

normal. I have before me the viewpoint expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister. This also was "B.H.", before Hellyer. Let me read what he said, because he has been promoted:

For a long time, it has been clear—

I am reading from *Cité Libre* of April, 1963, and this is the translation:

For a long time, it has been clear that the U.S.A. did not like Mr. Diefenbaker. From the beginning, he had proposed to strengthen the ties with the Commonwealth and decrease those with the U.S.A. . . . He had chosen an External Affairs minister who loved peace more than he loved the Americans. He was selling wheat to China . . . traded with Cuba . . .

Mr. Kennedy's hipsters could not tolerate this . . . The word was passed around, Diefenbaker must go.

These are not my words. These are the words of an hon. gentleman who today is in the shadow of the Prime Minister. I read on, Mr. Chairman, because these revelations are extremely interesting. They are honest revelations, because the hon. gentleman is just that. He said:

So it was easy for the Americans—

These are not my views; these are the views of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister of today:

So it was easy for the Americans to give a helping hand to defeat a government already wavering since the first day after the election.

The helping hand came from the Pentagon, and demanded that Mr. Pearson betray his party program—

Mr. Nielsen: Sold out.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I did not utter those words. They were from a man who was brought in by this government. He is not the only one but I do not want to cover everything in one day.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: But, Mr. Chairman, I do want the record to be clear so there will be no misunderstanding. He said:

The helping hand came from the Pentagon, and demanded that Mr. Pearson betray his party program, along with the idealism with which he was identified. Funds were plentiful.

I did not say that. We knew it but we needed corroboration:

Funds were plentiful.

Mr. Nielsen: There is the reason.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is a revealing thing, Mr. Chairman:

Gallup indicated that a pro-nuclear policy would not lose him the majority of electors. Power was within Mr. Pearson's reach—he had nothing to lose, except honour.

Supply—National Defence

Mr. Chairman, those are the words of an acute observer. Then he ends by saying:

And he lost it—and his whole party lost it.

This is an amazing statement. Again, in the issue of April, 1963, we find these words:

Since I have observed politics, I do not remember ever having seen a more degrading spectacle than all those Liberals who became "turn-coats" with their Chief, when they saw a chance of regaining power... Once the leader had shown the way, the flock followed with the grace of animals headed for the feeding-trough.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is an amazing revelation but I do point out to some of the sycophants opposite that it indicates the way to power and position. I go on, Mr. Chairman, because there are others who made statements too. This is another one:

The events of the last month have at least one advantage.

This is again in April.

They allow us to observe very clearly the decline of Canadian political thinking.

The hon. gentleman was concerned with that too. He was one of those whose political thinking underwent that change that beggars description. Let us go on from there:

But what we have not realized is the degree of political decay we are headed for. So, Mr. Pearson and the Liberal party decided to show us; the most serious questions are only important to them in so far as the number of votes they will bring—

Mr. Monteith: Typical.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Perhaps the minister will explain that tremendous change in his thinking.

—and within that party there does not seem to be one man left for whom principles are more important than political power.

These are strong but honest words from an honest observer. Then he goes on to say:

The political philosophy of the Liberal party is simple: "Say anything, think anything: better still, think nothing, simply put us in power, for we can govern better".

This is an amazing revelation because it sets out what an honest observer concluded on the basis of things that have only been revealed in their entirety in consequence of statements that have recently been made. Then there is this:

I remember the federal Liberals of 1957. They were cynics who believed power was their right, and they had come within a hair's breadth of muzzling parliament. Six years in opposition should have had a purgatory effect on these Liberals, unfortunately the events of the last two months proved the contrary.