

*External Affairs*

by Italy of the present plan does not take place. Two months ago the minister spoke with a degree of hope that the Berlin conference might achieve something worth while, but his speech today indicated the failure of that conference. It seems that in the last year there has been a softening of the probability of war in a defrosted stalemate of the cold war.

What is the alternative to EDC? The *New York Times* has referred to an alternative plan to EDC on a number of occasions, but that alternative has not yet been placed before this House of Commons. I would ask the minister to set out in detail the meaning of the words he used this afternoon wherein he indicated that if EDC failed, some alternative would be available.

I come now to the question of atomic energy. The minister's remarks with regard to atomic energy indicated that no decision has been arrived at; he posed questions that indicated that the whole question is in a state of "questions unanswered". All of the nations have expressed a desire to do everything possible to avoid the possibility of atomic war. The powerful potentialities inherent in the explosion that took place in the Pacific within the last few days, and which apparently frightened not only the peoples of the world but the scientists as well, demand action in connection with atomic energy.

I should like the minister when replying to answer certain questions. What are our international obligations at the present time with regard to extending present knowledge of atomic energy along the lines of making industry a partner in its development? What are the terms under which an atomic pool is to be set up? What agency is to control the atomic pool? Is that agency to be within the United Nations? Is it to be a veto-less agency so that it will not be emasculated before it is set up? Who is to determine the nations that are to contribute to that pool? Those are questions to which I think the people have a right to have answers even before the general set-up enters the blueprint stage.

Is Canada giving consideration to the British plan as an alternative to the Eisenhower plan whereby an international bank would be set up in which materials and scientists would be available in every country possessing fissionable materials and scientists? Would such an organization be set up separate from the United Nations or within its ambit? These are questions which today exercise the hearts and minds of men, realizing as they

do the terrible possibilities of that new hydrogen bomb with the explosive capacity, according to press reports, of four million tons of TNT. Is the minister in a position to say the degree to which the U.S.S.R. has tentatively agreed with Mr. Dulles to certain principles being accepted and adopted to the end that mass destruction of mankind will be avoided and prevented?

One other question was dealt with in January to which the minister has made no reference and which I think comes peculiarly within his competence. It is one that has been spoken of spasmodically in the house, namely, to what degree is Canada willing to trade with the U.S.S.R.? The minister stated today that no possibilities for peace should be denied. I think that Canadians will be in agreement that the proffered hand of friendship in trade should not be turned down without reason. But the experience of the last few years is bound to raise in the minds of those to whom the hand is extended the fear that deception and fraud and not honesty are behind the moves being made by the U.S.S.R. in offering to trade.

There has been little change in the attitude of the U.S.S.R. in the last year. Many felt that after Malenkov came into power things would change for the better. Purges are taking place today on an even greater scale, so far as their leadership is concerned, than during the last several years of the Stalin regime. Stalin's summary of diplomacy still remains as true under Malenkov as it did when he stated that "sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."

The people in the western provinces and farmers generally in this country are asking what are the possibilities for agricultural trade. Some argue trade with the U.S.S.R. would afford a means of getting rid of our surplus farm products. What is the attitude of the government with regard to this question? Has the government ascertained, through its representatives in the U.S.S.R., that while industrialization has proceeded apace under the five-year plans agriculture has proven to be a failure? Collectivization in agriculture, according to opinion worthy to judge, has failed in the U.S.S.R. because the vitality of individual effort has been squeezed out by communization.

Records published within the last four or five weeks show that between 1945 and 1952 industrial production in the U.S.S.R. has multiplied. As examples of this, pig iron has increased from 9 million metric tons to 19.4 million; steel from 11 million to 27.3 million tons; coal from 14.9 to 26 million tons, and