

were to have grounds for suspicion if they did not have access to vast areas of the Soviet hinterland.

But, it may be said, all this is very fine; we know about the hypocrisy of Russia, both in its use of international communism and in its toying with the hopes of all people for peace, security, justice and freedom--but all the same, we must somehow reach agreement with the Russians on the international control of atomic energy before we are all blown to bits by it.

I agree that we must never give up trying. We must not get into an atomic groove or refuse to examine any proposal from any quarter which may be put forward. However, it takes two to make an agreement and two to make the necessary compromises on which agreement can be based. Until the Russians give some indication of their readiness to accept genuine, not spurious, international control and inspection, it is hard to see at the moment where progress can be made.

The basic difficulty is of course, the Soviet fear of any contact with the west--a fear which is almost pathological. The Soviet leaders also stubbornly maintain that they cannot possibly accept any limitations of their sovereignty. We maintain, on the contrary, that we cannot afford to cling to an ancient concept of sovereignty when what we are seeking is a chance for survival. We shall never get anywhere, in our view, if we insist on talking about national sovereignty as if, in atomic matters, it were more important than national and international security, or if we consider that, by using our national sovereignty for joint action, we are losing it.

Whether we are talking about atomic or conventional weapons, we must have some means of knowing, not in any absolute sense, because that is quite impossible but within reasonable limits of certainty that no country is in a position to bamboozle the rest of the world as to the number of atom bombs or battleships or bombers or battalions that it possesses. If we cannot agree on a system for controlling the vast and conspicuous facilities necessary for the production of nuclear fuels, then we shall not reach agreement on the rest of our armaments industries which can more readily be camouflaged as factories for peaceful production or indeed may be hidden underground.

The cold fact in the cold war is that we do not trust the Russians enough to agree to destroy our atomic weapons and facilities for making them until we are in a position to satisfy ourselves, by international inspection and control of their facilities, that they do not secretly stockpile atomic bombs. The Russians, for their part, are not willing to entrust to an international atomic development authority, which they claim would be under Anglo-American domination, adequate functions of control, agreed beforehand and embodied in a treaty. This is merely another way of saying, Mr. Speaker, that the problem of peace is much broader than the problem of agreeing on the clauses of a treaty to prohibit the use of the atom bomb. It is the problem of establishing sufficient mutual confidence to tackle not only disarmament and the bomb but the whole range of major friction points--political, strategic and economic--which are witnesses today of the tragic division between the two worlds.

In conclusion, I come back to what our Prime Minister, then Secretary of State of External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent) said eighteen months ago in this House. He spoke then of the "tragic inability of the western democracies and the eastern totalitarian states, led by the U.S.S.R., to establish any basis for co-operation or even any basis for mutual toleration." He went on to say: "We had hoped for mutual toleration founded on a genuine desire to live and let live. It seems now that we shall have to be content with toleration based on what I hope will be a healthy respect for the determination of each of us to prevent encroachment and resist domination by the others."

Since that statement of the Prime Minister, the democratic world has made good progress toward the limited but practicable goal which he outlined. For that progress along the road to at least limited collective security, we can be thankful.