

The Address—Mr. Pearson

government which affected her interests. So careless was it about consultation with the United Kingdom in connection with the air agreement that it announced the agreement before it got the approval of the United Kingdom. As a matter of fact, it has not been able to get it yet. This demand for full information and more consultation sounds especially silly coming from a government whose high commissioner, no doubt acting on instructions from Ottawa, because that is the way in which high commissioners usually operate, refused to meet with United Kingdom representatives and other commonwealth high commissioners to deal with this particular matter.

Mr. Benidickson: Another case of putting the cart before the horse.

An hon. Member: Which matter?

Mr. Pearson: The European market and the implications of United Kingdom accession to it.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): You know that was denied.

Mr. Pearson: Within an hour of this situation becoming known a statement was issued by a representative of Canada House underlining the fact that this had been done deliberately. That statement, I admit at once, was re-explained and denied a few hours later. The world was then told that the non-attendance of the high commissioner was of no significance at all; it was due to a previous engagement, even though this meeting had been called days earlier. The Secretary of State for External Affairs in his desire to be helpful—and he always tries to be helpful in these matters—added that the high commissioner was also suffering from a bad cold.

The attitude of public opinion in the United Kingdom at that time was expressed in *Sunday Times*, a reputable newspaper now under the ownership of a former Canadian—a former Conservative candidate in Toronto, I believe. That paper had this to say last October:

Nobody in London *wants* to quarrel—but nobody seems to be able to keep on terms with the Canadian government.

The Manchester *Guardian* thrust this home on November 30 when it said this:

From now onwards, Canadian views should be heard as freely as before but heeded less.

I do not think any Canadian could have got any pleasure out of reading that sentence in such a famous newspaper.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): A shameful statement.

Mr. Pearson: Then, in the *Hamilton Spectator*, a newspaper devoted to the interests of hon. gentlemen opposite, the following statement appeared on January 6:

The only thing we seem to have succeeded in winning was a reputation for sulking.

Let us contrast this attitude with the attitude taken toward these developments by the United States—an attitude which combined an understanding of the developments themselves with a determination, as is proper, to protect national interests—the same kind of determination as we should show. In contrast to our own negative and sterile attitude, their attitude was positive and farsighted. Consider the report of Mr. Herter and Mr. Clayton. Consider the position of the United States administration as put forward by the under secretary of state, Mr. Ball. Listen to this excerpt from President Kennedy's state of the union message on January 11; I wish we could have had something like this in the speech from the throne. He said:

Will we in this country adapt our thinking to these new prospects and patterns—or will we wait until events pass us by?

This is the year to decide. We need a wholly new approach—a bold new instrument of American trade policy.

That certainly applies to this country. Then the President went on to say, in the same speech:

Concessions, in this bargaining, must, of course, be reciprocal, not unilateral. The common market will not fulfil its own high promise unless its outside tariff walls are low. The dangers of restriction or timidity in our own policy have counterparts for our friends in Europe. For together we face a common challenge: to enlarge the prosperity of free men everywhere and to build in partnership a new trading community in which all free nations may gain from the productive energy of free competitive effort.

On November 9, at Windsor the Minister of Finance pleaded that the United States should supply bold leadership in this field. He said we were counting on it. Then, in Ottawa, after that leadership had been given by Washington, the Canadian government gave a cool and qualified endorsement of the United States plans to the United States delegates who had come here to explain what that leadership might mean, together with the policies and the proposals which would be based on it. Indeed, after that conference, when the Minister of Finance was asked whether the Canadian government had given any form of undertaking to support President Kennedy's proposal for a major reduction in world tariffs, the hon. gentleman replied as reported in the press, and I quote from the *Globe and Mail*:

No, no, that was not a matter for discussion. It would have been premature and inappropriate for Canada to offer such support.