

to him, that of consulting the people's representatives in Parliament before presuming to represent Canada at this most important conference.

Honourable senators, his actions in this matter are now history; it is a *fait accompli*. You might ask: why bother talking about it? But, honourable senators, the Prime Minister has established a precedent. In my humble opinion—and I am satisfied it is the opinion of all eminent constitutional authorities—it is a very bad precedent, and I hope that no future Prime Minister will follow it.

Now perhaps I should say a few words about this conference. Did Canada's representatives act at the conference in a manner which met with the approval of Canadians from coast to coast? In my opinion the answer is no; far from it. Most Canadians with whom I spoke not only disagreed with what was being done, but were completely disgusted with the stand which Canada took; and I hazard the guess that had a poll been taken at that time the Government would have found few Canadians in accord with what was being done.

The press was not happy about it. You might say: that is the Liberal press and I am not going to read any extracts from the Liberal press. However, I think it is fair for me to read a comment from the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of January 10 last, as I do not think anybody would say that paper leans too strongly towards the Liberals.

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: Or towards the Conservatives.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Brantford): Perhaps not. Might I accept the suggestion of the honourable minister, and say that it is a non-partisan paper? This is what that non-partisan paper had to say:

The long period during which Canada behaved like a tearful infant, certain that Mother's entry into a new sphere would hurt the baby, merely prevented this country from exerting its proper influence on the negotiations and from developing the necessary attitudes to profit from new developments.

Officially, Ottawa has now decided to grow up and face with maturity whatever the Common Market should produce. It should tell Canada House to put away its hanky and do the same.

I should also like to read an extract from the *Winnipeg Free Press* of May 15 last. That paper, I will admit, is one that does not lean too strongly towards the Conservative party. In it I find these words:

For the privilege of installing itself as the dog in the international manger Canada already has paid a high price,

much of it yet incalculable. The final cost of its outright quarrel with Britain, on the issue of the Common Market, and its fractured friendship with the United States cannot be reckoned only in economic terms. Under the best of conditions, and under a new government, it will take a long time to repair the recent damage to Canada's stature, influence and self-respect.

The Canadian people may well ask how the Diefenbaker government managed to plunge them into this state of isolation from their closest and most important friends abroad.

Honourable senators, the last reference I shall make is to a few words from the *Calgary Herald* of April 24. Referring to the Government it says:

Its incredibly inept approach to the European Common Market changed Canada's stature abroad.

Now, honourable senators, I shall not quote further, but from what I have read—and I think they were representative statements of the press throughout the country—it is clear the Prime Minister did not present to the conference the views of the great majority of Canadian people. The citizens of Canada by and large do not want to put roadblocks in the path of Britain's entry into the Common Market. Of course we want to retain our preferences, but if we analyse the remarks of Prime Minister Macmillan, it is clear that the United Kingdom cannot much longer maintain her present state of economy unless she does join the European Common Market. It is obvious that unless Britain is strong our trade preferences will be of little value. Of course when she joins the Common Market there will have to be adjustments in our trading pattern, but it is clear that in the long run—and it will not be so long at that—Canada's trade with a strong and ever-strengthening United Kingdom will be much more valuable than with a United Kingdom isolated from the Inner Six and putting up an unequal struggle to maintain her present position.

Honourable senators, there is another reason why Britain—and I shall put it in the affirmative—should be encouraged to join the Common Market. The reason to which I am going to refer far transcends that of trade. It has to do with the peace of the world, and nothing is more important. Most of us have witnessed the agonies, the destruction, the suffering and desolation of two world wars. Prior to 1914 Britain was going her own way, as were the nations of Europe, without regard to and without consultation with the other European countries.