

*Foreign Policy*

friend the Afro-Asian bloc has and so we have kept our silence in areas where we should have spoken out.

I would contend that the external affairs policies of the government have not been so much misguided, have not grown from any lack of idealism on the part of members of the government, but have been simply out of date and unrealistic. I know I have support in that statement. It was voiced very recently in the *Globe and Mail* by Thomas A. Hockin in two important articles which dealt with Canadian foreign policy. This is what he said:

● (5:50 p.m.)

It would be unfair to say that our foreign policy-makers have been wilfully trying to escape from reality. What is probably closer to the truth is that these policy-makers are not aware of the extent to which they are escaping.

The proof of this flight from reality is becoming clear. Our tendency to put organizational viability before purposes of organizations, our penchant to put ambiguity and peace keeping in the place of clear declaratory policy, our naive faith in the magic of negotiations, flow genuinely from our domestic experience.

Certainly we have been too concerned about the viability of organizations before considering their purposes because we know that when the policies of the United Arab Republic with regard to its neighbour in Aden were criticized in a UN committee a few weeks ago, that committee refused to criticize the United Arab Republic on the grounds that it could safely criticize colonial powers but could not criticize nations that were not regarded as colonial powers. This has seemed to be the policy of the government of Canada as well, at least if we compare what happened in 1956 with what is happening today.

Certainly a great deal has been said by the government about our policies in Viet Nam. We have heard over and over again about the importance of our negotiator there, Mr. Chester Ronning. I am convinced that our actions there and his work were seriously sabotaged by the Canadian efforts a few months ago to have communist China brought into the United Nations, an action that I am sure was the poorest timed initiative that any Canadian government has ever taken in the field of external affairs. I am sure other nations which have a better grasp of the reality of politics in Asia wondered how, at the same time as we were endeavouring to negotiate peace in Viet Nam, we could make efforts to bring communist China into the United Nations just prior to the outbreak of the red guard activities in that country, activities which have been a source of such turbulence within

the nation itself, have had reverberations now in the British crown colony of Hong Kong and previously in the Portuguese colony of Macao. These outbreaks have also had an impact outside the borders of communist China.

When the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) inquired whether North Viet Nam has bombed any other country in the world, I am sure he oversimplified the situation because the question is not really what North Viet Nam has done any more than it is what South Viet Nam has done. The question is whether the communist powers have interfered in lands outside their borders. I would suspect that the United States has learned one thing since 1956, when as well as the Suez crisis we had the Hungarian crisis, and that is that there is no part of this earth that can be safely abandoned to the tyranny of communism. I feel that the government has been too much influenced by the type of pamphlets and briefs which drop like rain on the desks of members of parliament and which seem to coincide so happily with the policies stated in the house today by the hon. member for York South. We had a wonderful example of that in a pamphlet which arrived yesterday called "Viet Nam: The Logic Of Withdrawal" by Howard Zinn. I quote one statement from it to indicate the type of logic it contains:

But surely we have learned by now that the roots of communist success everywhere are indigenous rather than external; that communism is primarily an ideological force where nazism was a military one.

It would be difficult to tell the people of Hungary and Poland that what they faced in 1956 was primarily ideological and not a military force.

This is the problem which the United States has been facing in Viet Nam where there has been a threat of one more takeover by the communist régime of one more part of the world.

We have officially approved the policies of the government when it has endeavoured to bring about peace in Viet Nam and has refused to criticize the actions of the United States, if one can forget the statements that were made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Gordon). But we are concerned about the failure of the government to speak out with precision and make a definite statement as to Canada's position in the Middle East, because this is a most dangerous situation. It is the one part of the world which could take away the headlines from southeast Asia and divert our attention for a while. If we are going to