

*Supply—External Affairs*

of the other speakers who have taken part in the debate, I feel I should like to make a few comments and observations with regard to external affairs. I am not going to cover all the different fields. It may be that an opportunity will be presented for others of this group to take part in the debate. The hon. member for New Westminster in particular will be taking part because he had the opportunity of attending the session of the United Nations organization last fall and was also a member of the delegation to the NATO conference. Therefore I will leave those two matters to be dealt with by him.

As we look at the world today and face the situation we are reminded that the threat of communism is a continuing threat. Much has been said and written about the changes in Russia's internal policy. Perhaps we are interested in that aspect of the situation but certainly we are interested to a much greater extent in the seeming changes in Russia's external policy. Reference has been made today to the iron regime of Stalin, and of course we all realize that in his day a strong iron hand was exercised in every aspect of the economy and every aspect of Russian policy. There is some hope that at the present time that iron grip has been relaxed and that greater liberty and freedom are being given. But again I would say that personally I am not prepared to accept even that suggestion.

There may be a little different approach, there may be a little different strategy used, but certainly I feel that, as has been indicated by very recent occurrences, the iron rule of communism still is maintained in the Soviet union. There is talk of co-existence which means as far as communism is concerned no existence for those who disagree with them. There have been smiles instead of frowns, but I do not think that we can depend too much upon that as an indication of any fundamental change in the policy of the Soviet union. We are reminded of some of the statements that have been made quite recently in this particular respect, especially by Mr. Khrushchev. I have a copy of the NATO letter of June 1, 1956 in which is found an excerpt from a statement by Khrushchev used by Lord Ismay in certain remarks he made. The pertinent part reads as follows:

If we could believe that these changes in tactics meant a real change of heart, how happy we would all be! But are we justified in basing our plans on that belief? Quite recently Khrushchev himself gave us the answer. This is what he said: "The west say that Soviet leaders smile, but that their actions do not match their smiles. But I assure them that the smiles are sincere. They are not artificial. We wish to live in peace. But if anyone thinks that our smile means that we abandon the teachings of Marx and Lenin or abandon our communist road, then they are fooling themselves.

In putting that alongside the smiles that have appeared from time to time, I think we would be well advised to remember the frowns and to remember that, in the final analysis, the great plan of communism has not changed in the least.

The suggestion has been made—and I believe it is true—that to a considerable extent the cold war has moved into the realm of economic and political warfare. What I do not like about the thing is this, there are those who say that the policy has changed, that the Soviets have changed their program and have changed their plans and that they are now going to use economic and political measures instead of military means. I quite agree that they are using these economic and political aspects of the cold war, but I do not believe they have given up their idea, their intention and their determination to use the hot war and military means in order to achieve their ends if they are not able to achieve them by these other methods.

We have been greatly interested in reading in the last few days of events as they have been taking place in various Soviet satellite nations. We find that in the different countries—and also in the countries of the free world—the communist supporters and sympathizers have been having a difficult time to adjust their thinking and their planning to the meanderings of the Soviet and Kremlin line. However, as the minister stated this morning, it seems as though they are making the adjustment. Their allegiance, I would say, is still with the Kremlin rather than with the respective nations in which they reside. Hence we hear of the reports of the riots in Poznan. I have here an article—I am not going to read it—talking about the unrest and turmoil in the Baltic states. I have another one with reference to the situation in Tibet. This is from the *Ottawa Citizen* of July 31 and it reads as follows:

Reports from Tibet said today rebel Tibetan tribesmen massacred a delegation of several hundred Chinese communists after peace talks broke up in a quarrel.

Those are indications that all is not well in these satellite nations, the nations that are today ruled by the Kremlin, whether directly or indirectly. These people are giving vent to their feelings by taking their lives in their hands and staging riots and demonstrations in order to demonstrate the fact that they still value freedom and are willing to die for it. So today it would appear as I have said, that all is not well in these particular countries. As has been said by other speakers today—I have referred to the matter previously—I believe that before Russia can expect the free nations of the world to accept her propositions at their