

U.S. Invasion of Cambodia

government under Diem. Then under the pretext of having been invited they moved in their military forces and military hardware.

The International Control Commission of which Canada was a member protested the fact that this was being done. The myth was that they were invited in by Diem. This was like a dummy inviting the ventriloquist to dinner. The elections were never held. What had been a temporary military demarcation line became a fixed border. Some of the previous speakers who spoke about freedom should look at the sort of freedom there is in South Viet Nam. I doubt if there is very much more there than there is in North Viet Nam. The only difference is you have an élitist military dictatorship in the south and a Communist dictatorship in the north. But the United States had a vital stake in Southeast Asia and used its puppet government as a pretext for being in Viet Nam and for preventing the implementation of the provisions of the Geneva agreement. Through the protests mainly of the American people themselves it was finally recognized there could be no military solution. President Lyndon Johnson was defeated largely because of his policies in Viet Nam, and President Nixon was elected on his commitment to de-escalate the war.

The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich said that perhaps the invasion of Cambodia will prove to be counter-productive and consequently may not amount to anything. Mr. Speaker, the invasion of Cambodia is merely opening a new chapter in a ghastly story. As someone mentioned today in the press, this is not a turning point in the war; it is a turning back in the war. Anyone who reads the history of Southeast Asia will realize that a western industrial power invading any country in Southeast Asia is like a fly landing on flypaper; you can get in much easier than you can get out. The French learned that. The Japanese learned that and now the United States is learning it. The announcement last night by President Nixon that the United States is sending ground troops and bombing planes into Cambodia opens a sinister chapter in this already bloody story.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has pointed out, as did the President last night in his speech, that there have been Viet Cong and North Viet Nam troops in Cambodia for five years. This is the business of the government of Cambodia. Apparently Prince Sihanouk, who was the head of state, [Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

did not object. As a matter of fact, I gather from the comments of the Secretary of State for External Affairs that one of his quarrels with the International Control Commission was the fact that they were reporting the presence of the Vietnamese and Viet Cong troops in Cambodia. But Sihanouk was deposed. A military government took over. It could be assumed that they would be much more in opposition to the presence of foreign troops. But it is interesting that they have not asked for intervention. They have made no appeal to the United Nations, to the United States or to the government of South Viet Nam.

This morning's *Globe and Mail* states:

A Cambodian government spokesman in Phnom Pehn said yesterday that the government had not approved the South Vietnamese-U.S. intervention, adding that Cambodia is a neutral country.

The article points out that the ranking diplomat at the Cambodian embassy in Washington made a similar statement. As a matter of fact, President Nixon himself in his television speech to the United States people said that the government of Cambodia had been informed but not consulted.

• (5:00 p.m.)

When a country is invaded and merely informed that it is going to be invaded, without its having asked for help, without its having requested intervention, that constitutes aggression. The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich says, "Cambodia can protest to the UN". He said, "The fact that they have not protested proves that they are very happy with the situation". They have not had much time to protest since they only found out about it last night. But are we to accept the situation in which the United States, the Soviet Union or anybody else can invade another country merely because they do not like the troops that are stationed in that country? If we accept this doctrine, it is a dangerous precedent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired unless he has unanimous consent to continue. Is there such agreement?

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I will make my remarks brief. We have to recognize, I think, that for several years now every time there has been an escalation of the war in Southeast Asia we