

has no role to play and that, frankly, it is not up to us to supervise what goes on with regard to the implementation of the agreement.

I would merely like to remind him that if once again he is not happy with the agreement entered into by the two parties, Canada was not a party to it; he should direct his reproaches to Messrs. Le Duc Tho and Kissinger. Indeed, it is not our fault if they asked us to supervise the enforcement of the agreement.

This sentence struck me most in the speech of the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner):

[English]

Our position at the international conference must be that of ensuring a viable machinery, both political and supervisory, to police and secure that four-power arrangement.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) put it very clearly. We are not in Viet Nam to police any of these four powers. We are there only to observe and to report if one of those powers is violating the agreement they signed in Paris. We are not there to secure anything or to police anybody, particularly when the United States, with half a million soldiers, did not succeed in policing that country.

Mr. Forrestall: The United States declared peace in Viet Nam.

[Translation]

Mr. De Bané: May I be allowed to complete my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

I think that it is a total failure to recognize the role assigned to the four parties involved and responsible for enforcing the cease-fire and, in my opinion, it is such a glaring mistake that since more than a week the Secretary of State for External Affairs provided each Opposition party with copies of the agreements which were concluded.

As for asking us to perform a military task, I will say to the hon. member that the Secretary of State for External Affairs has fully explained that our role over there is not to keep the peace, but to observe and report if one of the parties does not live up to its commitments.

The hon. member took the liberty to add in order to downgrade the role of Canada:

[English]

We were cast, in 1954, as the representatives of the western interest on the commission.

Mr. Forrestall: Oh, get on and tell us something positive.

[Translation]

Mr. De Bané: Then I should like him to explain how it is that the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) when he was in Hanoi a few days ago could state that Canada was very highly regarded by Hanoi? Why, Mr. Speaker, try to downgrade our country, a country which succeeded in the field of its foreign policy in carrying out peace-keeping missions, about 15 of them since 1945? Why try to depreciate what is one of the finest aspects of our foreign policy?

Viet Nam

He repeated a little later in his speech, and I quote:—we find it difficult to understand why the government has waited so long before informing the House—

Waited? I remind him that we did it 48 hours after this Parliament reconvened and at that time he taunted the government with having stated once again as late as January 5 and in detail, the terms of our participation. Why is he charging us with having “waited before informing the House”, he who taunted us with doing so 48 hours after the Houses had reconvened?

Mr. Speaker, I could go on setting forth all the thoughts which come up in my mind following the speech of the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe which differs greatly in its reach from that of the hon. member for Fundy-Royal.

I was surprised also by his indulging into reading and reminding us of the various questions he asked in the House a few days ago. I am surprised that he dared recall them today even though the Secretary of State for External Affairs has answered each of them. And with the indulgence of the House and its permission, I will gladly recall his answers when my time has elapsed.

Mr. Speaker, why did the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe take the liberty of saying: “There can be no success”?

As far as we are concerned, we cannot guarantee the success of our mission but, as we are jointly responsible for the fate of the whole world—and God knows how the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe reminded us of our joint responsibility—we said to ourselves, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs explained on January 24, that our duty was to go to Viet Nam not taking for granted that we would succeed but saying we would try for 60 days. Will that trial succeed or not? One point is certain, and it is that we the members of this government have decided not to be prophesiers of evil.

[English]

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to take part in this debate on external affairs. It is certainly not the first in which I have engaged in my 15 years in this House. I would note at the beginning that the hon. member who has just resumed his seat has added perhaps more asperity to a debate on external affairs than I have been used to in this decade and a half.

Mr. De Bané: I was just quoting.

Mr. Macquarrie: If the hon. member wants to rebut it, he can change the rules. But it is my time to speak, now. I have always believed that while partisanship of itself is not the summum bonum of our existence here, especially in external affairs I have always tried to eschew partisanship. I should like to say, too, that I am proud of the statement made by the spokesman for our party, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) who since he came to this parliament has revealed eloquence, wisdom and consideration which makes me extremely proud and happy to be a colleague of his. I hope we shall long remain together side by side and for a long time on the other side of this chamber.

I know my time is limited to 20 minutes. I want to use a good deal less than 20 minutes. I want to hear from the