

committee, a review of a review, to have the Currie report referred to a committee—and that by way of an amendment introduced by a member of the government to the government's own motion.

What an extraordinary situation, typical of the government's inability to act to clean up this whole situation. The Prime Minister introduced a motion, which stood on the order paper for many days, indeed, over the Christmas recess. We all knew its purpose. Certainly, the government knew its purpose. They had lots of time to think about it, and yet, when it is introduced in this house, when the time comes to discuss it, the Prime Minister, with that extraordinary indifference which he has shown in this matter, as though he were a superior being standing on a lofty pedestal, with naughty grandchildren running around his feet, really no concern of his—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Cruickshank: You are from British Columbia; don't be as low as that.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Cruickshank: "Order", my foot! That is pretty low, coming from British Columbia.

Mr. Fulton: So he merely gives it the nod, and leaves it to somebody else to speak in support of his own motion. And then we find the extreme of indifference in that that minister, one of his own colleagues, introduces an amendment to his Prime Minister's motion that the committee should review the Currie review. What a most extraordinary spectacle—a government going all ways at once. They are trying to ride too many horses, and riding them in opposite directions. That is a situation which will not give satisfaction to the people of this country—

Mr. Cruickshank: Every horse has two ends.

Mr. Fulton:—who wish to see some assurance that their tax dollars are spent wisely. They will not be satisfied by the spectacle of a government too complacent to be consistent, too arrogant to explain its inconsistencies, and too weak and confused to know where it is going. But the people of Canada know what they want.

Mr. Cruickshank: Yes, they showed that at the last election.

Mr. Fulton: And they will show you at the next. They want to see an investigator who has shown his qualifications, as has Mr. Currie, given a free hand to continue that investigation into the Department of National Defence and its administration, so that he

Committee on Defence Expenditure

may bring to light further ways in which the money of the taxpayers can be saved, and then action taken to implement his recommendations so that we may know that we will get a dollar's worth of defence for every dollar that is spent.

Mr. Cruickshank: Thank God we haven't too many Rhodes scholars.

Mr. R. R. Knight (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I intend to make no attempt to analyse the Currie report, or to discuss that whole matter, serious as it may be. As a matter of fact I had my inspiration for saying a word or two at this time from the speech made last night by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Ferrie).

It is not likely that that gentleman would flatter himself that anybody would pay any particular attention to his speech. However, he did devote a certain amount of attention to me, and therefore his speech holds some interest for me at least.

It is fortunate that the house has its lighter moments, and I think we experienced one of them when the hon. member spoke last night. Amidst the serious business and the frustrations of debate in the house, with which we are bedevilled, we do need a member, like the hon. member for Mackenzie, who will make a speech occasionally and give us cause for laughter.

During the greater part of his speech I was attempting to understand what he meant. However, his words, like his comprehension, seemed vague. I shall give the house now a sample of his logic. I would direct the attention of hon. members to what appears at page 1049 of *Hansard*, because I think they will find it interesting. It would seem that the hon. member for Mackenzie is interested in psychology, because he makes an analysis of myself and two of my more important colleagues. This is what we find in *Hansard*:

Mr. Ferrie: Let us analyse these three gentlemen.

The three gentlemen are my honoured leader, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and myself. He refers to me, at one point of his speech, as "one man in Saskatoon"—and that is an interesting title. He said:

Let us analyse these three gentlemen. One of these gentlemen read it.

The "it" refers to that mysterious copy of the report which, one way or another, came into our hands. Then he goes on:

The hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Knight) read it.