

Government of China could not agree to this principle. So that there is not a long past history of consistent Communist insistence on immediate and unconditional cease-fire. Why did not the Soviet Union representative support these proposals of the cease-fire committee and raise his hand so that we could have had peace at that time?

Mr. Vyshinsky's call for an immediate cease-fire in Korea, which is of course echoed as a propaganda theme by the followers of Soviet Communism, is a crude attempt to exploit the desire for peace in Korea without providing a practical and adequate means of achieving it.

A cease-fire which does not resolve the prisoner-of-war issue would be an empty gesture. Mr. Vyshinsky would like to pretend that the General Assembly resolution of December 3, 1952 does not provide for an immediate cease-fire. But let us see what the facts are. The General Assembly resolution refers in specific terms to an immediate cease-fire. Acceptance of the resolution would not only provide a basis for solution of the prisoner-of-war issue; it would bring about a cease-fire within twelve hours of the signature of the draft armistice agreement which has so laboriously been worked out. Article 12 of the draft armistice agreement provides as follows:

"The Commanders of the opposing sides shall order and enforce a complete cessation of all hostilities in Korea by all armed forces under their control, including all units and personnel of the ground, naval, and air forces, effective twelve (12) hours after this Armistice Agreement is signed."

Further, the draft armistice agreement contains detailed provisions essential to achieve an effective and durable cease-fire, for its implementation and control. A cease-fire in the context of the draft armistice agreement would not be a mere declaration of intention, such as Mr. Vyshinsky's raising of hands, but a firm and secure cease-fire with adequate safeguards for its maintenance.

While I am dealing with the subject of prisoners-of-war in Korea, I should like to ask the Soviet Union representative whether he has any explanation for the unwillingness of the North Korean and Chinese Communists to exchange immediately sick and wounded prisoners-of-war in accordance with the Geneva Conventions. I have had occasion before in this Committee to refer to the Communist Command's refusal to adhere to the Geneva Conventions -- notably, to the provisions regarding the proper disposition of prisoner-of-war camps, the granting to prisoners of facilities for communication with their families, and receipt by prisoners of relief parcels. The United Nations Command from the outset made known that it was prepared to abide by the Geneva Conventions with regard to prisoners-of-war.