

*Supply—External Affairs*

We have an important responsibility in foreign aid and I am happy that a great Canadian like Maurice Strong, a man with exceptional gifts, has come into this service at great financial sacrifice to himself and his family. He will help do those things which must in charity be done for all the countries of the world irrespective of their political complexion.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** An outstanding man.

**Mr. Matheson:** As the minister points out, he is an outstanding man. He is one of the great men of our time. I was glad to hear the Leader of the Opposition indicate that we should step up the volume of our aid. I believe everyone realizes that the government has been faced with the problem of matching income to expenditure. However, it is good at this time to have a person in the prominent position of the Leader of the Opposition come forward and take the position he has taken today in respect of foreign aid. This to me is statesmanship. I know his suggestion is supported by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and I know how fully it is supported by the Prime Minister.

The studies which have been undertaken in the last few years with regard to the problems of Russia and China lead us to believe there is not complete peace and understanding in the Communist camp. The recent conference at Budapest indicated that many people of socialist inclination do not think entirely alike. It has been pointed out that one of the most articulate supporters of the United States position at this time is Prime Minister Harold Wilson of the socialist party in the United Kingdom. Facts are facts and there are certain indisputable facts which cannot be avoided. While we may have certain differences of opinion with regard to the tactics employed by the United States I do not think we can question that their contribution in the main has aided mightily to the stability of Asia. Arthur Schlesinger, who is scarcely considered to be right wing, said:

I am opposed to an immediate American withdrawal (a) because it would end all possibility of a negotiated settlement, (b) because it would deliver the people of Vietnam to the Vietcong, who would undoubtedly jail and murder a good many, especially among the students and intellectuals, and condemn the rest to a bleak Communist despotism, (c) because of the effect it would have in neighboring countries, especially on the gallant struggle of the Laotian neutralists under Prince

Souvanna Phouma to maintain their independence. Also I find something distasteful about those sitting in ease in Europe and America, who would righteously hand over a country to a tough Communist crew on the ground, evidently, that, though they wouldn't much like communism for themselves, it will be just great for the Vietnamese.

We are not thinking alone of Viet Nam but of Asia in which there resides two-thirds of the human race.

James A. Michener spent many years in southeast Asia. He lived in Viet Nam and several surrounding countries. He is intimately knowledgeable with regard to areas such as Korea and the Philippines. He lived in Thailand, Indonesia, Burma, Pakistan and Ceylon. He writes:

—I am driven by experience of the past and concern for the future to support my government's stand in Vietnam.

I believe that our stand in Korea some years ago helped to stabilize that part of the world. The agreement there reached was not a particularly good one, but it has worked. It has saved Japan, established a border zone that could be more or less controlled, and relieved international tensions that might otherwise have expanded into a world war. In Korea the United States learned it could of itself oppose both Russia and China, and that was a salutary discovery. But Russia and China also learned that they could not operate with impunity against world opinion. What may have been most important, Russia and China had a chance to see and to evaluate each other. On balance, I am not unhappy about our intervention in Korea.

He analyses the situation at the present time in Viet Nam in similar terms.

Eric Linklater said:

In the summer of 1951 I was in Korea. The beginning of that war had been the sudden invasion of South Korea by the Communist North and the almost simultaneous announcement, by the North, that its action had been necessary to counter aggression from the South. The small expeditionary force that Britain was able to send in defence of the South consisted, at first, of a battalion of the Middlesex Regiment, another of the Argylls. I had talked with their survivors, whose memories of the war were dominated by the appalling misery of the refugees who had fled from the North.

The North pretended to be the aggrieved and virtuous party—

This is what we have been hearing from many sources with respect to Viet Nam and from some Canadians ad nauseam for several years.

—but a multitude of starving, half-frozen refugees chose to escape from its virtue. There were no fugitives to the North.

Today, in Vietnam, there is a comparable situation. The Communists were the original aggressors,