

of the world's history has ever had a better neighbor, and, secondly, what nation in all creation has a better neighbor now?

Honourable senators, it is my intention now to deal with the international situation, and more particularly our attitude *vis-à-vis* Soviet Russia. I have made several trips to Europe, the Middle East and Asia, and on each of such trips I have studied the national and international situation with respect to those countries. Hitler stated clearly in his book *Mein Kampf* the way he would conquer the world. Yet, nobody believed what he wrote: I did not believe it myself. Sir Winston Churchill was the only great statesman of the West who believed what Hitler wrote, and he warned the democratic countries of the dangers forecast in that book. The United States was lukewarm about entering the fray, but Roosevelt was sympathetic to the Allied cause. Until the Americans got caught at Pearl Harbour it was hard for them to believe that such a thing could happen. These facts demonstrate well the need for being prepared for any eventuality.

The question that is most in our minds at the moment, and which now has been under discussion and study for almost a year, is the proposal for a meeting at the submit which was initiated by Moscow, and on which a great amount of correspondence has been exchanged between the East and the West. On this matter quite a large number of nations are under the impression that Soviet Russia has maintained the initiative, which has given her quite a lot of favourable publicity. Apparently on a question of such great importance we do not seem to be able to take the initiative, and we appear to be divided among ourselves on the mode of acceptance and the agenda that such a conference will be ready to proceed on, and it seems that there is no unanimity among the democracies on the time and place where it should be held, and which nations should be participants.

Another important stage in East-West negotiations—and in Anglo-American relations as well—has begun. It is a time when the two big power blocs are inching along, perhaps more effectively than ever before, toward a summit parley. It is also a moment when Britain and the United States, separately and jointly, need to re-examine their concepts of summity once more, and also their outlook toward suspension of H-bomb tests. It is certainly desirable for both nations to see eye to eye on both subjects.

On the question of summity, it is apparent that the average Briton regards himself as more willing than the Americans to have top-level talks to begin without laying down too many stipulations. It naturally follows that a cross-section of the people of Great

Britain also was less critical of the Soviet package for pre-summit negotiations to start last April 17 than the first Washington reaction indicated the United States would be, and there can be no doubt that there is a greater disposition of the British to talk. Such a venturesome spirit in dealing with other nations goes back for many centuries with Britons. Undoubtedly they suspect that Americans, while adventurous too, have confined their talents primarily to national affairs.

I believe that it would be entirely satisfactory for Britons for example, to have their Prime Minister meet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev to discuss East-West problems and attempt to make some progress. But if it was found impossible to achieve anything, the British leader could come home empty-handed and say: "I did the very best I could, but they would not agree to anything reasonable"; and I am convinced they would believe him and, moreover, classify the *démarche* as worthwhile, because it is a fact that Britons have confidence in their diplomats to hold their own conversationally with anyone, not to fall into negotiating traps and perhaps even to get the best of the other side.

If, as one certainly can hope, exportable communism becomes a diminishing and, finally, an atavistic force in Soviet policy making, the time will come when Soviet policy makers will come to regard capitalism as an objective term, not a subjective battle cry. At such a time summit talks could be conducted in an easier and perhaps more fruitful context; but, unfortunately for the peace of the world, that time has not arrived yet. Right now there is no possibility of useful negotiations over Germany or the Far East or the Middle East and Africa. We of the West want the Soviet Union to cease being an expanding empire, and the communists want us to stop resisting their expansion. Between such positions there is no agreed reconciliation. A summit meeting now would be largely a place where Soviets attempted to rationalize and justify their expansionism for propaganda purposes. At best it might produce tacit rules limiting the instruments they would use for expansion and those we would use in resisting that expansion, and tacit rules to keep open channels of diplomatic communication. More substantial agreements, many observers are convinced, must await the meeting which might take place when the context of world relation is very different from what it is today. May that time be reached sooner than we can foresee at the present time.

On the matter of suspending H-bomb tests, Great Britain also finds a tendency to run