

already knew. But the point is, what good has come of this; in what way have the deliberations of that committee assured the people of Canada that these things will not happen again?

In what way have any loose business practices been tightened up? Was anybody reprimanded for wrongdoing? If anyone was, I never heard of it. In other words, no action nor benefit really came out of the hearings and recommendations of the committee—nothing. I recall a member of that committee saying upon returning from visiting the *Bonaventure* last spring, "I'm sure this time we've got 'em; heads will roll this time". No, he was not a member of the party to which I belong. The only heads I know of that are going to roll probably are those on the *Bonaventure* if she ever puts to sea again. Anyway, we are going to scrap her after spending \$14 million.

The public accounts committee probably is not a good example of lack of action on committee recommendations, because all that ever happens really is that there are some newspaper articles on such things as horses on the payroll, highly escalating costs of naval refits and highly escalating costs of world's fairs and centennial arts centres. But that is about as far as it goes. Lack of results, yes, but I suggest all that comes of it is a studied ignoring of this committee by the government.

● (4:50 p.m.)

Up until now at least, the government has not openly directed or dictated the findings of this committee, but I suspect it will not be long now until this is done. What about the Transport Committee report? In that case the poor chairman of the committee allowed a motion recommending the continuation of the "Newfie Bullet"? What happened to that report? More important, what happened to that chairman? Neither one of them lasted long, and the results of the committee recommendation did not last long either.

Do you remember how that report never quite made it to the House? I have no intention of boring you with the details. It is all in the record of last session. You will recall how the matter was referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, but how many of you recall the earthshaking decision that that august body handed down? In case you don't I would like to read it to you. It is to be found in *Votes and Proceedings* for

21362—21

The Address—Mr. McCutcheon

February 13, 1969, volume No. 92, at page 695:

Your committee reports that the reason for the omission—

I am referring to the Newfie Bullet resolution.—is that it was never moved and concurred in that the said resolution, adopted by the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, be part of its Second Report.

How many of you recall how it was impossible for many days for the government to make a statement in the House regarding our future role in NATO? The reason given was, "We cannot do anything until the Defence Committee reports. They are over in Europe now, travelling from base to base. When they get back here to Canada we will make a statement." The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) mentioned this today.

The committee got first-hand information, and when it returned it reported to this House as follows:

1. Canada should continue to play an effective role in the preservation of peace through membership in NATO.
2. Canada should continue to maintain forces in Europe as a contribution to the collective defence arrangements of NATO.
3. Canada should continue its present roles in Europe until such time as the main items of equipment for its Air Division and Mechanized Brigade require replacement.

Did that report make any impact on government thinking? Not one bit! I quote from *Hansard* of April 18, 1969, page 7724 where the following announcement appears:

The Canadian government intends, in consultation with Canada's allies, to take steps to bring about a planned and phased reduction of the size of the Canadian Forces in Europe.

According to the hon. member for Vancouver East, that announcement was made within minutes of the arrival home of the Defence Committee. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of that—

Mr. Winch: I can.

Mr. McCutcheon: He is here and he says he can.

There may be some who think that what I have pointed out does not mean much. Maybe it does not, but it meant enough to a certain Liberal Senator because he resigned from the committee. He could not stand it. Do you remember that?

There are those who will disagree with what I am pointing out, and who will say the government has the right to govern. In this I