

Supply—External Affairs

If some measure of control is needed, Mr. Chairman, it is needed at the level of these industries which are shedding human blood. If, instead of making war, we were all trying to develop the resources of all the countries of the world, we would reach step by step the stage where man would no longer have to fight against man in order to have the right to live and think, where all men would collaborate in exploiting the natural resources of our planet and all would benefit equally from the material and spiritual progress necessary for personal achievement and for that of the whole community.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think that all of us in this house and in the whole country should do all that is humanly possible to bring about these negotiations as soon as possible, in order to put a stop to this ridiculous war which is destroying lives and which may spread not only to Asia but to all parts of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we have too many recommendations to make to the hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs, for I am aware of his views on this subject. Nevertheless, I can assure him of the support of our group in everything he will undertake with the UN or with the International Control Commission in order to enter into negotiations as soon as possible, to put a stop to bombing on both sides. It is the only hope that is left us for the settlement of this conflict which, I hope, will end very soon.

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to hold up the committee, and I thought a great deal before rising. The Secretary of State for External Affairs made what was obviously a prepared and measured statement, but I must say to him that that statement was as disappointing as it was measured. It seems to me that the minister attempted to emphasize his and the government's belief in the necessity for ceasing the bombing of Viet Nam, yet at the same time attempted to justify the refusal of the United States to cease that bombing. His entire speech seems to me to have been a kind of roundabout play that sought to do both things; but I do not think you can do both things, Mr. Chairman.

I do not know what the Secretary of State for External Affairs, or anybody else for that matter, means when he refers to meaningful negotiations. Whether or not the negotiations are meaningful will only be evident after

they have started. However, if U Thant and the minister are right, that a cessation of the bombing is essential for any negotiations to begin, then in all kindness to the minister I say to him that it is mere gobbledegook not to recognize that the refusal of the United States to cease that bombing is an obstacle to negotiation.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is exactly what we have said.

Mr. Lewis: Then I would be glad if the Secretary of State for External Affairs would rise and clearly say so. He indicated, for example, that even though Hanoi had stated its willingness to talk provided the bombing ceased, it did not say when.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is right.

Mr. Lewis: I still do not know what the Secretary of State for External Affairs means exactly. It is probably due to my dumbness.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. gentleman is not dumb, and he knows it. I said we believe the bombing should stop and that this should be the first step. This was the position we took in September and it is the position we take now. It is not agreed to by the United States. It was because we knew that the United States did not agree that we sought to get some indication from the north of when the talks would begin, in the hope that it might persuade the government of the United States to stop the bombing as the Secretary General has urged, and as we urge.

Mr. Lewis: With great respect to the minister, that does not enlighten me. If he believed, as I have no doubt he did, that a cessation of the bombing was essential to the start of negotiations and if, after two years of urging by members of this party at least, and by many others across this country, he finally did state publicly that he wanted the bombing to stop, I say to the hon. gentleman that if he is right, and means it, he ought to criticize the power which refuses to stop the bombing. He tells us he sent someone to Hanoi to get an idea when talks could be expected to begin. Is he suggesting that Hanoi had said: Let the United States stop the bombing first and then we shall see whether we can talk? He cannot mean that, because he emphasized that the foreign secretary of North Viet Nam had stated on New Year's day: If the bombing ceases, there will be talks. Does the hon.