

break down in failure and futility. There is every reason why they should not. If they can only succeed in taking one step forward that would do something to remove that fear in the world which is the father of armaments.

It may also be, and I do not want to go into the details of this, that the introduction of the H-bomb into these discussions has really brought in a new element, and it may be that all of us will have to take a new look at this problem. The approach we have been making in the past has depended for any success on an agreement over a complete and foolproof system of international control. That is going to be more difficult than ever in the light of these new weapons which lend themselves even less than previous weapons did to such inspection and control. But without some kind of control and inspection which would give us a basis for confidence in any agreements reached being observed, any disarmament proposals under the present circumstances of fear and contention would merely be a cruel and hypocritical delusion and could be put forward only for propaganda.

The stakes are too high in this matter to call any discussions off quickly. We are told by scientists there is no means of ensuring complete or even adequate defence against these nuclear weapons and the means of carrying and dropping them on great masses of people. Therefore we must concentrate more than ever not only, I suggest, on the limitation of armaments, important though that may be, but in the search for measures which will prevent war itself. What is certain is that the control of our power to destroy ourselves is a subject of such desperate importance that if either side should use it as a means of propaganda or counter propaganda it would be utter folly and might be supreme tragedy.

There are some who get comfort out of the conclusion that those new weapons are so annihilating that no side will dare use them if, it is certain that the other side will retaliate and has preserved the means to do so against surprise destruction. It was said by an authority whose words we always respect, I refer to Sir Winston Churchill, in the House of Commons in London the other day:

"It was an ironic fact that we had reached a stage where safety might well be the child of terror and life the twin brother of annihilation."

In other words, according to this view peace instead of resting on a balance of power now rests on a balance of terror. I think that in one sense it is true that the greatest deterrent against a general war, although not against a limited one, is the certainty of nuclear retaliation. In present circumstances that may be our best safeguard. If that is true it may give us some time which can and must be used for continuing the persistent and patient search for the solution to international problems and for the easing of international tensions. If we do not find such agreement and understanding then peace, such as it is, will be balanced on a hydrogen bomb or, to use