

Supply—National Defence

budget is set up, and in accordance with the traditional practice of parliament, both in Westminster and this house, when a supplementary budget is set up debate is unlimited and can range through the whole course of policy relative to and related to the items under discussion.

The Chairman: There has been quite a bit of discussion on this point of order. I certainly admit it is an important point of order but to my mind the situation is well set out in May's sixteenth edition on page 738, which reads as follows:

Debate on supplementary and excess grants is restricted to the particulars contained in the estimates on which those grants are sought, and to the application of the items which compose those grants; and the debate cannot touch the policy or the expenditure sanctioned, on other heads, by the estimate on which the original grant was obtained, except so far as such policy or expenditure is brought before the committee by the items contained in the supplementary or excess estimates.

The question that must be decided is: does the item before the committee raise the question of policy in regard to nuclear armament? Now we have under the main item of national defence, the vote that was passed, vote No. 232, departmental administration, which is the item under which the general policy of the department may be discussed. So far as discussion on supplementary estimates is concerned it must be restricted to the particular items covered by them, and the hon. member for Leeds has not yet explained to me how the matter that he is bringing before the committee is related to this item. Unless that relationship is established I feel that the discussion ranges outside the item, and therefore should not be taken up right at this particular instant.

Mr. Winch: May I have a word on that very point, Mr. Chairman. If you will just look over what you have referred to, that is vote 644, you will see under that "pay and allowances," "food supplies," and "travelling and removal expenses." It was stated by the minister that one of the reasons he had to bring in the supplementary estimates was because of the additional forces that have been sent overseas under the NATO command. Therefore if the money we are asked for now is due to the additional cost of sending these extra men over under NATO, surely the question of their equipment and role under NATO is a matter which is pertinent to this very supplementary vote.

The Chairman: I agree with the hon. member for Vancouver East in so far as that goes, but I do not think the whole matter of nuclear policy is pertinent to the vote.

Mr. Winch: One gun is policy.

Mr. Matheson: In the pamphlet distributed by this department, called "Canadian Defence Policy, 1960," we have this statement:

Therefore, we must not consider our defence effort in isolation but, rather, one should look at the general effectiveness of the defensive alliances—

I put it to you, Mr. Chairman, that one cannot sensibly and realistically consider any vote to our Canadian army as a vote to that army alone without thinking of where it fits in with these defensive allies. I put it to the committee that if a major change has in fact taken place in the official thinking of some of our chief allies on this matter then it is important, it is germane to the vote under discussion at the present time, that we consider what kind of army we are maintaining.

Some of us wonder how much of an overhead we have for four brigade groups and, in fact, the number of groups we have scattered in different places. I have been told that there are 13 headquarters and I would like the minister to tell us how many people are actually on headquarters staff. So far as I know there has not been an army list published since 1939, and it is incredibly difficult for us in the opposition to get any kind of answer from this department with respect to where troops are and what they are doing.

We understand the importance of security in these matters, but there are some other things that are also important. We are part of the NATO alliance. That means we have certain strong allies such as the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, West Germany and so on. We know that some of them are equipped to take on certain tasks, and our largest and most powerful ally, the United States, has come to some profound change in its thinking, a change which very definitely affects us. We also understand that there are no two countries going to do exactly the same thing in this NATO alliance, and it is meet and proper that they be different.

We have the nuclear power of the United States, United Kingdom and France, and we know that two of these countries have had certain relationships with other countries that were formerly colonies. That puts them in a special position with respect to so-called neutrals at the present time.

Mr. Harkness: On the point of order I raised previously I must direct your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the details of this vote which we are considering which are to be found at page 14.

You will see that they do not have any relationship to all these matters of general defence and foreign policy which he is attempting to debate. All that is dealt with here