

63 per cent had failed to vote for the Liberals, and that was a glorious victory!

What intrigued me even more was his statement that because of the situation which now exists in the House of Commons he and his fellow senators—and he gave this advice to all of us—must proceed to treat legislation coming before us here in a different way, to give it a sharper examination and to look at it in a different light because, he said, it would be “minority legislation.” The honourable senator from Gormley (Hon. Mr. McCutcheon) answered this, I thought, effectively the other day; but there is something else I would like to say.

Why all this wonderment, why all this amazement about what is called “minority government”? There is nothing strange, nothing new, nothing mysterious about minority government. In the very fatherland of parliamentary government they have had minority governments again and again. Mr. Pitt governed England for many years; he never had an organized parliamentary majority behind him. In the 1890's Mr. Gladstone had two governments that were in a minority—actually dependent on the Irish Nationalists of Mr. Parnell. I see that my most esteemed friend shakes his head; but we can discuss that some other day. Of course, there is in Canada a classic example, that of Mr. Mackenzie King.

So what is all this worry about now? I do not think minority governments are good, but they are not so desperate that legislation emanating from the House of Commons at this time must be looked at in a special light. As the honourable senator from Gormley (Hon. Mr. McCutcheon) pointed out, there can be no such thing as minority legislation. If it were minority legislation, it would never come before us at all. It has to have the support of the majority, and if it comes here with the support of the majority, are we going to look at it and say that the test you should apply to this legislation is: who voted for it in the other house; what were the political labels of the people who gave it a majority vote? Surely that would reduce this chamber to an absurdity.

The honourable leader then discussed the Common Market. This is a pet subject of mine, and I was delighted to hear him on it. I was glad that he mentioned the Common Market, because it gives me an opportunity to say things I think should be said in this house.

One of the first things that should be said—and I do not say it offensively—is that in Canada discussion of the Common Market has been almost wholly illiterate. Most of the people who were criticizing the Common Market had not taken the trouble to find out

what it was about. When one spoke to them about the Rome Treaty, judging by their comments some seemed to think this was a pact between Pope John and the Archbishop of Canterbury.

What is the Common Market? Primarily it is a political instrument seeking political union in Europe, through the devices of fiscal and economic measures. If anyone doubts that, I would advise him to read what was said only three days ago by Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of England, or to read Mr. Spaak; and if that does not convince him that this is a political instrument, a political organization, first, last and all the time, then let him read what was said about it last week by Professor Hallstein, who has been and is today the chief architect of the Common Market.

However, honourable senators, I am not concerned with that; that is not Canada's concern. What I am concerned with is the position of Canada with respect to the Common Market. There are people in England, like Professor Harrod, the distinguished economist at Oxford and the biographer of John Maynard Keynes, who hold with force and vigour that the Common Market is a statistical illusion. There are men like Professor Jay who hold the same view; and there are in England deep thinkers like Sir Arthur Bryant, who believe that if England joins the Common Market this will be a retreat from greatness, this will be an apostasy of England's past, and this will be a sale of the commonwealth birthright for an uncertain mess of pottage. I am concerned with the misrepresentation, the confusion and the distortion of the position of the Government of Canada with respect to the Common Market that have arisen in this country over the last year.

Let us see what has happened; let us go back through the record—and I shall do it very briefly. When, two years ago, the British Government decided they should explore the possibility of their joining the Common Market they came to us and asked—as they had a duty to do, because we are a commonwealth partner—whether we had any opinions to offer. Well, we did have opinions to offer, and there was a meeting at Accra. You know what happened there.

We went to Accra as a commonwealth partner with other members of the Commonwealth to tell the British ministers what we thought might happen if Britain joined the Common Market, or joined it without safeguards for our particular trade. And what happened in this country? There was an outcry, “How dare Canadian ministers go to Accra and talk that way to British ministers?” This was the mood and this was the spirit.