

*The Address—Mr. Pearson*

being told—I think the Prime Minister has said it himself—that the British minister in charge of common market negotiations, the Right Hon. Edward Heath, has endorsed it. When I read that statement I was interested in the kind of endorsement Mr. Heath would give to this kind of plan, so I looked up the *London Times* to see exactly what he said at his press conference. This is what he said, according to the *London Times*. This is the great endorsement of the plan:

Although Mr. Diefenbaker's suggestion for an international conference had not been discussed, it could be read into a part of the communique... as could the United Nations proposal for a world conference or indeed any similar initiative.

The president of Pakistan, who was a very welcome guest of the Canadian government a few days ago, did have some very friendly things to say about the Prime Minister's plan; but the finance minister of India, speaking in Ottawa a few days later, and he was here on business, merely remarked about the Prime Minister's proposal for a world trade conference of like-minded nations that a similar proposal had been made at the United Nations and that he could see no point in "duplicating, triplicating or complicating" that earlier proposal.

The fact is, of course, that this proposal of the Prime Minister's was a last minute attempt to divert attention from the failure of his tactics in London and from the very bad reception that they had in the United Kingdom and in Canada.

In view of what happened in London perhaps it is well to remember that in diplomatic negotiations with friendly governments you make your case most effectively and strongly when you do not invite misunderstanding or create ill will. It is also perhaps well to remember the old Chinese proverb, which seems to have been forgotten: "The wise man does not use a hatchet to kill a fly on the forehead of his friend." You must also know very clearly what you are seeking, not only for the short run but for the long run. In this sense the ideals and objectives of the Prime Minister may have been beyond reproach, but his diplomacy and negotiation at London for the realization of those objectives, for the protection of Canada's real interests, were both ineffective and unsuccessful. As so often before, this government exhibited its peculiar genius for getting into quite unnecessary difficulty with its friends.

On this occasion it has followed the normal course, when these things happen, of blaming others for its own difficulties, and in particular the press which, as usual, has been inaccurate and unfair. The British press, and that is not a Canadian Liberal press, was

shameful, according to some reports from government sources, and the Canadian correspondents were misguided largely, we are asked to believe, because the Canadian delegates followed the press rules of the conference after others had broken them. Mr. Speaker, are our representatives really so naive as that? All this was merely a convulsive reaction of a confused and ineffective administration when things go wrong for it, as they so often do.

So far as the Prime Minister's tactics at London were concerned, they have been condemned by a good many journalistic supporters of his own government; yet the Prime Minister now tells us he really accomplished everything he wanted to in London.

**Mr. Winkler:** He did not sell Canada short.

**Mr. Pearson:** He did not sell Canada at all.

**Mr. Winkler:** That is your policy.

**Mr. Pearson:** The Prime Minister now says everything went very well at the conference and that the atmosphere, to use his words, was "friendly and fair." His words were quoted by Mr. Richard Jackson in the *Ottawa Journal*, and Mr. Jackson was very close to the Prime Minister at the conference. He also said:

At no time were there bitter words as reported by clandestine sources to some newspapers. The communique showed this.

However the same Mr. Richard Jackson in his very interesting report—as his reports always are—in the *Ottawa Journal* of September 20, which lauded the Prime Minister's position at the conference and accepted without question, indeed with ecstatic endorsement the above statements, himself added, perhaps a little carelessly at the end of the same article, these words:

Both sides in the communique gave out with the old con—the ten days of talks had all been buddy, buddy. This—

said Mr. Jackson

—was eyewash. Blood had been spilled.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was not as bad as that but all who support the commonwealth of nations, this essential association of men and nations representing all races, all creeds and all continents, could not help but be disturbed by some of the implications as reported from the London meeting.

A very careful and experienced observer, Mr. Robert Duffy, reporting in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* on September 20 expressed this worry, and I am sure it is one which must trouble a lot of people. He wrote:

Despite the genial communique on Wednesday and benign comments on it by various prime ministers, it must be obvious to everyone that the past ten days at Marlborough House have done the commonwealth no good at all.