

Soviet Union should participate fully in these discussions; and for that reason Mr. Dulles, the United States Secretary of State, had been holding, as the House no doubt knows, bilateral discussions with the Soviet ambassador in Washington, and during the Berlin conference with Mr. Molotov, with a view to making satisfactory arrangements for further and more general progress.

These discussions have now advanced to the point where, on March 19, the United States government presented to the Soviet Government a memorandum outlining its views as to how President Eisenhower's proposal could be most effectively implemented. While that memorandum was sponsored solely by the United States government, which arose out of those bilateral conversations, the Canadian Government was consulted in advance about the terms of this memorandum.

After consideration we were able to say that we were in general agreement in these proposals to which we have been giving very careful consideration. And in that consideration we have had to face a number of difficult questions. For example: should the international agency suggested by the president hold in its own possession uranium or fissionable material to be supplied by contributing nations; if so, where? Alternatively, perhaps the agency might itself hold little or no material, and be in a position to draw upon stocks held by contributing nations up to the amounts pledged.

Another question to resolve is whether the proposed international agency should itself construct, own or operate atomic reactors, or whether it should confine its activities to arranging for the provision of the materials and technical assistance required by countries wishing to undertake this atomic development programme for peaceful purposes.

A problem of importance concerns the proposed international agency itself. Should it be associated with the United Nations? In what way would it be financed? What would be the basis for determining who should be represented on it?

Hon. members will note that I have framed my remarks on these matters as questions without answers. We are seeking for these answers, in consultation with our friends. But I think in view of our experience over the years that so much in the way of international discussion of atomic energy has been bedevilled by propaganda and frustrated by political fears--in view of that experience I think it is wise in the early stages at least to have these discussions conducted privately and confidentially.

And that is what has been going on. In due course, if these bilateral discussions about which we are talking turn out to be successful, then the discussions can be broadened to include other countries importantly concerned. I think in the privacy of discussions at this stage, however, lies the best hope that the talks will be used for serious negotiation rather than for propaganda.

But the more we study this question of atomic energy and its use, without control, for destructive purposes, the more important of course become arrangements, and the necessity for these arrangements, for collective defence,