

that students born since the war would not recall the events of the late "thirties". But many of us still remember them and we know that we cannot appease dictators and countries which have a dynamic expansionist policy. And Red China certainly has that policy now. One does not have to look far back in history to find examples. Human nature does not change. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) used to be fond of using Boadicea as an example. I would refer hon. Members to Ethelred the Unready. When the Danish ships raided Britain he tried to buy them off with gold, or Danegeld. The Danes took both the gold and the country, too. If we try to buy off the Chinese who are pushing forward, looking to Southeast Asia, countries which were originally Chinese provinces, we know what to expect. The only way of stopping the advance is by doing exactly what the United States is doing at the present time.

Nobody wants a war but sometimes wars are not stopped by letting aggressors get away with slice after slice until the whole piece of salami has been consumed. Sometimes people have to be reminded of these things. For these reasons I hope the Prime Minister will reiterate in strong terms that Canada does in fact support the Government of the United States in its policy and position in South Viet Nam.

Turning to another part of Asia, to the quarrel between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, there was recently a press report to the effect that certain friendly countries—Britain was specifically mentioned—had been requested to mediate. A few days ago I asked whether Canada had been asked to help in mediating this dispute. I do not recall exactly what the Prime Minister said on that occasion, but the inference was that Canada was taking an interest behind the scenes. I think we should like to know whether Canada is playing an active part in trying to resolve this dispute between two of the most important members of the Commonwealth. To be fair, one cannot expect the Prime Minister or the Secretary of State for External Affairs to go into detail on such questions when they are raised on the Orders of the Day, but I believe the people of Canada are greatly interested in the Commonwealth and in this dispute between two of its members, and we should like to know whether the Government is playing an active part in efforts to reach a settlement, or whether it is merely doing what it seems necessary to do without being aggressive in its approach.

Then there is Indonesia and the activities of Dr. Sukarno. After constant prodding by

Lack of Debate on Foreign Affairs

Opposition Members of this House the Government has at last stopped shipments of wheat flour to Dr. Sukarno's army in Indonesia. The Government is not shipping the flour and the inference I gather from an answer given to me by the Secretary of State for External Affairs is that it will probably not ship such supplies in future. I am glad of that.

● (4:10 p.m.)

I turn next to United States policy in the Dominican Republic and the events on that island. What is Canada's position? Questions have been asked in this House of the Prime Minister as to what Canada's position is with respect to the Dominican Republic. I have here a quotation from the *Globe and Mail* of May 5, and as I understand it the Prime Minister indicated that he hopes the people of the Dominican Republic get a free choice in their form of Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody would disagree with that view of the ultimate objective of the people of the Dominican Republic; but what I think we should know is just exactly what is Canada's position toward the intervention of the United States of America in the Dominican Republic. Do we approve it, or do we not? I think this is what the people of Canada would like to know. I believe this should be made clear.

There can be only three answers to this question. Do we back up the position of the United States in landing marines and other troops, sending warships to the Dominican Republic and occupying Santo Domingo, or large parts of it; or on the other hand, do we not approve of this? Or do we take a sort of neutral view and approve with some reservations, or disapprove with some reservations? The Members of this House would like to know just what our position is with respect to the United States intervention in the Dominican Republic.

Again I remind hon. Members of this House that if we have a salami policy being followed by Red China in Southeast Asia, we certainly have a so-called salami policy being followed by international Communist organizations in the Caribbean and potentially in South America as well. First it was Cuba; now we have a revolution in the Dominican Republic. As far as we can understand, the revolution was probably well justified and started off with the best of intent; but there is little doubt that the revolution has been taken over by the ever ready and ever willing Communist agents in the country, and undoubtedly what has been exported to the Dominican Republic