

*The Address—Mr. Pearson*

meeting, and speaking not off the cuff but from a text a copy of which I have seen, the Prime Minister permitted himself to say this:

In our relations with the commonwealth I need hardly add that the action taken by the Liberal party in 1956 at the United Nations when they put Great Britain and France in the same bag as aggressors with the U.S.S.R., will never take place with a Conservative government in power.

What can one say about such a false and indeed malicious statement?

Perhaps that statement is best answered not by me but by the two prime ministers of the country that we were alleged to have placed in the same bag as the Soviet union as aggressors. I will therefore call on them and not on any liberal in Canada as witnesses to the truth. If we had in fact been guilty of that offence, if we had in fact lumped them together with the Soviet union as aggressors, these two United Kingdom prime ministers, of all people, would have had no cause to say anything friendly about Canadian policy at that time. Their words are sufficient reply to this false statement. The words of Mr. Macmillan, the prime minister of the United Kingdom, have already been put on record in *Hansard* and it is unfortunate that I am obliged to do so again. However, in view of what was said last November I do not hesitate to repeat what he said in March, 1957, not long after these events occurred. I quote the words of Mr. Macmillan, the present prime minister of the United Kingdom uttered at that time. He said:

I think the service the Canadian government gave to finding good solutions and helping us at the critical moment at the United Nations assembly—

This was over the Suez business.

—was one of a most remarkable kind and will always be remembered by us with gratitude.

We are supposed to have condemned them as aggressors along with the U.S.S.R. and the prime minister of the country which we are supposed to have condemned said that he will always remember our service with gratitude. Sir Anthony Eden himself, who was prime minister at that time, in answer to a question addressed to him on this particular point of a few weeks ago by Blair Fraser on television, had this to say, and I quote from the text of the interview. It will be interesting to see whether he confirms this statement in his book which is now coming out by instalments, but on that occasion he had this to say:

If the United States had taken the line that Canada took, the position in the Middle East today would be very much better than it is.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we shall hear no more of these stupid and false allegations made to selected audiences for political purposes and which have no truth behind them.

[Mr. Pearson.]

I now wish to say a few words about the world situation because in the speech from the throne there are some paragraphs that deal with that subject. Of course, the search for peace and the effort to bring about a reduction of armaments is a policy to which every member of this house, to whatever party he may belong, can subscribe. Anything that the government can do in that regard I know will be given the warm support of every member of this house. We wish the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Green) well in the efforts he is making now towards that end, even though there will be times—indeed there will be perhaps such an occasion this afternoon—when I may not agree with all of the method, which he is pursuing toward that objective.

I think it is true to say that the international atmosphere is somewhat better than it was when we last met in this house and that there has been an easing of some tensions. I think it is also true that there has been a shift of emphasis in the conflict perhaps from the military to the political and especially to the economic; but I also feel that there has been no fundamental change. Certainly one cannot find any evidence of such a change in Mr. Khrushchev's latest and extremely important statement emanating from Moscow the other day. Hence there is no cause for complacency or indeed for any great optimism. The basic factors that brought about the cold war in the first place still remain. There is therefore no reason yet for the west reducing its strength or weakening what unity it has created. Indeed, it might be fatal to do so.

All of us who as citizens are interested in this most important of all questions are in a dilemma. We want to do what we can to create a better atmosphere for peace. We want to take advantage of any opportunity that might be given to us to negotiate peace. But we want to do so with our eyes open, with a sense of realism, not weakening ourselves in the process, something which might be what the other side would hope that we would do. In other words, we must be careful not to be either the prisoners of our fears or the victims of our hopes.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has expressed himself in recent weeks very optimistically in these matters. According to the *Ottawa Journal* of December 24 he exudes optimism. I hope his optimism is justified. On that day, namely December 24—and I am quoting from the *Globe and Mail*, although the statement appeared in other papers—the Secretary of State for External Affairs is reported to have said as follows:

Our view is that we have to accept the honesty of Russian intentions in this (disarmament) committee.