

*U.S. Invasion of Cambodia*

ernment is capable of doing so itself and has, indeed, brought the situation in Cambodia to the attention of the United Nations. So far, however, it has not pressed for a Security Council meeting. If in fact the Cambodians believe they have been invaded, notwithstanding the view expressed by President Nixon, then of course they could certainly take this matter before the Security Council.

The difficulty about discussing the situation in Southeast Asia at the United Nations remains as it always has. Many of the parties are not members. Neither North Viet Nam nor South Viet Nam, as the hon. member for York South said, are represented and of course the chair of China is occupied by the Republic of China government rather than by the People's Republic. Furthermore—and I point this out to the House—the Communist side in the dispute has always vigorously denied the authority of the United Nations to discuss the war in Viet Nam.

**Mr. Lewis:** Of course they would.

**Mr. Sharp:** All I am saying to the House is that it is very difficult under these circumstances to feel that this would be the most useful thing today since there seems to be expressed opposition on the part of one of the parties to the conflict. For the moment the prospect of any Security Council consideration of the Cambodian situation does not look promising, but there may be other United Nations machinery which might be employed.

I throw out this suggestion. In the past the despatch of a personal representative to troubled areas by the Secretary General has proved a helpful intervention. This is something which I think might be a useful initiative at the present time. When it comes down to it, however, any of these efforts will be successful only when the various parties agree to negotiation. Until the parties are prepared to discuss the issues, a Geneva-type conference or any other initiative cannot be forced on them. As soon as there is any hope in this respect, there will be an opening for Canada, and indeed the other interested governments, to make a helpful contribution. All we can do in the meantime is to urge the parties to get together, but the idea that one could call upon a group of countries that are not involved in the dispute to settle the dispute is obviously unrealistic. There must be a disposition to negotiate and there must be a disposition to agree. In this case, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House of the Canadian gov-

[Mr. Sharp.]

ernment's desire to see this agony in Indo-China come to an end as quickly as possible. We will spare no effort.

I am sure the House will support the government in avoiding what might be called diplomatic gestures, and I hope the House will support us in concentrating upon the hard slugging and even upon the quiet diplomacy that is so often derided but which is of the essence of effective work in the cause of peace.

● (4:00 p.m.)

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, all over this nation and throughout the world today there is deep fear on the part of mankind and I think all of us should restrain ourselves on this occasion and not engage in incendiary statements. I am sure that when the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) reads some of the statements that he made so freely today he will regret having done so.

**Mr. Lewis:** I will not.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Well, there are some to whom common sense will never appeal. I remind him that his party in the United Kingdom has not engaged in the type of speech or action that he has placed before this House. He has a power of language and debating skill that I have always admired, but his reaction to the tragic situation that faces mankind today was not marked by that degree of self-control which is necessary.

**Mr. Lewis:** Which the right hon. member always uses.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I did not get the benefit of that interruption. Apparently the hon. member is annoyed already; the interruption indicates that. I listened as he covered the whole gamut of Socialist condemnation of the United States, and one wonders who is the wrongdoer. I am one who has had disagreements with the United States. The state department interfered in Canada in 1962 and 1963 in a way that was completely unjustified. Today we are facing a situation that will not be made better by incendiary speeches, however attractive they may be as headliners for the press.

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

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** One would almost think that the United States has become a criminal in the dock. There are many things with which one disagrees but there is one thing