

only in terms of advantage to ourselves but in terms of the peace of the world, will follow. By maintaining an occupation army, we are showing a readiness to admit our obligations and we have therefore the right to have a voice in the settlement of those terms."

The history of this particular matter goes back to 1945, in the last session before the general election. I wish to refer to a statement which was made then by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Speaking in the house on April 4, he said, as reported at page 433 of *Hansard*:

In Europe it is necessary not only to secure complete victory, but that achievement must be confirmed, and the continued maintenance of peace assured. Where needed, after the cessation of military operations, the inter-allied army will continue in occupation of Germany. The size of this force has been set to give continuing assurance that Germany will not be able to resist or evade the settlement which will be imposed on her.

The burden of maintaining this force will be shared among the allies and all will be appropriately represented.

From time to time, as progress is made, and as considerations of safety and security permit, reductions will be made in the size of this army of occupation.

I think that paragraph is important because it implies that the army might later be withdrawn; and I shall refer to that later in my remarks.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Speaker, I do not like to interrupt the hon. member, but I would ask for your ruling on the question whether the subject matter of the debate on Monday can now be revived. On Monday we spent the whole day in discussing this matter. That debate having been concluded, I submit that the subject matter is not now open for further discussion in this debate on the address.

Mr. FULTON: I can understand the minister's reluctance to have this matter opened again—

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I do not think the hon. member means that. I asked you for a ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether the matter should now be reopened. That was not because of any reluctance to discuss it, but because of reluctance to have so much more time taken than the standing orders permit when there is urgent legislation that has to be considered. It might be very agreeable to stay here the year round and discuss these matters, but there are standing orders for the purpose of determining when and in what order of priority they can be dealt with. I suggest that, when one has been disposed of, it should not be reopened on another occasion.

[Mr. Fulton.]

Mr. GRAYDON: What is the minister afraid of?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Nothing at all but the loss of time.

Mr. GRAYDON: After all, the debate was not concluded on Monday.

Mr. FULTON: In regard to the point of order, this particular subject was not discussed during the course of that debate. That is one point. The army of occupation was referred to, but the whole matter was not discussed. The second point is that this is the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, and it is my understanding that any matter may be referred to during this debate. I also understand the rule of the house which forbids reference to a subject matter discussed in a particular previous debate during the same session, but I submit that, as long as I do not refer to remarks made during that debate, or quote passages from it, I am in order in discussing this particular aspect of Canada's foreign policy.

Mr. HANSELL: Before you give your ruling, Mr. Speaker, might I offer one observation which I think the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent) has overlooked. When the motion was made on Monday for the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, the motion was based upon the urgency of the matter. The house was adjourned, and that debate automatically died at eleven o'clock that night. If your ruling should be that we cannot discuss foreign policy on the speech from the throne, then you preclude from a discussion of that subject any hon. members who did not have an opportunity to discuss it last Monday. Our day is only six hours long. We have only six hours of debating time, and you cannot crowd 245 members into those six hours. So that while there may be some justification for suggesting to hon. members who had an opportunity to take part in that debate on Monday that they should not deal with the subject again, surely those of us who were not able to discuss it, because of the lack of time at our disposal, should be able to do so now.

Mr. GREEN: Very serious questions are raised by this point of order taken this afternoon by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. They have been dealt with largely by the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) whose speech is in question. I submit that the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne is wide