

gested that the Prime Minister had spent money for his private enjoyment as Prime Minister of Canada. This was the charge which had been made by the other side. It had been suggested, for example, that repairs to the Prime Minister's house were made for his private enjoyment as Prime Minister. Those were the kinds of statements which were made across the floor of the House. Surely, in these circumstances, the Prime Minister should be given the privilege of pointing out that when the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was prime minister, improvements were made which resulted in his private enjoyment while he occupied the position of prime minister.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** That is not what he said.

**Mr. Sharp:** Therefore, I think this is a spurious point and I am surprised at the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) for supporting it.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, will the minister permit a question? Does it not make a difference as to whether the charges are true or—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Is the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre rising on a point of order?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) who expressed amazement at the stand I had taken. He asked if it was not proper for that side to accuse this side of spending money, in the same way as this side accused that side. I know that the matter is equal between the two sides if it is true that the right hon. member for Prince Albert spent the money that way; but if it is not true, surely that makes a difference.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can explain, because I know the facts. The truth is the same for the right hon. gentleman and for myself. When we talk about private enjoyment, when we talk about thousands of acres and about using that space, he did it and I did it.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I did not do it.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's Residence Act sets aside 17 acres. I'll bet you the right hon. gentleman used the lake, too. I'll bet you he went fishing in that lake. This is outside the 17 acres.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Childish!

**Mr. Trudeau:** The right hon. gentleman says it is childish. I quoted him—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Is the Prime Minister to be given the opportunity for a second speech?

**Mr. Trudeau:** I am answering a question. The truth embarrasses you.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre asked a question and the Prime Minister

*Privilege—Mr. Diefenbaker*

has been recognized solely for the purpose of answering.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, I repeat, if he enjoyed the lake, so did I; and I said in my speech that I thought it was a good thing that this had been added for the enjoyment of the prime minister. The right hon. gentleman said that he only used 17 acres. I quoted him talking about me, Trudeau, when he said, "He took over everything over there".

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** That is exactly what happened. That is exactly what the National Capital Commission said.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, I used the lake and he used the lake. The truth is the same on both sides. In the one case was I using it for my private enjoyment, and in the other was he using it while prime minister? I submit that both men, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the right hon. gentleman for Prince Albert, are preposterous.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Childish!

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think much turns on the arrangements. Without question, the government House leader and I discussed whether the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) should speak first or not. When the government House leader telephoned me in the morning after the cabinet meeting, that was my first official notification that the Prime Minister would not be present in the House for the full day. In those circumstances, after consulting my colleagues I agreed that the right hon. gentleman should go first. But there was a clear understanding that the Prime Minister would make a statement which would not be lengthy and that he would hold himself ready for questioning. But that is beside the point and I will not press it.

I want to respond to what the government House leader said about the words that were used by the right hon. gentleman. This was not a case of the Prime Minister coming here during the heat of debate and responding to something which the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) had raised in debate. What was said by the right hon. member for Prince Albert had been said three weeks earlier, so this was not a case of statements being made in the heat of debate; it was a case of the Prime Minister's deliberately—

**Mr. Stanfield:** And premeditatedly.

**Mr. Baldwin:** —and premeditatedly saying something. There is no question about it; he did it in a considered way. He came here on May 22 and made those statements. He cannot be excused on the grounds that he made those statements in the heat of debate. There is a clear distinction to be made. This was, in my opinion—

**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):** That is your opinion, not everybody's opinion.

**Mr. Baldwin:** —a cold, considered slander. We who sat here heard it. There was more than an innuendo contained in those remarks. They were a reflection upon the character of the right hon. member for Prince Albert in his discharging of functions as prime minister of the country.