

*External Affairs*

years, and I know what rioting there is like. I know what a wrong policy adopted by the western nations can mean to the east. The late President Wilson adopted a policy of self determination for all people. It was a high-sounding policy; and how was it received in the east? That news went through the bazaars like wildfire, and they interpreted it to mean that they could do as they liked, that they could disregard law and order. That was the way they acted, and troops had to be called in.

We do not understand the eastern mind. We in the west have developed the material or practical side of life, while the people of the east have developed the abstract or mystical side. If we think we can adopt a policy here, with our western ideas, without fully understanding the eastern mind, we shall fail and fail badly. Let me give just one simple illustration. A carpenter in Canada saws from the top down. A carpenter in the east saws from the bottom up. In other words they view life from the opposite standpoint, and we must understand their point of view; we must understand their civilization, their religion, their social problems, if any policy we adopt is to be successful.

I was in India when the London *Times* came out with a policy to which, on the face of it, every man in the western world could subscribe; but if that policy had been adopted in India it would have led to untold trouble, and we who lived there knew it. I was through the riots in India. I was through Delhi, Amritsar and Lahore shortly after those riots took place, and I know how bad they were. I know how serious the eastern problem is, and I believe that any policy Canada adopts must be undertaken with a thorough knowledge of the eastern mind. One reason the Russian policy has been so successful in the east is that the Russians are half oriental themselves, and understand the eastern mind.

We have a situation in China which is not clear. We have a communist government, but we have the two islands of Hainan and Formosa held by the nationalist forces. The problem before us today is what to do about those islands. If we support the nationalist forces in China we will be accused of meddling in the internal affairs of that country, because Formosa was ceded to the Chinese republic after the war. If we decide to support the nationalist forces there it will mean that we will have to supply them with munitions and money to carry on the struggle. The best military advice in the world today is that Formosa cannot be held by the nationalists once the Chinese communists re-arm and reorganize their air force with Russian help.

If that situation arises, Formosa cannot be held.

What do we do then? Do we send men and munitions to hold it? And if we decide on such a policy will the people of Canada and the United States back us up? If we do not support the nationalists and Formosa becomes communist territory, it will provide a springboard for communist propaganda and infiltration in the Philippines and the eastern islands. I do not know the answer, but there is the problem. I agree with the leader of the opposition when he asks for caution, and for time to be taken in order that consideration may be given all these matters.

We have more or less the same problem in Indo-China. We are fighting a guerrilla war against communism in the Federated Malay States. We have Siam not knowing which side of the fence to stay on. She has 30,000 communist troops within her borders, and she is afraid that if she disarms and interns them she will become unfriendly with the communist regime in China. Like so many of the weak states in the east, she is sitting on the fence waiting to see which way the wind will blow. We have chaos in Burma, and a situation in India which requires careful consideration.

How many men in this house know how India is composed? When we speak of Canada we think of it as one nation; but when we speak of India we must think of it as a conglomeration of peoples. In India and Pakistan over three hundred dialects are spoken. There is more difference between a Mahratta and a Sikh than between a Frenchman and a German. There is a greater difference between a Bengali, a Rajput, a Tamil and a Punjabi. How is Mr. Nehru going to bring all these people together?

He has our sympathy. He spoke here, and he received a grand welcome. Mr. Nehru has a problem which is colossal in the extreme, and just as complex. The United Nations decided they would send a mission to settle the Kashmiri dispute. They are trying to settle it according to western ideas. They said, "We shall take a plebiscite, and let the people decide for themselves." This mission has been there for many months, but no plebiscite has taken place as yet. Kashmiri is a thorn in the flesh of India. If this question is not settled promptly, it may well lead to civil war between Pakistan and Hindustan. You have a situation there which is fraught with great peril. If we can help Mr. Nehru and the Indians to solve this problem, by all means let us do it.

India is the bastion of democracy, such as it is, against the communist influence filtering down from Afghanistan through the Khyber