

least tolerable terms, is possible, but a sober realization that it may only be possible if our own policies and actions make it so, by their wisdom, steadiness and firmness.

"Co-existence" must, of course, be viewed in the light of its alternatives. If we accept the view at the outset that "co-existence" can be nothing but a snare and delusion, to be spurned at all costs and that those who are willing to examine it should be investigated as security risks then we are driven logically to the thesis of the inevitability of an atomic war, whether of aggression or prevention; to the conclusion that co-existence must lead to "co-destruction". Such a grim and despairing view would restrict the area of human control, to not much more than deciding where and when the global smash-up is to take place.

If however we refuse to accept the inevitability of "co-destruction", and to deny to ourselves any power over our own destinies, we can best meet the challenge of "co-existence" by considering sincerely, without easy illusions, but without passionate prejudice - whether or how we can convert it into some form of co-operation.

In meeting the challenge in this way we cannot afford - indeed it would be most foolish - to reduce our strength or relax our vigilance. But neither should we adopt an attitude of defeatism, or a posture of provocation.

As I see it, we must seek to get what advantage we can out of the present situation without prejudicing our safety or surrendering our principals; accepting the imperative need to work toward something better than a situation where humanity resembles two scorpions in a bottle, co-existing only because each knows that the other can sting it to death.

This positive policy can, at the present time, be applied both generally and to specific areas of tensions. It requires that we should be hard-headed but open-minded about recent moves in Soviet policy, which seem to be conciliatory. It requires that we should go half-way, or even beyond that point in order to meet these overtures, with a view to seeing - to testing by concrete proposals whether a basis can be found on which the issues that now so tragically divide the world might be solved; remembering, however, as we move forward, that there may be a point of no return!

One example of the kind of realistic, yet flexible and forward-looking policy I have in mind is provided by recent discussions at the United Nations Assembly on disarmament. For the first time since 1946 the Western Powers and the Soviet Union, by their joint sponsorship of a resolution proposed by the Canadian delegate, your neighbour from Windsor, Mr. Paul Martin, have agreed on a common approach to the study of this vital question. That is a development of importance. Agreement on a common procedural approach is a long way from an agreement on substance. Nevertheless we are now in a better position to find out whether such agreement on substance is possible, and to attach responsibility for failure if it is not possible.

The Western powers are sometimes taxed with the charge of inconsistency in this matter, because at the very time that we are actively pursuing the goal of disarmament