

*Restraint of Government Expenditures*

**An hon. Member:** You must eat a lot of baloney.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I have heard all kinds of explanations. But can you see a picture of the Minister of Agriculture sitting with a group at the round table, like King Arthur who has been commemorated throughout the years, whether he existed or not? What do the South American countries say about that ejaculation on the part of the minister? A caller from one of those countries asked me, "Who is this fellow?" I had to explain that he was the Minister of Agriculture for Canada.

We were talking about waste and extravagance. How could anyone expect it would be otherwise with a Prime Minister who has been on a constant spending spree? There is 24 Sussex Drive. There is the home in the country. The Taj Mahal has nothing on that! If the Prime Minister is a waster of public money, as he has been to the extent of spending \$400,000 to beautify the surroundings in which he lives, do you expect the cabinet to behave any differently? What is his attitude toward parliament? I do not want to resurrect anything from the past, but I think of that pool—\$200,000 was the original cost. He said it was donated by certain philanthropic Canadians. He himself apparently contributed something, because one of the ministers reporting on the subject said he had. But what sum did he contribute? It could have been \$25 or \$30. Why should parliament be denied this information?

Mr. Speaker, it was not philanthropy which was shown here, it was cupidity, because before they made their contributions those philanthropists got in touch with the Department of National Revenue and it was agreed that whatever they contributed would be deductible as an expense in the determination of their income tax. So if you and I paid for it, Mr. Speaker, why should not the Prime Minister, with the love of parliament he spoke of today—I have never known him speak in such feeling tones—

**An hon. Member:** Why not?

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** He was trying to teach the rest of us how parliament should be conducted. He, who has done everything to destroy it, dares to try to teach the rest of us how parliament should operate. Again, you get the picture. I had hoped that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) would be here today. He was for a while. He has established for himself a most unusual record. He flies through the air with the greatest of ease—at our expense!

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

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** He flies to Calgary, because there is no government representative there, just as the Grey Cup game was on. That cost \$8,000. He spent \$750,000 in three years. But this does not tell us how much he spent prior to that, because the records have disappeared. He says he believes the western farmer should recognize, as far as the Crowsnest pass rates and other freight rates are concerned, that the principle to be followed is that of "user pays". He believes he can use and we can pay.

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

[Mr. Whelan.]

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I want to go on to a statement he made on Sunday on "Cross-country Check-up." He was explaining the unexplainable, unscrewing the inscrutable, and he came out with this observation: he said, "There are other ministers who have spent more." I had hoped there would be quite a number of them here today, because I would like to give them an opportunity to stand up and identify themselves. This is an example of what the government has done all across the country. People are asking, "What about Lang?" Having been out in the west, I can tell you that his song after the next election will be "Auld Lang Syne."

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

**An hon. Member:** Its a lang, lang way to trick the prairies!

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** If the hon. gentleman were here, I would say some more. I should merely like to add that there will be no aircraft fast enough to get him out of the way when members opposite go to the people in the next election and receive their condemnation. In the old days, during the days of depression and drought for the farmers of western Canada, conditions the like of which have never been seen before or since, those who had little cars could not operate them, so they simply hitched them up to a horse or two, and because the government of Canada was under the prime ministership of Mr. Bennett they called them "Bennett buggies." I think there should be a name given to these high-class jets the minister uses—Otto-mobiles because he deserves to be remembered in history as the man who flew away three-quarters of a million dollars worth of the Canadian people's money. I should like, also, to know the names of the other ministers who were big spenders. I know the Minister of Agriculture would not be one of them. He spends his time at round tables. But who were these people? Can we get any information about them? Oh, I see the minister is going to provide it.

**Mr. Whelan:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I should like to remind the right hon. member that he bought the first two jet planes. I am sure he did not buy them to leave at the airport terminals; he bought them to serve the people of Canada.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I see that what remains of the ministry is applauding. The hon. lady from British Columbia is applauding. The point I am making is that the government has been using these aircraft in a way which cannot be justified, that is, taking them for personal use.

● (1620)

There is the position of affairs. No amount of water from Neptune's ocean will ever wipe out the blemish of the Minister of Transport, because what he did was totally unjustifiable, even though he said the other day by way of Calamai that there are others in the same position. No one has any objection to the use of an aircraft, though I am not one who would choose a high speed jet, provided however it is used on