

debate on the development and deployment of nuclear missiles is more essential precisely because of the difficulties of political control. And I think that the public in our countries is in fact aware of my basic opening statement and that their own individual security and their children's security have not by our collective wisdom been increased over the last couple of decades, but that it is in fact decreasing. And that is one of the reasons why we see the growth of the various peace movements in our countries.

I think that, as practicing politicians, or those of us who are, we have not been very successful in the handling of these peace movements or the handling of this wave of public concern. There is no doubt in my mind, certainly if I may speak for a second of the British political scene, that those who advocate the sort of unilateral solution are a tiny minority of public opinion and that was demonstrated during the general election because the Labour Party in Britain committed itself to just such a policy. In other words, they say that if we are elected the government we will not have cruise missiles in Britain whatever the outcome of the Geneva negotiations. And that was one of the main reasons why the Labour Party went down the plug hole in the election. That policy is not accepted by the broad mass of the population. However unpopular or uneasy people regard the future of having missiles stationed in the country, the fact is they are not prepared to renege on the 1979 major decision. We stuck by that in the Alliance parties and we pulled up to 25%, Labour went down to 27. What is interesting is that in the Labour leadership election, which is going on at the moment, the candidate who is advocating standing by that Labour policy of unilateralism is the one who is going to win and the Labour Party has