

*The Budget—Mr. Fane*

that there was not even a corporal's guard of ministers in the house at that time to support the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). I wondered whether the Prime Minister had forgotten to tell his ministers that the session was reconvening on that day and as a result they were all absent.

I also wondered, Mr. Speaker, whether by any chance those of the Liberal party on the front benches who form the government at the moment thought that because their arch-enemy, the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), was not in the house the Conservative party had decided to lay down and play dead. If they thought that, then I can assure them they have another think coming. Believe me, the spirit that the right hon. gentleman fostered in this party lives on and it is going to live on with our new leader.

To return to the budget, I should like to say a few words particularly about the amendment to the amendment which actually is the topic we are discussing.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif):** Order. It being five o'clock p.m. the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely notices of motions, public bills.

**Mr. Knowles:** Mr. Speaker, I thought there was an understanding that we would carry on with the budget debate today. At least, that is what was intimated to me.

**Mr. Fane:** And to me, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif):** Does the house agree that we go back to the question under study?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

● (5:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Fane:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment to the amendment is what we are talking about now. When the budget was first presented by the minister on June 1 it was still something to talk about. I wrote a newspaper item which was distributed in western Canada. At that time I said:

On June 1st the Minister of Finance took some hours to present his latest budget which, as far as I can see, doesn't mean a thing except perhaps another increase in the cost of living which is already becoming evident. I have not read one favourable comment about this budget in any of the Canadian newspapers nor have I heard anybody, other than Liberal members of parliament, with any good to say of it. It certainly doesn't do anything good for the residents of the prairie provinces.

[Mr. Fane.]

I still maintain that that is correct. I do not intend to talk much more about the budget because my hon. friend from Edmonton West, who is a neighbour so far as constituencies are concerned and a friend, has said just about everything that can be said about it from the financial point of view. I did want to talk about agriculture, Indian affairs, veterans affairs, defence, housing, the cost of living, foreign affairs and a few other matters, but I cannot do so in the 30 minutes each that it has been decided we are to be allowed. This time I must confine myself to the Department of Transport which needs to be discussed most urgently. Don't let anybody ever think that this is not a national issue. I want to talk about a particular case where the Department of Transport certainly has made an awful mess of things.

It is lucky that the former minister of transport had the wisdom, avarice, or whatever you want to call it, to kick himself upstairs by taking the appointment of chairman of the new Canadian Transport Commission before I was able to participate in this debate or I should have had some harsh things to say to him. I cannot make my remarks as bad as I should like to seeing that he is not here to defend himself. But he will know what I think by what I say. I hope that if I get really warmed up I do not lapse too much into western prairie slang. I hope that you will not call me to order, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say, first, what a disgrace it is for the former minister of transport to create a job for himself, establish the rules for it through Bill C-231 which was passed by the house, decide that the chairman of the board should get \$40,000 a year, which is more than the Prime Minister gets, and then take himself off like the witches of Macbeth. They made the air to vanish into but they did not create \$40,000 to await them at the end of their vanishing act. This does not seem right to me. The Prime Minister could have appointed the former minister to the Senate if he wanted to get rid of him. Now, of course, we have the former minister of national defence to finish the job of wrecking the transportation systems of this country and, God knows, he made one gosh awful mess of the Department of National Defence. We will all rue the day he did that. He will probably finish the job that the former member for Pickersgill began with the Department of Transport. I did not make a mistake when I said the member for Pickersgill. Politically he represented the constituency of Bonaville-Twilligate, but to my mind the first statement is correct.