

Commonwealth that a condition precedent to Britain's joining the European Economic Community was the safeguarding of the interests of commonwealth nations. That was generally understood by all commonwealth Prime Ministers, who would have betrayed the trust of their peoples had they not pressed strongly for as wide-open a window as could be obtained in the Common Market tariff wall. Why did the prime ministers from the four corners of the world gather at London, except to urge Britain to seek the best possible terms for herself and for the Commonwealth in Common Market negotiations? That was the purpose of their going to the conference and that is what they did. Any other course would have been ridiculous.

Now as to the view of the people. This leads me to refer to press clippings. Canada is a broad country, and there are many newspapers to choose from, but I shall quote from only a few of them. First, I shall quote from the *Regina Leader-Post* of September 13 last:

What the prime ministers stated left the impression the feeling was shared that Britain will join providing that the final terms are fair and reasonable and that, as Prime Minister Macmillan declared, there are "satisfactory safeguards for other Commonwealth countries".

Next I shall quote from the *St. Catharines Standard* of September 19:

To suggest—as certain politicians currently on the election warpath have done—that Prime Minister Diefenbaker, Mr. Nehru of India and certain other commonwealth leaders have stabbed Britain in the back by opposing its E.C.M. plans, is to confuse the facts, or worse. Mr. Diefenbaker spoke for what he felt were the best interests of the commonwealth. And so did the other commonwealth prime ministers.

Now I quote from the *Winnipeg Tribune*, September 17:

The contention by Mr. Pearson and other Opposition spokesmen that Canada has lost its influence and prestige at international conference tables does not stand up. If Canada had little influence, no one would be paying much attention to Mr. Diefenbaker's views in London. This is certainly not the case.

The *Fredericton Daily Gleaner* of September 12, said this:

Prime Minister Diefenbaker has made many a telling speech in his long career as politician and statesman. He never did better than yesterday when, as acknowledged leader of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers meeting in London, he gave his

views—and Canada's—on the issue of Britain's proposed merger with the European Common Market.

Diefenbaker is the key man at this conference. What he said will have a profound effect.

Another matter which the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Macdonald, Brantford) mentioned was the World Food Bank. I have already dealt with that. I was pleased to hear him endorse the Prime Minister's outstanding work towards making more of our surplus food available to needy nations. He also criticized our economy, in these words:

...we are on the downgrade in regard to our economy.

And to substantiate this he went on to say:

I think from what I have read it is clear that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association has lost confidence in our Government.

I would now like to quote from *Industry*, a magazine which I note is published by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. In the September issue under the heading "Forging Ahead" it says:

How fares the Canadian economy as summer gives way to fall in this year of 1962? The answer is that it is faring very well indeed.

Does that sound as though the Canadian Manufacturers' Association did not approve of the Government's stand? It goes on to say:

Industrial production in the first six months of this year was up more than nine per cent on the same period of 1961. Likewise manufacturers' shipments. Retail sales were higher by more than five per cent.

Output of passenger cars and passenger trucks climbed by more than 30 per cent in the first half of the year, sales by more than 20 per cent.

The buoyancy of the economy in general and of manufacturing industry in particular was the reason why there were a record number of Canadians at work at the end of July—180,000 more than a year earlier—and why nearly 50,000 fewer were without employment. Significantly, of those who were looking for a job—4.5 per cent of the total labour force—only one in three had been unemployed for more than three months.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition spoke of the unemployment picture. I have just mentioned how it has changed. At page 34 of *Hansard*, he commented that the unemployment problem "was laughed off". I am