

I think this is something that we all have had to learn. Human nature and the essential aspirations of human nature are very much the same all over the world, but the background against which you have to place the attitudes of different people must be the background of their own civilization, of their own tradition and ancestral habits and ways of thinking and of acting. I am quite happy to report to the house that I got the very distinct impression, when Mr. Nehru visited us after his visit to the United States, that he was very much better satisfied with his last visit than he had been with the visit he made in 1949.

The hon. member speaks of a conference of France, the United States and the United Kingdom. It would be important and it is important that their actions be conducive to the same general results for the benefits of free people all over the world as they have to such a great degree in the past years and perhaps even in the past century. But there are other peoples in the world, and if we want to have peace in the world there must not be strife, there must not be misgivings, and there must not be mistrust or suspicion among the leaders of any of the other nations.

We have to try to behave in such a way that we will not be looked upon with suspicion and misgiving. Many hon. gentlemen saw and heard Mr. Nehru being interviewed by Mr. McInnes on the Sunday afternoon preceding his departure from Ottawa. I had the privilege of seeing him almost immediately afterward at the reception at the home of the high commissioner for India and I complimented him and told him that I hoped a lot of people in the United States enjoyed seeing him on the screen and of having the opportunity of appreciating his discussion with Mr. McInnes.

I told him that I must remind him that he had reminded me that the terrestrial globe might look different to one sitting on the north pole than it would to someone sitting at the equator. I told him that I had accepted that as a reason for his, and his people's, approaching some problems somewhat differently from our own people. I said that the aspect of the international situation at the present time might appear somewhat different to us in Ottawa and to Mr. Eisenhower and his colleagues in Washington than it would to Mr. Nehru and his colleagues in New Delhi.

I said that there did not seem to be any suggestion that India was going to be the ultimate target of any aggression which might be undertaken, but that so long as there were these terrible agents of destruction at the disposal of us in the free world

*The Address—Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent*

and of those behind the iron curtain we had to be sure that those behind the iron curtain who might be—I do not think they are apt to be for a very long period—actual aggressors should be convinced that if there was aggression there would be inevitable retaliation which would do to the aggressor at least as much damage as they might do to the nation attacked.

If there was to be that kind of aggression it did not seem improbable that the ultimate target would be the United States and that the way to the United States would be on a path which led through Canada and that we intended to have that path in such condition that it could not be used for aggression without serious damage to those using it and that if it was used, no matter how rapid or how unexpected the aggression was, there would still be inevitable retaliation which would do as great damage to the aggressor as he might have caused.

We agreed that the likelihood of going to war with these terrible implements of destruction was not great, but that there was still a possibility. Because of that possibility we felt that the free nations must remain in such a position that possible aggressors would realize that retaliation would be inevitable and the result would unfortunately be a great degree of mutual destruction.

Mr. Nehru had suggested that military alliances appeared to him to be adding to the international tension because they appeared to denote a warlike attitude. I told him that unfortunately for us we were in such a position that we had to maintain military alliances as long as there was any possibility of aggression with the use of these new weapons because we ourselves did not have them. In our military alliances the tasks had been distributed and we could count, and possible aggressors knew this, upon the fact that these weapons were at the disposition of the United States.

I was saying all this to him, not to criticize his attitude but to ask him to feel that we also could rationalize our conduct, that we had what appeared to us to be very good reasons for maintaining these alliances and not adopting the view taken by him that there might be less international tension. We felt that the tension which existed was necessary as a deterrent against the use of any of these terrible instruments.

I have got quite a distance away from the agricultural problem that my hon. friend was discussing. With respect to that I can assure him that we are anxious to conserve that confidence we have had from the Canadian electorate for a number of years and that we are not going to omit doing anything we can