

...and if the opportunity then occurs, to negotiate with the aggressors...

Later in the same speech he said:

Appeasement in itself may be good or bad according to the circumstances. Appeasement from weakness and fear is alike futile and fatal. Appeasement from strength is magnanimous and noble, and might be the surest and perhaps the only path to world peace.

The United Nations in Korea, as events have now shown is, thanks primarily to the magnificent effort of the United States, not weak or frightened, and it is getting stronger. From that strength I think it will always be wise to negotiate, to "appease", to use Mr. Churchill's words, in order to bring this diversionary and weakening struggle to an end on honourable terms as soon as possible.

One of the vehicles for this so-called appeasement was the United Nations cease-fire committee, on which I had the honour to be associated with the president of the assembly, Mr. Entezam of Iran and Sir Benegal Rau, the Indian delegate. I assure you in taking on that work I was no volunteer. I was the victim of conscription, because it was not a job which anyone would willingly choose. I do not intend today to go into the details of the work of that committee, but there are some things about this particular initiative which I should like to make clear.

In some quarters it has been assumed that this was a sterile, if not dangerous, exercise undertaken by naive idealistic persons merely to placate Asian opinion. It is quite true that the Asian countries had taken the lead in suggesting that a committee should be set up to determine the basis upon which a satisfactory cease-fire could be arranged. It is also true that many other members of the United Nations, including Canada, had been anxious, whenever possible, to take advice from Asian countries as to the best method of restoring peace in the Far East.

I should like to point out, however, that the resolution to establish the cease-fire committee secured the support of all members of the United Nations with the exception of the Soviet bloc. The United States in particular actively assisted and encouraged the members of our committee in their work. The task of the committee was an up-hill one, and often a frustrating one. In one article which I read not long ago we were referred to as three men in search of a cease-fire. Our search was not successful. After we had secured from the Unified Command in Washington a basis for stopping the fighting which we thought reasonable, we tried to enter into effective contact with the People's Government at Peking. But for a long time our efforts were unavailing, and I must say were not treated even with very great politeness.

However, on December 21, the Chinese foreign minister broadcast a reply to our approaches in which he claimed the cease-fire committee had been illegally constituted. He demanded that negotiations for a political settlement should precede rather than follow a cease-fire