

*Supply—External Affairs*

Then, General Pearkes also pointed out that it should be understood that any United Nations responsibility for West Berlin would be complementary to the present rights and obligations of the four occupying powers. These views stated by General Pearkes correspond in some particulars with proposals made on February 12, 1959, by Senator Mansfield. I do not propose to go into Senator Mansfield's proposals. One or two may not be acceptable, but I believe that some of them deserve the careful study of those whose immediate responsibility it is, as members of a government, to find some solution to this difficult situation.

What I have said is all I have to say now about Germany and Berlin. Along with the government, I recognize the seriousness of this situation. I recognize the understandable irritation that all free people of the world must have with the constant succession of events which seem to indicate the success of Soviet union diplomacy. It is no wonder that one hears it being said constantly, when are we going to stop this continuous advancement of the Soviet union. That is understandable when we have to face into this situation. The Soviet union cannot be allowed to go on endlessly interfering with other countries and other people in their determination to see that their philosophy becomes the dominant philosophy and the dominant form of human society.

While this is so, at the same time we have to think of the consequences of actions which would provoke a world nuclear war. It is the balance between that situation and the present one that presents us with the serious problem which confronts us at the moment. The Secretary of State for External Affairs characterized the announcement—it was not by the Soviet union but by the United States itself—of an explosion of a nuclear bomb by the Soviet union as a most tragic situation coming, as it did, before a formal break-up of the Geneva test talks, certainly after some 300 meetings, thus giving the lie to the Soviet union, in the attempt to try to get an agreement on a matter which if successful might have led to the possibilities of a comprehensive agreement on disarmament in conventional and nuclear weapons. It may be that the announcement to commence testing by the Soviet union is intimately related to the Berlin crisis. It may be part of the Soviet union's over-all scheme to create a crisis atmosphere among western public opinion that would force our governments into a move which would bargain away rights and make concessions. I do not believe the Soviet union has been successful in this. Certainly it has aroused even some of the most neutral among the neutral nations.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs referred to the statements of Mr. Nehru and President Nasser, and of course there are statements of other leaders indicating their grave concern with that decision of the Soviet union. But we ourselves cannot escape a responsibility in these matters. The declared position of the Canadian government today as on other occasions during the past twelve months is that we are in favour of a ban on nuclear weapon tests with or without controls. That position of the Canadian government was reiterated today, but I would point out that it is not the position of the government of the United States. Undoubtedly the government of the United States has done everything within its power to arrive at an agreement, but they are in favour of a test with controls above and under the ground.

We are all agreed with regard to the criticism of and the indictment that has been levelled against the Soviet union for the initiative it took in exploding a nuclear bomb in Asia. It is now suggested that possibly another will be exploded in the Arctic. But I should like to know what step the Canadian government has taken to indicate, in the ways that are open, through diplomatic techniques and other methods, our deep displeasure first of all with the Soviet union. That, of course, was done by the Prime Minister in his speech. If I recall correctly—I may be wrong in this—the Prime Minister said that no other form of opposition or complaint had been registered. He may conclude it would be useless. In any event, I hope that at the United Nations we will take our place and indicate to the Soviet union its responsibility not only for the failure of the test talks but for the further regression of progress in the matter of disarmament. But have we intimated to the United States our regret that they found it necessary to carry on tests, even though there is provision for an absence of radioactive consequences because the tests are to take place in the laboratory and underground?

Our position, as stated today, is that we are against tests. While the minister did not say whether or not we are against tests with or without control, we are against tests. I presume the minister was stating the situation as he believes it to be and as he understands government policy. However, if I read correctly the speeches made by the Minister of National Defence, I find a different emphasis. It could be that this emphasis is misunderstood. I have read particularly the speech made by the minister in Toronto the other day. I find it difficult to reconcile the statements made by both ministers with regard to this matter. The Secretary of State for External Affairs said he understood the attitude of the United States is being forced