

*Supply—National Defence*

are civil salaries and wages, pay and allowances, professional and special services, travelling and removal expenses, exhibits, advertising, films, and so on, materials and supplies such as clothing and personal equipment, food supplies, and the repair and upkeep of buildings and works.

Those are the sort of things that we are dealing with. We are not dealing in any way with general defence policy and general foreign policy, which is what the hon. member is talking about. I maintain that discussion of that kind on these particular items is completely out of order and completely contrary to the rules.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister a question. Does the provision "pay and allowances \$4 million" apply in part to Canadian forces serving under NATO?

**Mr. Harkness:** Yes.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Well surely that answer should conclude this whole matter.

**Mr. Harkness:** That has got nothing to do with general defence policy or foreign policy.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Why not?

**Mr. Chevrier:** On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order was determined at least two days ago. I tried to bring that to Your Honour's attention a moment ago. On vote No. 636, technical and vocational training, after there had been a discussion for a long period of time by those of us who sit on this side of the chamber on the question of education in the province of Ontario and in other provinces, the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys rose to try and stop the hon. member for Levis discussing a matter which concerned the province of Quebec. He said exactly what the Minister of National Defence said just now, that on a question of principle it was too late to discuss these matters. I do not know whether or not Your Honour ruled on that occasion—I thought Your Honour had ruled—and we went on and discussed it afterwards for quite some time. So having decided, in effect, if not by a formal decision, that this could be done on another vote, surely it can be done on this vote. That is my respectful view.

**Mr. Hellyer:** On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, surely the question of alternatives is relevant. The minister, for example, would not contend that the opposition has no right to suggest that some of the fat should be trimmed off the army; that perhaps we have too many headquarters, too many brass—

[Mr. Harkness.]

**Mr. Harkness:** I am not suggesting anything of the kind.

**Mr. Hellyer:**—and that some of the money could be saved for some of our needed equipment for our fighting men. Surely the minister does not suggest that. If he does suggest that, he has changed so much from the time when he sat on this side of the chamber and before he moved to the other side of the chamber that he is scarcely recognizable. At that time he said he thought it was extremely pertinent to discuss the top heavy personnel of the army structure and ways in which the top fat could be trimmed off so that we could save money. With this in mind, I think the minister is quite out of order in suggesting that we do not have the right to discuss alternatives as to how the money should be spent.

**The Chairman:** Again I must remind the committee that we are not on item No. 1 of the department, general administration; we are on a subheading concerned with particular sums that are being used for particular purposes.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** For the army.

**The Chairman:** The rules of this house are quite explicit on that. Rule 59, subparagraph 2 deals with it. There are citations in Beauchesne, there is the quotation that I have given from May, and the hon. member for Laurier referred to the practice that was adhered to last week in this committee. In making my ruling then I did mention that I would caution the hon. member that—

**Mr. Chevrier:** What page?

**The Chairman:** Page 1861 of *Hansard*.

—as the minister has well pointed out, the rules of relevancy must be adhered to and he must correlate his remarks to the particular item.

I allowed the debate as a premise to discussion on the item and I directed the discussion toward the item. I think the same ruling should apply again and that the hon. member who has the floor could correlate his remarks to the particular item in a manner that is precise and specific, and he should not embark on a discussion on general policy. That, I think, is the only ruling I can give in regard to the rules and the practice of this committee.

**Mr. Benidickson:** Mr. Chairman, I am sure I do not need to draw your attention to the importance of this item as a supplement to perhaps the largest item for the whole year in the main estimates. I refer to page 46 of the estimates of 1961-62 which concern the Canadian army operation and maintenance. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you would not