

*Supply—External Affairs*

those who are anti-communism, but I suggest it is not realistic.

Our objective should be the development of a policy in this country and in the United States, our great friend and ally, which is pro-democratic. This should be our aim and our hope, as well as the reason we spend money on foreign aid in an effort to do our best to assist other countries in obtaining those benefits that we enjoy. We should try to bring to these countries the best parts of our system in so far as they will fit the needs of these countries, in the hope that this will be of benefit to them.

Surely none of us in this house wants to ram anything down the throats of anyone. Surely that is what the hon. member for Leeds is attempting to do in respect of the United States policy in Viet Nam when he suggests that communism is so bad the actions of a democracy must be all right. I do not care whether you kill someone in the name of anti-communism, in the name of crime or in the name of passion, it is still murder. As law-abiding citizens the people who live under a democracy which is founded on idealism must take a very long and careful look at the violence that the United States is perpetrating on South Viet Nam in the pursuance of its policies or the lack thereof. No matter how blind we may be or how unwilling we are to criticize our friend and neighbour, I think a careful consideration of the situation will indicate that the United States is wrong.

Let me hasten to add that no nation in the history of the world has had more concern for its fellow man than the United States. The record of that country's contributions to international aid in an attempt to help underdeveloped countries and its contributions toward peace-keeping and in other directions cannot be criticized. The United States has opened its pocketbook in its endeavour to do the right thing. I am not questioning its motives. But no matter how great and wonderful its actions have been in this regard I must say that in my opinion it is wrong in respect of its policies in Viet Nam. No matter how well meaning or how good the intentions of that country are, its policies are dreadfully wrong. No matter how sincerely the United States may believe it is right in trying to contain communism and no matter how much that country believes in its own anti-communist policies, an action is not necessarily right because it is anti-communist. The idea that

anything goes if it is anti-communism will defeat the ultimate purpose. As a result of that policy there is no reform possible for new or emerging countries and they will be forced to turn to communism as the only alternative. Communism is not the only alternative. Reform is the only alternative and I think it is an alternative these countries are entitled to and should have.

● (5:20 p.m.)

Certainly the Americans did not go into Viet Nam to save the South Vietnamese from an invasion by North Viet Nam. One has only to read the American explanation of their own actions to understand this. Reading in American newspapers what the American foreign office has said one finds that over the course of two years they sent military advisers to Viet Nam to help the neutralists make sure the situation would be stabilized so that elections could be held and the people could determine their own type of government. I think most members of the house would say this is a very laudable and worth-while objective. No one will argue with the idea of trying to bring about peace and stability so that people can choose the type of government they want.

I want to stress that the right to choose the type of government they want is the objective. We have subscribed to this objective in the United Nations charter. It is not a case of choosing the type of government we think they should have, that we want them to have, that is acceptable to us or even that we think is best for them. They have a perfect right to choose the type of government they want even if we think it is silly and even if it is so silly as communism. That is their right and we have subscribed to the idea that they have the right to choose the type of government they want, not that we want.

So here we have the Americans expressing this idea and providing military advisers to the neutralists to stabilize the situation so that elections could be held and the people could choose the type of government they wanted. We say that is a fine, great and wonderful idea. But did you happen to read the news a couple of years later when Buddhists and Catholics were rioting and people were burning themselves in protest that there had not been any elections because the Americans had prevented them? The situation was not stable enough and the American puppet, Premier Ky, said: We will not have elections