

**Hon. Duff Roblin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** President Kennedy, too, for that matter.

**Senator Macquarrie:** And President Kennedy, of course. Thank you, Senator Roblin.

We were assured that only "experts" were involved. We believed that as long as we could, because we wanted to believe it. I can well recall being in the House of Commons from the very beginning of the war in Vietnam. Most of us there were totally reluctant to criticize the United States. It was a very tense time when the then Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson, voiced his criticisms of the United States. After his "conversation", shall we say, with President Johnson, he came back and said, "I have been to Berchtesgaden." His criticism was not well received.

However, we found that the United States was suffering more from that situation than anyone else. The assault upon American society was grievous. Now we have it again. We asked this question: How many years, how many lives, how much social turmoil, how much destruction is necessary to bring about the full unfolding of what was a tragic blunder? Some voices are raised in the United States today, warning that the same thing may happen again.

When I seek the point of view of people who are possessed of knowledge and experience, I try to avoid the extremists. Those who lash out in a denunciation of the President or of the American regime do not come to my mind as people I care to quote or to believe. I have been impressed, in all of this, by the opinions of Robert White, the former United States ambassador to El Salvador, who courageously jeopardized and perhaps terminated a brilliant career in American diplomacy. He has come back from El Salvador and has made some very candid statements, but he has not at any time gone into free-wheeling denunciations of his own country or the government from which he resigned. He feels, however, that the biggest danger in the United States' involvement is that it will drive the populace of El Salvador leftward. That would not be the first time such a thing had happened.

No one can rewrite history and say, "Had this not happened, this would not have followed." However, most thoughtful observers believe—certainly, many people in both countries concerned profoundly believe—that the support of the United States for that dreadful man Batista had much to do with the success of Castro; that the Bay of Pigs invasion had a great deal to do with the sustaining of that man in office. That is another example.

It is always sad if any regime is run by Bourbons, of whom it was said that they learn nothing and forget nothing. If you remember John Foster Dulles, it is too bad that you forget the Bay of Pigs or Vietnam; but if you have that tragic combination, there is danger.

Robert White said:

The Reagan Administration . . . tends to ignore the fact that in El Salvador there is an authentic revolution which would exist whether or not the Soviet Union existed.

[Senator Macquarrie.]

He said that the engagement of the United States in a military way is sending the wrong signals to Latin America. The United States is a great country. I would have no problem deciding whether I would prefer the country of Thomas Jefferson to the country of Lenin. However, the United States does not have a great record in Latin America. It would only be the most myopic chauvinist who would say any such thing. The United States has a bad record there. It is always wise, I think, to listen to those who have a broad range of knowledge and a deep perception as well, and I think that Robert White has both of those qualities.

I am not a member of the United States Congress; I would far sooner be here. My major interest is in what this country should do. What should be the attitude of this country? Should we say that it is an American concern and not ours? Of course, we cannot say that. The country that produced Sir Robert Borden, the first international statesmen of the land, and Lester Pearson could not think of that kind of foolish detachment which would be worthy of Mackenzie King.

• (1520)

We must try to find our role. Is our role to be totally supportive? Is our role to say that that which emanates from Washington is the voice of Canada too? If honourable senators think that I am trying to be dramatic for some effect and filling the air of this quiet Thursday afternoon with vain imaginings, I assure you that such is not the case. I have been doing my research, and what I am paraphrasing are the remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

I have not spent much of my time in public life in criticism of people, even those in the opposite party, and it is certainly not my practice to look upon foreign policy as a great field for partisan controversy. I am, nevertheless, disturbed when I see a significant and revealed alteration in the Canadian attitude on one of the important issues facing the world today, and I think it behooves us in this illustrious senior chamber to give some thought to it.

Not long ago, the Secretary of State of the United States and his counterpart in this country met, and followed with a statement that the attitude of Canada toward the military assistance of the United States was "quiet acquiescence." Later it was stated that that was a mistake; that what was really said was that it was "quiet quiescence." The difference between "acquiescence" and "quiescence" is not in the range of a wide gulf fixed by any means. As a man who has acquiesced a great deal for the last 60 years, I am pretty familiar with the meaning of the words. They mean: to raise no objection; to accept arrangements or conclusions. I am sorry to be pedantic, but I suppose one cannot shake these bad habits. "Acquiescence," I would say, is a better word than "quiescence." "Acquiescence" is moving towards a state of quietude; and "quiescence" indicates that you are already there. When you put before that the word, "quiet," it is really being terribly mum—

**Senator Frith:** What was that word?