

No prisoner-of-war would be held back as a result of any previous screening, and the Commission would be obliged to see that no prisoner was subjected to any form of coercion. What could be fairer?

Mr. Vyshinsky thinks that under these circumstances very few prisoners would express an unwillingness to return. If so, well and good. We would not object. But we disagree with Mr. Vyshinsky's estimate of the number of prisoners who would be unwilling to return under these circumstances. In any event, why not put it to the test? That question was asked by Mr. Selwyn Lloyd several times during the debates last fall and we never really received a satisfactory reply.

I think I am constrained to say, in view of the statement just made by the Foreign Minister for Czechoslovakia, that the resolution put forward by the General Assembly on December 3 was by no means the dictum of a clique of closely collaborating States. It certainly was not, as the Foreign Minister for Poland said yesterday, an ultimatum put forward by one great Power. To say, however, that it had the approval of fifty-four countries seems to me a lifeless cipher, and I am sure it is a lifeless cipher to the Foreign Minister for Czechoslovakia.

In order to realize the very broad measure of support which accrues to our stand in this matter, it is instructive to look at the list of countries which joined in approval of the General Assembly's proposal, countries from North and South America, Africa, Europe and Asia. The Foreign Minister for Czechoslovakia said, if I understood his words correctly, that the resolution was a formal mechanical one with a mechanical majority. He also said that it was an illegal resolution, in that it was contrary to the conscience of mankind. Because his words may go to many places, let us see whether or not this resolution does not really give the character of the sponsorship it had in full measure. The representative of Czechoslovakia was not here last fall and I would remind him that this resolution was supported by Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi-Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yeman and Yugoslavia. Surely there lies the conscience of mankind.

Every nation around this table but six voted in favour of the Indian resolution; and of the six, one nation abstained. Only the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic voted against this resolution which the Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia said was formal and mechanical, the dictum of a clique of closely-collaborating States. But the recital of the names of the nations that I have given means that a great majority judgment was made on what would be a just method of resolving the