

U.S. Invasion of Cambodia

State for External Affairs seems to place his entire faith in silent diplomacy—a policy of hear nothing, see nothing, say nothing.

I thought that some of his arguments were most ingenious. For instance, he said that President Nixon is undoubtedly conscious of the risks involved in the policy which he announced last night; that he undoubtedly made this decision in the full knowledge of the opposition which it would incur. Then he went on to say that after all, the United States is a democratic country and the people can remove the government if it is doing something that is wrong.

Surely that is a most invalid argument. Are we to wait till the people of the United States at the next presidential election change the President before dealing with an international crisis? In 1956 when the British and French governments, along with Israel, attacked the Suez Canal, surely it was not suggested that when the people of those respected countries decided to change the government the problem would be resolved. The United Nations stepped in and sought to find a solution to the problem.

Mr. Sharp: They changed their policies.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): They changed their policies under pressure from the United Nations, that is why.

Mr. Sharp: Under pressure from their own people.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The policies were not changed by waiting until the next general election in each of those three countries. Here is the Secretary of State for External Affairs telling us that the only way to resolve this problem is to wait until the United States has a presidential election.

Mr. Sharp: No, I did not say that.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): He said that he doubts the value of simplistic appeals.

Mr. Sharp: I do.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We would welcome hearing what he does think would be of value. He says there is no value in taking this matter to the United Nations. He points out, quite accurately, that some of the countries most involved are not members of the United Nations, and that is true. But they could be invited to sit in on

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

the discussions, and if they accepted it would certainly help them become involved in the world community.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs points out that the Soviet Union on the Security Council has the power of veto, and again that is true. But as I pointed out this morning, only a few days ago Mr. Jakob Malik, Soviet ambassador to the United Nations, indicated in New York that the Soviet Union would be interested in having the Geneva Conference reconvened.

If the right hon. gentleman for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) is right and there is a danger of Southeast Asia falling under the control of Communist China and the great hordes sweeping across the Pacific and endangering the freedom of the people on the North American continent, not only would we be concerned about that but the Soviet Union would also be concerned about it. I am sure that Members of Parliament who accompanied the former Speaker of this House to the Soviet Union on a visit in 1965 would all agree that one of the greatest concerns that the Russians have today is the threat of the growing power of China at their back door. I think there is nothing that guarantees that the Soviet Union would not be prepared to find some solution to this problem in Southeast Asia and they would not be just as anxious as we are to prevent a conflagration in Indo-China which could involve Communist China and which could eventually involve most of the nations of the world.

The right hon. member for Prince Albert referred to the United Nations as a denuded shadow. I would not go that far. Certainly the United Nations has not had either the cooperation of the great power or the essential powers in its constitution that it needs in order to maintain the rule of law in the world. But the fact is that it is the only international body we have from which we can hope to establish the rule of law in the world. To have this matter discussed in the Security Council and the General Assembly, to invite the various nations involved to come to such a discussion, to ask the United Nations to step up the kind of machinery or some type of international commission that might work out a solution in Southeast Asia at least offers some hope.

What disappoints me about the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs is that he has offered no hope at all. The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich detailed one by one the things we cannot do. Today the