

Communists should not think, or try to make others think, that we are divided on this issue. We are not. I hope they will not subject themselves to the temptation to think that they can exploit our differences in this regard because on this matter we now stand united.

What follows if there is an armistice? Under the draft armistice agreement which we are discussing, there is to be a political conference to discuss Korean political matters and related matters. Now that of course becomes a United Nations responsibility and not the responsibility of any particular member of the United Nations, and is accepted by all of us as such. At the last meeting of the United Nations Assembly before we recessed, we passed a resolution which made it obligatory for the President of the Assembly to call the Assembly together as soon as an armistice agreement is signed, and that means presumably that the Assembly will then consider political questions arising out of that agreement.

If these political questions in regard to Korea can be satisfactorily solved -- and that is a big "if" -- then other Far Eastern questions can be considered. One of these of course -- there is no use trying to deceive ourselves -- is recognition of the Communist Government in Peking.

Our own position as a government on this matter is that it would be unwise to adopt any firm or final position now. I would not go beyond that except to say this: -- if, and I keep underlining these "if's" because "if's" loom large in international diplomacy these days -- if the Chinese Communists agree to an honourable armistice in Korea, which will end their aggression and bring about their withdrawal from Korea, and if they do not begin some other aggression in some other part of Asia, then we should agree, I think, that serious consideration can be given to the question of recognition in the light of all the facts at that time. I would not myself wish to go further than that but I think that we should in these circumstances go that far.

If we solve this problem and other specific problems, then there will remain, of course, the whole question, the ultimate question of Far Eastern and Pacific security. I think co-operation and collective security are just as necessary between the free states in the Pacific as in the Atlantic. Security, like peace, is indivisible. But that does not mean, of course, that security need be safe-guarded and strengthened by the same means in every part of the world. Conditions differ; so methods are bound to differ.

We have in the North Atlantic a closely knit group in which the same general conditions prevail. Inside that group we have built up habits of co-operations and free discussion. When we considered the North Atlantic pact, we knew whom we wanted in that pact, though we did not get everybody; and we knew the nature of our obligations and what we were defending ourselves against. At the present