

We were firing on the Guards. And our press, including even some of our Conservative press, joined in this hue and cry.

Now, honourable senators, I am quite well aware that there are a few remaining people in this country still wet with the spray of the deluge, who think that if it is raining in the Strand we ought to turn up our trouser legs on Sparks street. But what are we to say of informed public men using nonsensical arguments like that, telling the house, of course Canadian trade will be affected, of course there will be injury to \$700 million worth of exports, but we must let the British decide? But the British, to give them credit, did not say that. After Accra they went back to the British Parliament for a mandate, for power to go to Brussels and see what they could do. This is the resolution that was passed by the British House of Commons on August 3, 1961, and I would ask you to listen carefully to the wording of it because it comes into my argument later:

That this house supports the decision of Her Majesty's Government to make formal application under Article 237 of the Treaty of Rome in order to initiate negotiations to see if satisfactory arrangements can be made to meet the special interests of the United Kingdom, of the Commonwealth, and of the European free trade association; and further accepts the undertaking of Her Majesty's Government that no agreement affecting these special interests or involving British sovereignty will be entered into until it has been approved by this house after full consultation with other Commonwealth countries, by whatever procedure they may generally agree.

Now that was the mandate they got. That was the undertaking they gave, that nothing would formally be done until they consulted with the Commonwealth, and the manner of consultation subsequently agreed upon was the Prime Ministers' Conference held in England two months ago.

In the light of the resolution passed by the British House of Commons and the authority that Mr. Macmillan and his ministers had, who will argue that Canada had no right to have its Prime Minister at this conference? That is why the conference was called, to get a progress report or an interim report up to that time. British ministers had been assuring us repeatedly that nothing would be done to affect adversely the vital interests of the Commonwealth. Mr. Duncan Sandys at the Conservative party conference put his hand over his heart and said, "I will swear I will leave British public life before anything is done to adversely affect

the vital interests of the Commonwealth." Mr. Macmillan gave us a pledge that if there was a choice between the Commonwealth and the Common Market there was no doubt where he stood. He is not talking exactly that way now, but that is the pledge he gave.

Incidentally, before I forget it, there was a communiqué put out some weeks ago, after the Prime Ministers' Conference, which contained certain statements signed by Her Majesty's Government in Britain. I ask you to read that communiqué and then read the discussion that took place the other day at the Conservative party conference in Wales—"E.E.C. or bust". That was the spirit of that conference. There was nothing about Commonwealth vital interest. And in the speech by Mr. Heath, which was described by Mr. Justice Frankfurter as the finest speech in structure of modern times, what does he say? I have here the exact quotation, and this is almost unbelievable in the light of what has happened since. He said that "under no circumstances can we enter the Common Market unless the vital interests of the Commonwealth partners are protected."

Now in those circumstances, surely it became not only the right but the duty of the Prime Minister of Canada to go to this conference and see how far we could go. That is what happened.

But what was happening over here while Mr. Diefenbaker was in London? Over here an effort was made to stab Mr. Diefenbaker in the back. Everybody knows that. I have the proof of it right down in my office. I can show you that on the very day when two scurrilous journalists in London, one unfortunately on the old *London Observer*, the old organ of J. L. Garvin, and the other the *London Daily Telegraph*—What were they saying about Mr. Diefenbaker? The *London Observer*, of all papers, said Mr. Diefenbaker was speaking for "yokels on the prairies". Honourable senators, those "yokels on the prairies" are the people of whom Kipling wrote after the First World War:

From little towns in a far land we came,
To save our honour and a world aflame.

Then the *Observer* went on to speak of Mr. Menzies and said Menzies was followed by an array—I think the writer used the word "horde"—of Africans and Asians. This is the spirit of the Empire prevailing in London by those who are trying to isolate Mr. Diefenbaker, the Prime Minister of Canada, from the others.

On the very day those attacks appeared in the *London Sunday press*, other *London*