

Then he said:

We have a balanced budget and it's going to stay that way—

It is in ways like this that we in the House and the country have been deceived, and this is what causes me to be very suspicious of the explanation concerning this particular subclause.

● (1230)

I could go on and read another promise of the Prime Minister. I have one of his press releases here and this is what he promised:

The government intends to hold down federal government spending and to keep our expenditures in line with our tax revenues. In other words, our aim is to achieve a balanced budget.

The people of Canada were deceived in the last election because they believed the Prime Minister when he said something to this effect: "We will not bring in price and wage controls." The then leader of the Conservative party said that they were necessary. We went down to defeat because the hon. member Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) said what he believed to be the fact. This government lied to the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is this government any more truthful today when they say that, as far as this clause is concerned, they really do not intend to use it? This parliament is an emasculated parliament. Why is there this rush in these dying days to bring in this particular section? What is the purpose? What is the means? I look across the floor and see the whip of the Liberal party, an intelligent man, and he smiles.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am glad that his colleagues agree with him because what he is doing is smiling while parliament is being trampled on.

Mr. Raiton: I laugh when I hear that from you. I do not smile, I laugh, John.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I will be glad to receive any interruptions. I do not see the hon. gentleman here for York East (Mr. Collenette) who was here just a while ago. I was hoping that he would be here, because he spends most of his time in this House saying no to everything we bring in by way of Standing Order 43. I intended to say some very kind words to him. I was raised in York East and I have a very high regard for the people of that constituency. I just hope that they will rectify the mistake which they made when the opportunity comes.

If we give the Government of Canada the power for which they are asking in this bill and the power contained in the referendum bill, we might as well close this institution now. The opposition will cease to exist.

Mr. Raiton: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: What is the hon. gentleman saying? I would like to get those precious words.

Energy Supplies

An hon. Member: He is just mumbling.

Mr. Diefenbaker: With the record of the promises which were made in 1974 and 1968 by the Prime Minister, the Liberal party and the members of the government, I can only conclude that anyone who trusts them when they say they are not going to rule in the House of Commons of parliament can only be suspicious and more than suspicious.

Just in passing I would like to mention that I am concerned about something which happened in the last couple of weeks when a motion of mine—

Mr. Gillespie: I think that that is just terrible. I have been watching you.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. minister makes his finest contribution with a wave of his marshal hand. That is the most intelligent thing that he does. As a matter of fact, if we were in committee and called an adjournment we would be out, because we would not be able to hang around for a couple of hours until we got the necessary majority.

I am concerned about what is happening. I will go into some detail next week on this matter, but a motion which I had made was deleted from *Hansard*. It was deleted from the blues because it did not meet with the pleasure of those in charge. Once we reach the point where things which are said in this House and a motion which is made can be removed, then we are in a serious position in so far as this parliamentary system is concerned.

When I see this particular section, I simply ask one question. I am not going to speak at length at all. This parliament is a farce today, held over and over and over. Why? Because, to use the Prime Minister's expression—what is the word he used?

Mr. Mazankowski: Creep.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Creep. This government is afraid of an election. The Prime Minister travels and faces university audiences. I can understand that because there is some intelligence there, and they proved it by their reaction yesterday. Creep, that is what this government is doing. It is bringing forth major matters of legislation at a time when it is expected an election will take place, which has been postponed from time to time by the Prime Minister because he is afraid to bring in a section such as this. It simply places parliament in the position of being a pawn under the control of a majority government. I would have more to say about that were we not waiting to vote on this amendment by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham.

The hon. member for Northumberland-Durham has stood and pointed out the danger. If the minister wanted to establish for himself a reputation for preserving parliament, he would ask those surrounding him to vote for this amendment. For if it is defeated, it is all over. The government can do what it will and pass whatever regulations it chooses, because at the end of three days a vote will take place regardless of the merits or demerits. Already having this power, why does the government