

*Abandonment of Defence Projects*

was 521 per cent in 1943 as compared to the 1939 production. Aluminum increased by 588 per cent; for machines and equipment, production increased by 630 per cent. For engines, the 1943 production increased to 853 per cent as compared to 1939. The production of airplanes increased from 1939 to 1943 in the United States—we could say the same thing in Canada—by about 1632 per cent, while the production of merchant ships increased by 6918 per cent, and for magnesium, the increase in production was 7100 per cent, as compared to the 1939 production.

That indicates that when there is a war emergency, a national defence emergency, governments, whatever they are, Liberal or Conservative, or Democrat or Republican in the United States, found the required means, funds and credits to make possible those improvements and increases in production amounting to about 500 or 600 per cent in a period as short as four years.

But the war ended in 1945, almost 20 years ago. Since then, the Conservatives and the Liberals have headed the government one after the other, but nothing has changed. We are still looking for a solution to the problem of unemployment in Canada and for means to establish new secondary industries. The situation remains unchanged: we do not have the necessary capital, we do not know where to get the required funds to develop our natural resources in order to help—

[Text]

**Mr. Nugent:** On a point of order, I think the hon. member who has the floor was certainly closer to being in order when he was talking about nuclear arms. Certainly he was a lot more interesting when he was speaking on that subject than he is on this.

[Translation]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I have already reminded the hon. member that his remarks did not pertain to the matter being discussed and that he should stick to the amendment before the house.

I take the liberty of reminding him of that once again.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, the amendment seems to provide that the government should continue spending those sums for national defence, on the recommendations of the special committee on defence.

And now the government decides to curtail those expenses, to reduce the national defence forces and replace those forces by something more constructive.

The hon. member who just finished his remarks, will certainly understand the attitude according to which the government

should not stop spending, but direct its spending to other areas of economic activity, because defence is certainly one of them.

Mr. Speaker, at any event, the amendment submitted to us this afternoon does not mean so much.

The government must be blamed for it. But, when the Conservatives were in power they behaved almost in the same way. Today they are trying to blame the government for things the former government did not do or neglected to do.

Mr. Speaker, I should like now to move an amendment to the amendment. Therefore, I move, seconded by Mr. Gilles Gregoire:

That all words after "government" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

subserviently agreeing to the storing of nuclear arms on the territory of the state of Quebec, notwithstanding the strong protests voiced by the civic and municipal authorities of Quebec, the national societies and the welfare clubs, the labour and agricultural unions as well as by the Quebec members of parliament belonging to all political parties.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I might give my ruling now on whether the subamendment introduced by the hon. member for Villeneuve is in order or not.

As the hon. member and the house know, the debate now in progress originates in an old parliamentary practice, that is a proposal subject to amendments that the house resolve itself in a committee of supply. In this case, it is a grievance and an amendment. But the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) is to the effect that some national defence programs established previously had been cancelled by the government. This is the essence of the amendment.

In my opinion, the subamendment of the hon. member is completely outside the scope of the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and contains something new. Consequently, the hon. member's subamendment is inadmissible and I must rule that it is out of order.

**Mr. Gilles Gregoire (Lapointe):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to explain myself.

First of all, the amendment—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I do not think the hon. member is entitled to give explanations on the validity or the admissibility of the amendment which the Chair has ruled out of order. The only thing he can do now, is to appeal from the ruling. It is certainly not proper for him to launch a debate on a subamendment which has been ruled out of order.