

U.S. Invasion of Cambodia

following royal assent. Of course I have no control over how quickly the bill will go through Parliament.

I want to thank hon. members for their contribution and for their support of this bill which causes a fundamental revision or change in some aspects of our consumer credit laws, and I hope that the support that was indicated today will assure a speedy passage of the bill through the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26**EXTERNAL AFFAIRS****CAMBODIA—INVASION BY UNITED STATES AND SOUTH VIET NAM ARMED FORCES**

Mr. David Lewis (York South) moved:

That this House do now adjourn.

He said: Mr. Speaker, some years ago the American Professor Hans J. Morgenthau made the following statement in the opening words of an article on Viet Nam:

It illuminates the many misunderstandings that beset our Viet Nam policy that in order to criticize that policy in public one has first to justify one's right to do so.

This seems also to be the case in this House, judging from some of the reactions of some of the hon. members to my party's position on this matter. I want to make it clear from the outset that I do not intend to apologize for our position. We are and have always been opposed to the U.S. war in Viet Nam.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: We believe and we have always believed that the U.S. forces had no right to go there in the first place, that it is a war which is legally and morally indefensible, that it is a war which has helped the spread of Communism in Asia, that it has achieved nothing either for the United States or for the world, whilst devastating an entire people.

It is said that because we are friends with the United States and because of our special relations with that country we ought to be soft in what we say about any policy of the

[Mr. Basford.]

U.S. administration. In my opinion the opposite is the case. It is precisely because we have special relations of friendship and association with the U.S.A. and because we have such things as the defence sharing agreement with them under which we produce at least some of the armament which is used in Viet Nam, that we have a special responsibility to watch the developing situation and to speak out about it without hesitation and without using weasel words.

Some hon. members keep chiding us of the New Democratic Party that we do not condemn the North Vietnamese, China or the Soviet Union. Anyone who says that is quite wrong. We do. We have no illusions—and I have looked up a speech on the subject of Viet Nam which I made in 1966 and in which I said exactly the same thing, and so has my leader on many occasions—about the long range policies and objectives of world communism. We are agreed that there is need to find proper, effective and peaceful means to counteract the possible appeal of the communists to the hungry and desperate peoples of the underdeveloped world.

But we do not agree that the U.S. policy has served this purpose. On the contrary, I am convinced that the U.S. war in Viet Nam has been a magnet to Communism throughout that area. I agree with what Senator Fulbright said in a recent article in the *New Republic* of April 18, and I will quote this important passage.

He said:

They cannot—

The Communists.

—drive us out of Indo-China, but they can force upon us the choice of either plunging in altogether or getting out altogether.

It is this choice that the Nixon Administration has thus far refused to make.

He might have added "the Johnson administration before it".

"Myth" is a mild word for madness on so grand a scale. Not only has the rationale for Viet Nam proved unfounded; it has shown itself to be disastrously mistaken. Instead of deterring Communist intervention in Southeast Asia, American military involvement has turned out to be a powerful magnet for it.

I think Senator Fulbright is right in every word that he stated in that short article. It is for this reason, precisely because in our view the American policy assists Communism in the underdeveloped world, that, in addition to our opposition to the war on general principles, we believe Canada must speak out against the recent action.