

estimate which is before us on the basis of this rule of procedure which I have read from May.

Mr. Benidickson: Mr. Chairman, I wish to reply to the leader of the house on the point of order. As I wrote down his remarks I believe he referred to a relatively moderate amount. We are dealing with an amount of \$35 million.

Mr. Pickersgill: Exactly.

Mr. Churchill: What percentage is that of the total vote?

Mr. Pickersgill: Ten per cent of the original estimate.

Mr. Benidickson: In disdain the Minister of Veterans Affairs who is leading the house asks what percentage is that of the total amount of \$7.4 billion that the government is asking the taxpayers of this country to pay. I wish to remind him that the minister often chided one of his eminent Liberal predecessors, a man who vastly increased the economy of this country, for having said off the cuff, "what is a million compared with receiving another \$10 million or \$20 million out of it?" The minister disdained that. He says \$35 million is a relatively moderate amount.

At page 15 of supplementary estimates No. 3 which are before us we see reference to pay and allowances for the army. Referring back to the current item in the main estimates for 1961-62 we find under the item relating to the Canadian army a tremendous amount appropriated for operation and maintenance and pay and allowances. I say we are entitled in this committee to deal with any operation of any employee who will be paid under this vote. The sum of \$35 million is involved in this vote for pay and allowances of members of the army. I say we may discuss policy and have the right to say that certain people are not properly employed.

The Chairman: Before the hon. member for Leeds continues I would like to recall to hon. members that, after all, the rules are made for our guidance. I believe it was the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate who recently said this is a free parliament. Our rules were made by a free parliament and they have been accepted. It is only by all members accepting the rules that intelligent discussion can take place and progress can be realized.

I believe there are 96 items listed in the supplementary estimates. I think all of us understand that if every item listed in the supplementary estimates were to give rise to a discussion of policy and general affairs we would not be devoting our time to the business for which this committee has been set

up. I would therefore ask the hon. member for Leeds, who has tried to co-operate, to continue to correlate his remarks and not to get into the subject of broad policy. There is a distinction between broad defence policy, nuclear policy and so on and the more restricted interpretation of policy inasmuch as it applies to the pay and allowances of Canadian military personnel. I think that within that frame he can validly and completely discuss the item under consideration. I should very much like him to restrict his remarks.

Mr. Benidickson: What about the much misjudged civil defence?

Mr. Harkness: Go ahead and talk about that.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No. We cannot do that.

Mr. Matheson: The minister has referred to a relatively minor vote of \$35 million. In my innocence I felt that with a population of eight and a half million, this is a relatively substantial item.

Mr. Chevrier: The hon. member means eighteen and a half million people.

Mr. Matheson: Yes, eighteen and a half million people. May I say that the really serious situation that we see is that Canada can spend in the wrong direction such large amounts that actually we lose for our army any flexibility, any opportunity to develop, change, expand or keep up with the times or actually fulfil this very special purpose which our NATO allies would assign to us if we had a government that could sit down and enunciate policy and be able to indicate where we would be able to fit in, maybe with the Norwegians, Danes and so on, for special conventional purposes. Obviously, from the remarks of the Chair, it is the wish of this committee that we not discuss policy at all.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Matheson: But when we take the position that we are paying about \$1.6 billion for a gigantic shotgun blast that hits nothing and makes nobody happy, we are concerned because our little army which could be vitally significant for the objects of the NATO alliance and indeed in other roles, perhaps under the United Nations and so on, is not fulfilling its purpose and function for which it is naturally best adapted.

An hon. Member: How do you know?

Mr. Matheson: The hon. member has asked how do we know. We talk to military people also. We have talked to a number of military people. I am not going to mention some of the military people who would like to have some of these ideas passed out to the country