not propose at this time to make any observations - except of a very brief and general character - on these amendments. Since, however, they have been referred to by the representatives of Australia and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. I would simply say this: When the Chairman makes his ruling as to the amendments, I take it there will be ample opportunity to discuss whether or not they are in order and whether they would vitiate the main decision of this Committee to give priority to the Indian draft resolution. For a careful examination of the Soviet Union amendments will reveal that at least some of the paragraphs proposed as amendments are not now amendments at all: rather, they are word-for-word reproductions of the phraseology used in the draft resolution presented some days ago by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. It would certainly be unfortunate if we were to allow yesterday's decision to be nullified by a clever device, the full particulars and strategy of which are not immediately clear. When we come to discuss the various paragraphs of the Soviet Union proposals, I may ... have something to say.

Finally, the Indian delegation has come forward with a draft resolution which, taken as a whole, in my delegation's judgment provides a practical solution of the issue, a solution consistent with principle.

Set against these positive efforts to achieve a workable solution, we have had most remarkable illustrations of Communist intransigence in the attacks made by the Soviet Union and its satellites on the Indian draft resolution - and, indeed, on all other draft resolutions before the Committee except those put forward by Mr. Vyshinsky.

The Soviet Union representative's statement was not, it seemed to me, that of a man seeking a solution but that of a man who had come here to dictate a solution. The habit of