

*Supply—External Affairs*

What then can be done to change the attitude of the United States administration? Obviously the responsibility for a change rests upon the American people themselves. We can urge the Americans to put pressure on their government, and we do not think we would be appealing in vain. According to a recent Gallup poll, 49 per cent of the American people now believe that the American intervention in Viet Nam was a mistake. We, in this party salute the courageous stand of Senator McCarthy against the administration. We rejoice at the support he is getting. We acknowledge that many distinguished senators and writers in the United States have urged a change in policy. We know that the American churches have spoken out. We know that a great number of the younger generation in the United States vigorously oppose the war. We recognize the difficulty in wartime of opposing government policies, and the charges of disloyalty and lack of patriotism which result. We know that it is difficult for a great and powerful country to admit that it is wrong. To do so is to think the unthinkable, and this of course is no easy operation. But I want to say that the friends of the United States, and they include the vast majority of the Canadian people, should not be afraid to make it clear where they stand on the question of ending the war in Viet Nam.

To admit a mistake and to rectify it does not always cause a great nation to lose prestige. Algeria, as many hon. members know, was for many Frenchmen far closer to their vital interests and the essential prestige of France than Viet Nam can ever be to the United States. French lives and French treasure were spent on an effort to maintain the proposition that Algeria was an integral part of France. Yet General de Gaulle, the incarnation of French pride and French nationalism, as I think he would call himself, pulled France out of Algeria. Has the prestige of France suffered by reason of this act of belated wisdom? Is the great United States of America desirous of lagging behind General de Gaulle in statesmanship because of its national pride? I suggest that the people of the United States can and will persuade their government to change its course, and I think it is up to us, their friends, to urge them to do so.

Another thing that could be done, which has been recommended in questions put in the house by my colleague and friend the hon. member for York South, is to ask that this

matter be inscribed on the agenda of the security council. It is true, of course, that the security council perhaps cannot take action. It is true that North Viet Nam is not a member of the United Nations and does not acknowledge it jurisdiction. But the security council is charged with the responsibility of maintaining the peace of the world. At this crucial moment of threatened escalation, the security council could be the voice of the world's morality, if not legal authority, and we urge that this matter be brought forward for immediate discussion there.

We realize that dissent, however mildly or vigorously expressed, is not enough. It is not enough for us to recommend action to others, and Canada, despite the mild dissent expressed recently in government pronouncements on the subject of Viet Nam, is itself implicated in the conflict. It is implicated by the growing sales of war materials under the defence production sharing agreement. Canada is profiting from the war and compromising her neutrality. Under the defence production sharing agreement no control by means of export permits is exercised in respect of the use or dissemination of Canadian war materials. There is not the slightest doubt that much of the war material exported without control and without any attempt to impose control is finding its way into the hands of one side in the fighting in Viet Nam.

The original defence production sharing agreement was undoubtedly partly for Canada's benefit. It was a natural agreement to make with a close ally. But Canada is not and cannot be the ally of the United States in Viet Nam, and I suggest we must retake control over our exports of war materials. There is only one way to do it and that is by abrogating the defence production sharing agreement.

Some people will say that this is no more than a gesture and will in no way slow down or affect United States operations in Viet Nam. This may be true, but I think it would be an extremely important gesture. It would at least make clear to the United States government and people that Canada is prepared to do something to indicate that she is not an ally in the disastrous involvement of the United States in Viet Nam. I have no doubt it would cause a lot of hard feeling in administration circles but I believe that in the long run it would earn the respect of the American people.