

*U.S. Invasion of Cambodia*

are always wrong. Can you show me where he ever saw that anything was right? I have no such occasion in mind at the moment. Naturally, there will be condemnation in the United States, because there is fear there, too.

Away back in 1914—and I lived through that period—nobody thought a war would come. We read that if there had been a little more industry shown on the part of diplomats in Great Britain, France, Russia and Germany, there would have been no war. Mankind does not want a world war; everybody agrees with that. But, Mr. Speaker, if the United States were out of Asia, the marching legions of Communism would take over in Asia in those places where today they march by subterranean methods.

Do you not think the President of the United States faced one of those awe-inspiring appointments with destiny while others slept? The responsibility was on his shoulders. It was obvious as he spoke last night that he did so with the realization that he and the United States, by risking this action, had undertaken an appointment with destiny. I do not want to see the message go out from this chamber that, with 40 or 50 members present, it endorses any widespread and unqualified criticism of the United States. That responsibility which Britain had and the United States now has is awe-inspiring. In the words of Matthew Arnold, it is like a "weary Titan—staggering on to her goal, bearing on shoulders immense, Atlantean, the load, well nigh not to be borne."

Sir, as I listened to the speeches today I wondered whether we realized how fortunate we are in Canada that our neighbour is the United States.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I had every reason to take strong umbrage because of what happened in 1962 and 1963. What was heresy then, when we refused to take those nuclear weapons after the bomber no longer was the primary danger to North America, was completely approved in the speech of the President to Congress on March 12, as I recall the date. Having said that, I ask, what recommendations can you make? I do not know what recommendations should be made. Should the Geneva Conference be convened? Who will accept the invitation? Is there any nation that will?

For over one year the United States, in facing North Viet Nam across the negotiating table, has continued to make allowances.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Whatever the United States has offered has been spurned. Consult the United Nations, someone suggests. My friend, the leader of this party, Mr. Stanfield, thinks this would work and that we should try it. Well, I have no reason to object to anything being tried, but as I see it there is no possibility of anything being achieved. The United Nations today is a denuded shadow of what we believed it could be in San Francisco in 1945. The blame rests on the veto. Some say, "Bring this matter before the Security Council." How long would it last there, with the power of veto? It could be tried, but the attempt would be innocuous unless there has been a complete reversal of opinion on the part of the U.S.S.R.

The minister wondered if there is not some initiative we could take. I would like to suggest two, and I do not want anyone to think I am being facetious in what I am about to say. First, how about sending Chester Ronning again to Southeast Asia? He has gone on two occasions. He has entrée in Asia. He has an unusual personality and a capacity to transmit his views. Second, the Canadian government is negotiating with Communist China the question of recognition. The minister smiles now.

**Mr. Sharp:** I am waiting.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I do not suggest that any close relationship from the discussions would permit Canada to place her views with the representatives of Communist China, but when you get right down to it that country is the backbone and the bulwark support of North Viet Nam, and has been throughout the entire period of the war in Viet Nam. Three years ago I was talking to an audience at a United States university. What I said on that occasion was not very acceptable to many. I said at the University of Miami that a military victory by either side cannot be achieved and that a political settlement is the only possible solution. In the light of subsequent events, that statement was well-founded.

Can you imagine the position in which the United States finds itself? It has its troops in South Viet Nam and across the border in Cambodia the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong are accumulated in large numbers. Whenever they want to, they can come out and attack. If a criminal were to commit a crime on one side of the street, would you deny police officers the right to cross to the other side of the street and arrest the wrongdoer?