

*Supply—External Affairs*

American forces must be withdrawn from South Viet Nam. I think most of us would agree that this is an unacceptable proposition. In this connection I have here an article from the *Christian Science Monitor* of December 9, 1965. It is very interesting and I hope to refer to it later.

It seems to me there are some who speak as though all that is necessary is for Canada to stand tall and shout loudly and then the United States will pull up stakes and move its forces back home. But we must recognize that the United States is a sovereign nation. In many respects it has to make its own decisions. Even though we may be able to make our views known, which is our prerogative, I do not think the United States will take such action simply because we make a great noise about it and loudly proclaim that the United States forces should move out of Viet Nam. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that to a considerable degree Canada's responsibility in this situation is in the area of diplomacy. Many times diplomatic methods can be used to solve a problem where other methods would fail.

I should now like to refer to the *Christian Science Monitor* of December 9, 1965 which contains an editorial headed "Realism On Viet Nam." It reads:

The illusion persists that all that North Viet Nam is waiting for is a suspension of American bombing to rush to the peace table. Although there is not now and never has been any justification for this belief, the National Council of Churches is but the latest in the list of those supporting this well-meant but ungrounded thesis.

The second paragraph is the one to which I would like to draw particular attention:

How unrealistic this proposal is is shown in a long and thoughtful article by a British newspaperman who has just returned to North Viet Nam after 12 years. Carried in the United States by the New York Times News Service, James Cameron's report states that the Communists are totally determined to force American withdrawal from South Viet Nam.

Of course the conclusion is that if this is so the cessation of bombing is not going to accomplish that objective. I am not saying that we agree with the bombing of North Viet Nam. I am not going to say it should have been resumed a short time ago. I am only pointing out the fact that just because the American and South Vietnamese forces might cease the bombing of North Viet Nam is no guarantee that Hanoi would be prepared to come to the conference table and

[Mr. Patterson.]

arrive at a mutually satisfactory agreement on this crucial issue. The question remains, whose move is it now?

It has been stated that the President of the United States is willing to negotiate without any preconditions. If he laid down any such conditions they were certainly very few, but the response on the part of the Hanoi government and those associated with it has been silence.

We all know that the matter has been brought before the Security Council of the United Nations and will be debated in that forum. It is our sincere hope that through such debate some tangible progress will be made toward the solution of this very difficult problem.

I should now like to make two observations in connection with South Viet Nam. Following a reading of the reports and the information that is available, it seems to me that the government of South Viet Nam is failing to sell itself to the people. Perhaps there is no alternative to it. It may be that the best government possible is in control in South Viet Nam, but the fact remains that it is failing in its responsibility to convince the South Vietnamese people that it has a logical and sensible program of reform which can solve their problems and present an adequate alternative to the claims of the advocates of communism.

My second observation is that military might is no substitute for social, economic and political solutions. I should now like to refer to another article in the *Christian Science Monitor*, the issue of January 24, 1966. The last paragraph reads:

With the growing American firepower to match North Viet Nam's mounting infiltration, there is no longer the threat of imminent military collapse. As long as the United States stands firm, the purely military line can probably be held. But this, in the view of many observers, is merely progress in a negative sense.

The war is not lost. But it has yet to be won.

This emphasizes the fact that if the United States is to accomplish its objectives in South Viet Nam it cannot be done by military might alone. There must be recognition of the fact that economic, social and political problems must be solved because only then can peace be assured in the area.

● (5:00 p.m.)

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there is great need for intensification of efforts in respect of rehabilitation and reconstruction in order to convince the people that there is something better than what is promised by