

*Supply—External Affairs*

Canadians in the 1st division in 1940 and 1941 when many of the wise people of the world seemed to feel that the British were, after all, rather foolish in their objection to the mighty power which confronted them and that perhaps the proper thing to do was to accept the presence in Europe of a great military force which was bound to prevail. At that time there was a very lonely feeling on the part of those who were in uniform in the United Kingdom, along with the gallant civilians who perhaps contributed more to victory in the long run than the soldiers ever did.

Perhaps the most encouraging thing for us in those dark and terrible days was that a young, intelligent, idealistic American by the name of Lyndon Baines Johnson from Texas stood up on two or three occasions and told the people of the United States that there was a conflict of far reaching proportions which could not be avoided. He made a dramatic speech approximately eight months before Pearl Harbour; it was not very popular in Texas, as was indicated by his political defeat.

In the course of his public career Lyndon Baines Johnson had served in the defence area. He had studied defence and, in particular, he had studied problems relating to American naval responsibility. In 1939 there was a very strong group of isolationists in the United States. They were honest but, in my opinion, deluded peace seekers who were urging the Roosevelt administration to cut down sharply its responsibilities in the Pacific. And Lyndon Johnson, coming from this rather isolationist part of the United States, helped lead the fight in the house against this profoundly shortsighted proposal. In 1941 he stood out as one of the great people who defended the lend-lease program, described by Winston Churchill as the most unsordid act of high policy in human history. I remember it was Johnson who identified himself with us at a time when we believed we were contributing something for mankind. I do not think there were many Canadians who really thought they were serving a Canadian interest or a British interest or a western interest; they really believed that the military solution was one which could not be avoided. President Johnson, when I saw him a few days ago in Washington, looked whiter than he did when we met him at Great Falls, Montana for the ceremonial opening of the Columbia dam project, but it appears to me that this man has

[Mr. Matheson.]

played the part of a real man in world history and that he will go down as a great big man, the kind of man Texas might be expected to produce.

I spent some time months ago comparing the contribution, year by year, in public affairs of two personalities, Ho Chi Minh and Lyndon Baines Johnson. What a contrast there is between these two persons. I do not have the material with me on Ho—that, of course, is not his real name; he is of Chinese origin and his real name, I believe, is Al-Quoc. He was very active in Paris with the radical socialist party. He went to the U.S.S.R. in 1924 and became active there. He took part in the Chinese revolution of 1925-27. In 1927 he went to Siam, and I have talked to people in Bangkok who well remember his revolutionary activities there. He was imprisoned for his conduct in Hong Kong in 1931 and there are not many people in the east who forget what he stood for then. I think it is fair to say that this man has raised hell wherever he has gone over his rather long lifetime. I think his influence has been destructive.

I have read a great deal of the thoughts of Chairman Mao. I have read most of the extended five volume series. And it seems to me that Ho Chi Minh represents a practical, modern exponent of the revolutionary thoughts of Chairman Mao and his military lieutenant Lin Piao. Many of the essentially destructive and hurtful ideas of Mao are applied by Ho directly from the works of the Chinese leader. My view is that Chairman Mao is dated inasmuch as Marxian clichés are no longer relevant or applicable to the modern world.

I am glad the Leader of the Opposition prefaced his remarks by dilating for a few minutes on the important question of external aid. This is an area in which we in the west can even now claim some measure of success. What country has more to its credit than the United States? I would commend hon. members to look at the March 11 issue of the *United States News and World Report* where they will find an article headed: "Amazing Success Story In Asia". What do we find in Asia? Part of the story reads:

● (4:50 p.m.)

You see growing prosperity. Political stability is the rule, not the exception. You see new cities on what used to be swampland. You see Asians who are bigger and better-dressed.