

*Supply—National Defence*

Then he frightened everyone when he said:

As a matter of fact, the fall-out from these so-called defensive weapons alone, if they are equipped with nuclear warheads, would be sufficient to wreck tremendous havoc amongst our civilian population.

Was he speaking the truth then or was he merely talking? Let us carry on because we want to get the complete record. He said:

No, Mr. Chairman, we have no protection from these devices; we are as exposed as Babes in the Wood.

I remember him saying that and it was frightening. What a picture he created with all the certainty of his ideas as he presented them. Let us go on, because these are literary master-pieces. First he frightened us with fall-out and then he said they were no good; now he keeps them.

On September 15, 1961, as recorded at page 8431 of *Hansard*, he said:

It is our opinion, therefore, that it is not necessary to have two Bomarc squadrons, nor is it necessary to arm our defence squadrons with nuclear weapons.

At least then there was consistency, but suddenly he changed his mind. What did he say after three years of denunciation? On February 4, 1963, he said, as recorded at page 3429 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, as of this date, I have changed my mind.

What brought about that change, because there was a metamorphosis of that definite, knowledgeable mind? Let us read on because I know the minister is anxious to have the record of what others said about him after his change of view. I intend to place their views on the record.

Mr. Charles Lynch on July 14, 1965, as reported in the *Ottawa Citizen*, revealed what took place. He was referring at the time to the Heeney-Merchant doctrine that was enunciated, that Canada in relation to the United States should be seen and not heard. Certainly we have had some wonderful examples of that in connection with guide lines and the like in respect of which Canada did not speak out.

Dealing with the declaration of the former ambassador, Mr. Merchant, this is what Mr. Lynch said:

Mr. Merchant will claim that he had nothing up his sleeve and that he practised no sleight-of-hand on our Mr. Heeney. If Mr. Heeney's striped trousers are missing, Mr. Merchant will plead innocence. Just as he did when, years ago, he was secretly briefing members of the Ottawa press corps against the anti-nuclear-weapons policy of the then Diefenbaker government.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

• (4:30 p.m.)

I wonder whether the minister was one of those students who received the inoculation that brought about the change of viewpoint and heart. I ask him to deny that and say he was not in touch with Mr. Merchant, the United States ambassador. He has every opportunity to deny it now but there will be no denial. Was he briefed on the manner in which to undermine the government because that government would not bow to the determination of another state?

**Some hon. Members:** Shame.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Listen to this, Mr. Chairman:

Nobody who attended those basement sessions will ever forget his—

Mr. Merchant's.

—earnest logic and "good-sense" approach as he administered the hypodermic.

Certainly Mr. Lynch reveals that those who were of the elect were given instruction on how to answer the government of that day. And I have something more. There were meetings that took place in Ottawa in the offices of officials of the United States. At those meetings there was first the entertainment—they were given lunch and the like—and thereafter full instruction as to how to answer. That is why I gave the minister an opportunity earlier to deny that he had been in touch with Mr. Merchant.

**Mr. Hellyer:** Mr. Chairman—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** He wants to deny it now.

**Mr. Hellyer:**—I should like to deny it. I had not heard of it until I read of the dialogue between Mr. Charles Lynch and the right hon. gentleman. That was the first I heard of it.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I am not talking about the minister hearing dialogue; I am talking about his hearing what Mr. Merchant said.

**Mr. Hellyer:** I deny that.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I am pointing out the fact that it is a singular circumstance that the minister turned a complete flop from one stand he had adopted for a period of years and suddenly changed just at the time the American ambassador was giving Canada the hypodermic treatment on Canada's policy. Let me pursue that matter, Mr. Chairman. What do some of the followers of the hon. gentleman say? I have before me a few quotations that are of interest. They reveal that this was