

Supply—National Defence

want to cut off any discussion that was supplementary to a parliamentary vote involving \$359 million.

Mr. Pickersgill: Now being increased by 10 per cent.

Mr. Benidickson: This is a supplementary item increasing the amount of the vote by \$35 million. I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that, unlike most items in the estimates, we have under the Canadian army in the main estimates only two items, but they total \$420 million and here we are asked many, many months after we have observed government policy, to vote an additional amount of \$35 million for the Canadian army.

Surely in a democracy, having regard to this percentage of our total demands on the taxpayers of this country, we are entitled to have a fairly wide discussion about expenditures particularly concerning the Canadian army. I am sure that in your fairness, Mr. Chairman, you would not deny that.

If one goes to the details on page 14 of the supplementary estimates No. 3 he will see the reason for the observations that I am making at this point. I say that there is nothing more important at this time, having regard to the concern on the part of the taxpayers that we are not doing our duty in scrutinizing some of these expenditures, than looking at these items when they involve vast expenditures amounting to \$359 million in the main estimates and another \$35 million in this supplementary estimate attached to the main estimate.

I say that having regard to that and looking at all the other smaller estimates in supplementary estimates No. 3, surely the tolerance of the Chair will be given to the committee to make sure that the taxpayers' rights are properly taken care of in this matter.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Chairman, on March 15, 1962 when the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate was speaking, the chairman made his ruling. I am reading from page 1861 of *Hansard*:

—with regards to the remarks upon which the hon. member for Levis was embarking I would point out that he was speaking about the principles of joint programs. This is a joint program and if he relates his remarks on joint programs generally to the joint program that is now under study, then to my mind he is fairly well within the realm of relevancy. I do not feel inclined to stop him at this stage—

Mr. Pallett: Would the hon. member read the rest of the paragraph, to complete the ruling the chairman gave at the time. He would not want to leave it up in the air, half finished.

Mr. Browne (St. John's West): He should finish the sentence anyway.

Mr. Pallett: He should finish the sentence at least.

Mr. Chevrier: His Honour has just read it.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Chairman, my time is limited and I would like to address myself to the operation and maintenance of the Canadian army particularly as it applies to a joint program with particular NATO nations when certain circumstances have materially altered since our last deliberation with respect to defence. I think it is proper and germane that we mention this when we have additional pay and allowances of \$4 million, and further pay and allowances totalling \$23,120,000 together with travelling and removal expenses of \$1.5 million. Our Canadian army is obviously not an army by itself. We on this side of the house have tried over a period of months to elicit the facts about the army from hon. gentlemen opposite. We do not know much about it. There is much information known only to the minister and his parliamentary secretary and probably not to many others. I suspect that for the number of fighting troops there is a grossly overweighted headquarters. We do not understand why there are so many headquarters in our military establishment. We do not know all the facts nor can we find them out. Searching the parliamentary library we find ourselves limited, naturally, with respect to the literature published by the department although we have not been at war for several years on a large scale.

I put it to the Chair that there have been substantial changes of policy on the part of our principal allies, particularly the United States and the United Kingdom. These announcements have taken place particularly since January, 1962. These changes compel us to ask the committee to consider whether or not the expenses which at one time we were appropriating are now applicable. I ask the Minister of National Defence whether in light of the fact that our two most valued and trusted allies indicate the need for a substantially stepped up conventional army it is necessary in these circumstances that we review whether or not the expenditures in the direction of nuclear deterrents are proper and relevant.

Recently in the United States the statement was made that there must be greater emphasis than in the past given both by ourselves and our NATO allies to non-nuclear forces. Mr. McNamara speaking with the confidence of the president—and at a number of conferences President Kennedy has repeated virtually the same thing—

Mr. Churchill: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.