

*U.S. Invasion of Cambodia*

condemnation. The *Times* of London stated yesterday in its lead editorial and I quote:

Has Mr. Nixon learnt no lessons from the way his two predecessors in the White House got involved in Viet Nam? ... In spite of all the warnings the military men seem to have won again. This was where President Kennedy came in eight years ago, always under pressure from the generals, always assured that victory was round the corner with that little bit extra of American commitment. But victory never did come and the machine ground on inexorably through all the suffering and the waste to the stalemate that finally unnerved President Johnson.

I mention this mainly because I believe the world is afraid that this type of military operation will escalate to the point of no return. While the newspaper headlines this morning were full of the Cambodian tragedy, at the same time there were reports from Peking of the Chinese jubilation over the launching of their satellite and nuclear accomplishments. I think the world has good reason to fear.

● (3:30 p.m.)

Perhaps we ought to remind ourselves of part of the history of southeast Asia; there are many ways of looking at the situation in these countries which now occupy the headlines. We were all appalled at the savage treatment of Viet Nam civilians in Cambodia recently, and we may have wondered what led up to this situation. The *Economist* of April 25 gives an account of the differences which have soured relations between Cambodia and Viet Nam long before the present crisis. Perhaps I might quote a paragraph from the *Economist* of that date:

Educated Cambodians believe they have been the victims of Vietnamese expansionism for centuries. Even today they are thankful that the French saved them from what might have been permanent Vietnamese domination.

The article goes on to explain this at greater length.

Certainly, Cambodia is not Viet Nam. Although it lies next door, it is now, as it always has been, a country of a very different people. Those people are a nation which has learned to beware of invaders. And the ones they have for centuries feared most have been the Vietnamese. It is for that reason cold comfort, if any at all, that the main burden of the Cambodian incursion is being carried by Vietnamese rather than American forces. The Cambodians have been neutral in a very real sense. They have been anti-American, anti-Viet Cong, anti-Vietnamese and anti-Communist. In short, they have been simply pro-Cambodian. Now, they find themselves militarily threatened by virtually everybody.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Although for five years North Vietnamese and Viet Cong troops have held substantial segments of Cambodian territory, that country did nothing. The former chief of state, Prince Sihanouk, did not try to prevent the use of his country by Communist troops. When the Communists became even greedier for control of Cambodian territory, Prince Sihanouk was overthrown. The new government decided to resist the Communists. South Viet Nam began making raids across the Cambodian border. Today, South Vietnamese troops are engaged in battle with Viet Cong forces in Cambodia. The Americans are helping. The North Vietnamese are also engaged in that same battle in a country which wants only to be neutral, to be left alone.

It is in these circumstances, recognizing the complexity of the situation, the tragic situation in which the American people find themselves, I realize the situation in Southeast Asia, that I ask the government, if it has started to intensify its work in Washington, Geneva, Paris, London, Moscow and Hanoi if possible. Our envoys and diplomats must call for an immediate and complete freeze on all military activity in Cambodia plus, of course, effective machinery to enforce this. North Viet Nam must be persuaded to recross the border and get out, as must the Viet Cong, the South Vietnamese and the Americans. Of course, there must be methods of enforcement if this is to have any meaning. The question is, of course, how to make them go. That is the major problem. I do not expect the Canadian government to make them all get out by itself. But is it even trying, Mr. Speaker? I suggest to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) that we ought to go to New York and call for an emergency session of the Security Council of the United Nations. Surely, if ever there was a threat to world peace justifying Security Council action, this is it.

The Security Council should immediately set up a new and third version of the Geneva Indo-China talks. It must build on the admittedly imperfect foundations of those talks, to arrive at a new *modus vivendi* for the people of Indo-China. If the original sponsors of the Geneva Conference are now inappropriate, as I suspect some of them are, then the United Nations itself must sponsor those talks.

I admit the Soviet negotiator, Jacob Malik, has been both encouraging and discouraging on the topic. But he must be approached and every possibility explored. Has Canada made