

*The Address—Mr. Pearson*

in Karachi and the Minister of Finance in Tokyo were throwing cold water on any change of Canadian policy regarding that government.

This leads me to my final subject for this afternoon, United States-Canadian relations. I want to touch on this matter, and I can only touch upon it because it is a question of the greatest possible importance. I do so at this time only in the context of government fumbling and indecision in policy. There will be other opportunities, I hope, for a discussion of the more general and substantive aspects of those relations about which so much is being said these days. I will content myself now with the general aspect of the question and by expressing my own hope that we, in Canada, should always consider and discuss this vital relationship with a mature sense of responsibility, and with a full realization of the fact that the destinies of our two countries on the same continent, in a dangerous world, are inseparable. We may wish that it were not so, but wishing will not alter the facts; yet the facts should influence and, perhaps at times, govern both policies and words.

When in opposition my hon. friends opposite had some hard and harsh words to say about these relations. They referred to "Texas buccaneers"; "U.S. domination"; "sell-out to Washington"; "the menace of American financial control"; we were becoming hewers of wood and drawers of water for our neighbours; that we were being throttled and sold out. We remember that talk. Then came the realities and the hard facts of official responsibility, and the talk changed overnight, as well it might. In fact, the Minister of Trade and Commerce in Chicago last November, in one of the first indications of the sober second thought that has come from a member of this government, admitted, and I quote:

The misunderstanding that has arisen over this matter can be traced to speeches made in election campaigns for the express purpose of embarrassing political opponents.

**Mr. Churchill:** I was referring to your speeches.

**Mr. Pearson:** The minister never made a truer statement. He must have been reading some of his old speeches.

**Mr. Churchill:** I was referring to yours.

**Mr. Pearson:** The minister must remember that we were on the receiving end of that kind of talk from him and his colleagues, that we were selling out Canada to the United States, and when we tried to put this relationship into perspective as befitted the importance of the subject we were the victims of some pretty vigorous and bitter assaults

from the hon. member and others. They ought to go back and read their speeches in *Hansard*.

Now, what does the minister say? He said this in Chicago:

There is neither alarm nor fear in Canada over the growth of U.S. capital.

Did he talk like that four years ago? The Secretary of State for External Affairs, speaking at Seattle on the same day, was even more expansive. He had this to say:

For the United States, Canada has no fear, no jealousy, no suspicion. On the contrary, we have the positive attitudes of co-operation, fairness, justice and freedom.

The first sentence in that statement might be difficult to prove to every Canadian's satisfaction. He might have difficulty in persuading everybody in Canada that we have no worry about some aspects of United States policy. I am glad he put it that way. However, the second sentence which he said, and which I have quoted, seems to me to be entirely admirable. It is an admirable sentence which expresses sentiments in which we on this side of the house share and upon which I congratulate the minister. I wish he had been in this House of Commons during the debates of two or three years ago.

Even more interesting were the political words used in New York by the Prime Minister at the non-political Pilgrims dinner on October 28 last. Here is what they are according to the text of his speech as circulated by his own office:

Beneficial changes have taken place in these relations (between Canada and the United States) since I spoke at Dartmouth fourteen months ago. The plants in the garden are being more carefully nurtured;—

I enjoy these interruptions and that applause, Mr. Speaker, makes my next observation so much more implicit.

The plants in the garden are being more carefully nurtured; they are being trained up and guided, not left to grow jungle wild.

Well, what evidence did the Prime Minister give of this spectacular change from Liberal times when the flowers in the garden were growing jungle wild? Here is the evidence that he gave. Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles have visited Ottawa. Well, they have done that before. It is true that the President had not previously made a speech criticizing diversion—Conservative policy—and praising expansion—Liberal policy—as the essential foundation of wise trade policy. This was the first evidence that the gardening was being more skilfully done.

The other evidence that he offered to his audience was that there were now three high level Canadian-United States legal committees. One of these is the parliamentary-congressional committee, proposed first by the