

External Affairs

three or four years. Some hon. members say that we are not doing enough in that regard.

The Colombo plan is not going to change the minds of people in southeast Asia regarding communism. We must offer them something more than that. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that from my knowledge of the East—and I spent two years there, particularly in India, many years ago—the Orient does not change quickly. What was true when I was there is true today. The people of the Orient are waiting for a message of hope, as are the people in other parts of this world. Our diplomacy has failed to give them that message. What they need is something to counteract the subtle propaganda of communism which offers them hope in another form.

I stated here two years ago that the foreign policy of Canada should be peace through strength. That policy has been followed, but there have been some degrees of weakness. I do not think it is sufficient today to change the minds of men. I advocate now a policy of power through love, through strength. These may be only words. In other words, the power of love through strength is what the people need, and is the message which we must convey to the people of the Orient and to our own people. Nobody can tell me that men like Klaus Fuchs, Burgess and MacLean embraced communism because they were suffering from poverty. I think that is a sufficient explanation to show that poverty is not the full answer to communism.

May I demonstrate what I mean by what I said? If you followed the elections in Italy of some two or three years ago you will know we were all betting that that country would go communist. What happened? The people of Italy were swaying between two minds, and it was decided by the people there that they required a message. A clergyman preached love to those people. He explained what it meant. He explained the power behind it. It was that message of love preached to the people on the streets of Milan, Naples and the other large cities, which convinced a sufficient number of Italians so that Italy has been saved so far from communist domination.

I wish now to refer to the Prime Minister's trip to the Orient. If I can analyse and sum up his trip and the statements which he has made since he came back I would do it in this way. The Prime Minister found out on this trip that it does not matter what colour a man is; whether he is white, black, yellow

or brown, he is a human being and he has the same feelings that you and I have. Kipling summed it up very well in a poem when he described the feelings of the wife of the common soldier and the wife of a colonel in these words:

For the Colonel's Lady an' Judy O'Grady
Are sisters under their skins!

The Prime Minister went to India and interviewed Mr. Nehru; he went to Pakistan and interviewed Mohammed Ali. He carried a message to them from this country and from the whole western hemisphere. It was received gladly. It was a message of good will and a message of love, if you want to use that term. But he did it through strength, because in India he was put on the spot when he was asked about the United States offering military aid to Pakistan, which was a very unpopular move so far as India was concerned.

What did the Prime Minister do? He faced up to the situation, and he told them of the friendship between Canada and the United States, and he was convinced that in giving military aid to Pakistan the United States had no thought that it would be directed at India. That was not the answer that the Indians wanted to hear; that was not what they expected. But they respect honesty and they respected the good will and the courage displayed by the Prime Minister in making that statement.

It has been said by the leader of the C.C.F. party here, who has on two occasions rather complained about the military aid of the United States to Pakistan, that there is uneasiness in India regarding it. Let us examine what that means. Will anyone suggest that Pakistan is going to declare war on India? Will anyone suggest that 70 million people are going to take on 360 million people? Pakistan has not the capacity to wage war on a large scale, nor indeed has India. In my opinion such an argument is utter nonsense and certainly not logical. When people make that statement in this house they do not complete the statement because President Eisenhower also offered military aid to India which India, being a proud nation, politely refused. What happened shortly after that? When news of the proposed Geneva conference was released the Prime Minister was asked what he thought. When Mr. Nehru called for a cease-fire in Indo-China he was also asked his opinion of that. Immediately and without any hesitation he backed up Mr. Nehru in his plea.

There you have a demonstration, if you like, of love through strength and the power of love through strength. In one case he