advances were channelled toward permanent restoration of peace it would be possible to reach that objective.

In the same line of thought, Mr. Speaker, until we find pacific means of settling world problems we will always be faced with international disagreements. And when financiers and leaders of all countries, particularly ours, will understand that all the money now being spent on war, defensive or otherwise, could be allocated to the establishment of permanent peace, then we will be able to say that our aspirations for peace have been reached. In fact, there is no doubt that what is happening in Viet Nam is not peace but rather a ceasefire and the developments that followed this famous ceasefire prove that peace is very far.

To sump up the present situation I should like to read an editorial heard on radio station CJTR in Three Rivers and entitled "A step in the right direction but no peace yet".

People had been talking sporadically about it for a few years and in more concrete terms since last fall, and it finally came through Tuesday when Messrs. Kissinger and Le Duc Tho finally signed the document ending the American and North Vietnamese intervention in South Viet Nam.

It is actually a cease-fire agreement and not a peace treaty. We should not delude ourselves. War will continue in Viet Nam between the North and the South. It will certainly be less extensive and less lethal, due to the absence of the American military might, including the famous B-52's, but it will remain cruel because death and misery will continue their work of devastation for some time, i.e. until either one of the two governments, probably North Viet Nam, succeeds in controlling the whole territory which was arbitrarily divided in 1954.

It is truly unfortunate that this should be so, but it cannot be otherwise. Those people have been fighting too long to stop when they are so near their goal. They fought against the Japanese during the World War, then against the French who, as colonizers, did a great deal for Indo-China, but the Asians wanted their independence and for eight years they harassed the territorial army until the fall of Dien Bien Phu in 1954.

Then, after a few relatively quiet years, the Americans, fearful of communism 6,000 miles from their coast, decide to intervene, at first discreetly, and then, caught in the mesh of circumstances, it turned out to be a real genocide with the greatest war machine in history sweeping over a tiny country.

During almost ten years, an atrocious and barbarous war cost the lives of 1,000,000 Asians and 50,000 Americans, many of whom never knew why they were killed. To that must be added a hundred thousand physically and morally wounded and mutilated men who, for years to come, will remind their fellow citizens of that war to which, for reasons of honour, the leaders could not manage to put an end.

• (1710)

For us as well as for millions of human beings in all countries of the world, and particularly the most developed, it is to be hoped that the withdrawal of the United States from Viet Nam will mean more than the disappearance from our papers and television of horror pictures and the live reporting of massacres involving men, women and children, that could be seen every day like any other sports news.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse that editorial, because it summarizes a cruel state of affairs and because Canada's participation in the cease-fire agreement will only be useful if the parties involved show good will.

Now, that is precisely what was being questioned in the editorial I have just read and this is the very reason why we have to ask ourselves seriously whether the Canadian mission now in Viet Nam will prove useful. Of course, the minister asserts that it is only a supervisory role, but we never knew exactly what that meant. We were told that as a member of the International Control and Supervisory Commission Canada accepted the rights as well as the duties. What are exactly those duties? I believe that the minister perhaps has not thrown enough light on the subject.

And no doubt the hasty decision to participate without first informing the House was due to the fact that a *de facto* situation was meant to be established. That is why apparently the famous 60-day initial period was accepted, subject to subsequent review.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps for a minority government such as ours, it was a way to avoid imbroglios, but I think that democracy is getting the short end of it.

Mr. Speaker, I must point out that there is only one French-speaking member in the Progressive Conservative party, namely the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner). I was somewhat surprised a moment ago when I was given his amendment in English only. I think that if the Progressive Conservative party wants to show that it is a little more Canadian, the only French-speaking member of this party should have the decency to introduce his amendments in both official languages.

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Matte: Now then, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Wagner: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it known also that I hastened to translate that amendment and send the text to the hon. member who is speaking now.

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, I must point out that it is upon my request that the hon. member has done so.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I think that notwithstanding the language in which it was drafted the amendment itself deserves our attention. In my opinion, with such an amendment Parliament could recover the authority it should never lose in any kind of situation and especially such as this one.

I should point out at this stage that all countries form an opinion when they realize that Canada is a member of any committee. In such cases they say this is the position of the Canadian people as a whole. So, if this decision is not made directly by Parliament, it may well be considered throughout the world as not reflecting public opinion. This is why we should always ensure that decisions are made by Parliament itself. After these 60 days—nothing can be changed now—the government should act only after consulting this House.

Mr. Speaker, this war that has been going on for years has been discussed extensively and some grievances could be expressed against Canada. For instance, I wonder to what extent the North Vietnamese are interested in the Canadian participation, as we are aware that in many instances Canada, by accepting American sub-contracts, was materially participating in this war. It would be appropriate to ask whether it is logical to establish differ-