

The Address—Mr. Coldwell

Then they went on to say that, in case we believe we can rely on our security because our side is making it first:

It is certain that the Russians will be able to make one too.

They added that it was indeed possible that the Russians were engaged at the present time in making such a bomb. Those of us who have had the privilege in this house of knowing something about atomic energy through visiting Chalk River and sitting on the committee that was set up and, I hope, will be re-established, and who followed the developments and the discussions on atomic energy since the first bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, can be under no illusions as to what or who has blocked an effective international control of atomic weapons until now. Putting it baldly, it has been the insistence of the Soviet union on complete national sovereignty and their refusal to agree on more than limited and therefore ineffective control and inspection by an international body under the United Nations. The new developments make the outlawing of atomic weapons more urgent than ever. But any outlawing of these weapons must be accompanied of course by effective control, effective inspection and control such as will remove any possibility of atomic weapons being made secretly in any country in the world. I say that up to the present time all efforts to achieve this desirable end have failed; but I believe that new attempts should be made to secure an agreement now. I say to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) that I believe Canada might take the initiative in this regard. At the same time, if that is done, it should be accompanied by a new crusade for world peace, which I believe can be secured to all mankind only by the abolition of war itself as an instrument of national policy. That was the idea behind the United Nations when it was organized. Now that the Russians at least have the atomic bomb and the monopoly on our side has gone, perhaps there may be greater chances of success in reaching an agreement than there were before; I do not know. But let us hope so. In any event it seems to me we are now faced with two alternatives: One is to despair, to organize our side of the iron curtain and engage in a furious and intolerable armament race; the other is to bend every effort to find an acceptable plan for international control and inspection, and proceed at the same time to remove from the world the age-old causes of war.

In support of the second alternative no less a person than the joint chairman of the United States congressional committee on atomic

[Mr. Coldwell.]

energy, Senator McMahon, has made a significant and worth-while proposal. He calculated that at the present time the United States is spending \$15 billion a year on armaments and war preparedness. He therefore proposed publicly the other day that the United States might begin by offering the world, through the United Nations, two-thirds of that sum for five years—and on two conditions: the first condition was a general acceptance of a satisfactory program for the effective control of atomic energy and, the second, an agreement by all countries, and enforced by inspection, that two-thirds of their present spending upon armaments would be devoted to constructive ends.

This proposal received amazing support, as I think, from members of all parties in the United States. Even an old and unyielding isolationist like Senator John Bricker of Ohio said this:

If we can get an agreement for air-tight control and true international inspection for \$50 billion, I would grab at the chance.

Senator McMahon said that he desired the development of atomic energy everywhere for peace and that he was prepared to give general economic aid and help to all countries which would accept the two conditions he made, and he included Russia. Then he added:

Such a global Marshall plan might combine with the marvellous power of peacetime energy to generate universal material progress and a universal co-operative spirit.

Such a proposal surely is one which, if we have the opportunity, Canada should support, both from the idealistic standpoint and, to place it on a lower level, for selfish reasons. Because of world impoverishment we face a grave crisis both in agriculture and in labour. It is no good saying that we should not fear. If we do not fear we may not find any solution, and indeed we may find ourselves in the position of the ostrich, with our heads buried and not seeing what is threatened around us.

I have said that this is a crisis in both agriculture and labour. But of course, in reality, the welfare of all Canadians is involved, and the problems faced by farmers and industrial workers are a part of a single problem, not two separate problems.

At present we are told, and told authoritatively, that only one-third of the world's two and a quarter billions of people receive sufficient food. The other two-thirds, as they did before the war, live on a marginal level of existence, a state of semi-starvation. We now have, as never before, the possibility of removing from men this age-old struggle against undeserved poverty, misery and want. That is what the right use of this challenging new power offers as the alternative—to what? —to war and mass destruction. Stealing across the world today, feeding on the misery