

*Inquiries of the Ministry***EXTERNAL AFFAIRS****CYPRUS—INQUIRY AS TO DURATION OF
PEACE KEEPING OPERATION**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that neither the Secretary of State for External Affairs nor the Minister of National Defence is in the house, I would direct my question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In just something less than ten days it will be one year since the Canadian peace keeping contingent left for Cyprus. How long does the government expect that this peace keeping operation will continue? What commitment has been made for our Canadian forces to remain there?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the question of the extension of the mandate of the United Nations force, as my colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs said the other day, is now being considered. I cannot go beyond what he said then. He hopes to be able to make a statement shortly on that extension.

**VIET NAM—PROTESTS AGAINST U.S.
BOMBINGS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I will address to the Prime Minister, though I had intended to address it to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I know it involves a matter about which the Prime Minister is greatly concerned. Has the government made or does it intend to make any representations to the government of the United States in respect of the bombing attacks launched on Tuesday by 160 United States and South Viet Nam planes without direct provocation, and the apparent adoption of a policy of continuous bombing in Viet Nam?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have been discussing the dangerous situation in Viet Nam not only with the United States government but with other governments that are concerned. We are in the middle of these discussions, and we hope that whatever influence we have will be in the direction of bringing about a negotiated and peaceful settlement under proper conditions. At the moment I cannot go beyond that.

Mr. Brewin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The recent bombing has been described as evidencing a radical shift by the

government of the United States to the policy advocated by Senator Goldwater in the last election. Does the government assess the change of policy in this way?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I should like to look into that question before I comment on it. As my hon. friend knows, the situation is very delicate as well as dangerous. I assure him we are using whatever influence we have in whatever way we can to bring about the kind of settlement I have talked about, and we would deplore any development which would make it more difficult.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Prime Minister if the government of Canada has drawn to the attention of the government of the United States that in their opinion these continued bombings are in direct violation of the Geneva agreement of 1954.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the United States authorities do not admit, of course, that this is a violation of the agreement. The position they take is that the bombing is either retaliatory against attacks on Viet Nam and they are acting in that respect, or that they are trying to destroy the bases from which aggression from the north into Viet Nam takes place.

Mr. Douglas: Does Canada share that interpretation?

Mr. Pearson: I have said before and so has the Secretary of State for External Affairs that the main aggression comes from the north.

Mr. Douglas: One further supplementary question. Is it not true that the report of the truce commission of June, 1962, which the Canadian representative signed, said that not only was there provocation from North Viet Nam but also violation of the 1954 accord by South Viet Nam because of the presence of American military personnel?

Mr. Pearson: I would have to look into that to make sure. It could be given that interpretation, but I should like to point out that if some of the earlier reports of the truce commission and especially the position taken by Canada on that commission had been adopted by both governments in Viet Nam we would not be in this position today.