

Supply—National Defence

certain basis, then I should think it would be contrary to the rules of order to reverse that procedure.

Mr. Coldwell: Mr. Chairman, I did not rise to make a point of order. I wanted to say that if this motion is put referring only these estimates to a committee, it is in line with what has been suggested, namely, that we have a committee set up. I was not raising a point of order. I was not questioning the right to move this particular motion at this time.

Mr. Drew: May I point out that standing order 59, in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, second edition, reads as follows:

A motion that the chairman leave the chair is always in order, shall take precedence of any other motion, and shall not be debatable.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): Question.

The Deputy Chairman: I looked into this standing order when the hon. member made his motion and I also considered citation 480 of Beauchesne, third edition, which reads as follows:

The only motion allowed, when a resolution is under consideration in committee of supply, is that the amount be reduced or that the chairman leave the chair (either without making a report or to report progress on certain resolutions).

If the motion of the leader of the opposition had been "I move that Mr. Chairman do now leave the chair", I would immediately have decided that the motion was not debatable and that the only duty I had to perform was to put the motion forthwith. But what puzzled me, and this is the reason why I raised the matter, was the part in the motion about the procedure; and my understanding was that the procedure had already been decided. Since the situation is doubtful, however, and as I have no authority at the moment on which I can rely for a decision as to whether the motion made by the leader of the opposition is in order or not, I will therefore put the motion right now. Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Deputy Chairman: Mr. Drew moves, seconded by Mr. Pearkes:

That the committee now rise and report progress, and that further consideration of estimates Nos. 245 to 252 inclusive be deferred until such time as they have been submitted to detailed study by a select committee, reported to the house and again referred to this committee.

Motion negatived: Yeas 35; nays 50.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the motion lost. Perhaps it would be the wish of the committee to consider the procedure to be followed from now on.

I have the copies of *Hansard* before me now. Perhaps I should refer to them and see what has been said with respect to procedure. In his opening remarks on this general item the Minister of National Defence said, as reported in *Hansard* at page 2805:

In order that we may have the discussion of these estimates in the order most convenient to members, I would suggest that we follow the practice of recent years. This is entirely a matter for the committee and there is no thought of binding it, but it would be a desirable thing and I am sure one that would meet the views of all quarters of the house if hon. members wishing to make statements about defence generally should do so at the outset. We could then follow with a detailed consideration of the estimates beginning at page 269, taking the main heads in the following order: administration, inspection services, civil defence—I would point out that, since the responsibility for civil defence was transferred to the Minister of National Health and Welfare by an order in council dated February 23, this branch of activity falls under that minister and I expect he will be here to make a short statement and to answer any questions—imperial war graves commission, navy, army, air force, defence research, mutual aid, grants, et cetera, pensions.

Perhaps I should quote also the remarks made by the hon. member for Nanaimo in reply to the suggestion offered by the minister.

Mr. Chairman, the method of examining these estimates suggested by the minister will, I feel sure, be acceptable to members on this side of the house.

Then, in *Hansard* of yesterday, at page 2913, the hon. member for Nanaimo in the course of his remarks said this:

The Minister of National Defence had suggested that, after a general discussion on the general defence policy, we might turn to the details of the estimates as they are laid out at page 269 of the book of estimates. He suggested we might deal with them in the order of administration, inspection services, civil defence, and so on, and that they should be taken one by one so that there would be a chance to discuss each of them.

Earlier in his remarks he had said:

What I was rising to do was to make the suggestion that perhaps we might get along with a careful examination of the estimates.

Then in the typewritten copy of *Hansard* of today I find these remarks by the hon. member for Nanaimo:

Mr. Chairman, I understand item 245 has been called, and that it is now the proposal to continue with the details as they are set out at page 269, the first group of which is under the heading of "Departmental Administration, including inspection services and civil defence." I wonder if the minister who is now responsible for civil defence would now make a statement in this connection? I notice that the subject of civil defence is not separated as a separate detail under the group of details connected with departmental administration.

At that moment he asked if the minister responsible for civil defence would make a statement on that subject. We had a discussion on civil defence, and the consent of the house had been given earlier to this type of procedure, which has been interrupted