

*Motion for Adjournment of House*

will not impede the operations of our three services, and will not remove any soldier from our Canadian forces at the present time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe the urgency the Conservatives wish to bring forward at present simply amounts to a political football so as to play partisan politics in parliament.

● (3:10 p.m.)

[English]

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the statements made by the hon. member for Villeneuve, who fails to recognize that the Minister of Finance has indicated he wants to talk about something else besides railways sometimes later this week or next week—he has not indicated when—I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to some of the factors I think you will be considering as to whether there is or has been an opportunity to discuss the matters raised by this particular motion.

First of all, there are no items on the order paper concerning unification. There are no committee reports for consideration. There has not been a committee report for consideration. There are no estimates to be called. There are none of these things. There is no supply motion. There is no general debate, and the general debate referred to by the minister is almost a laughable reference, a mere scribble in the Speech from the Throne saying that there will be amendments to the National Defence Act. I think the minister is trying to strain credibility when he wants us to believe that this would point directly to unification.

But the point is that since the last meetings of the defence committee on June 23 and June 29, when a no comment report was tabled in the house, there have been very important events. As a matter of fact the minister has changed his mind, because he assured the committee that no decision had yet been taken on unification. However, now we know for a fact that he did tell senior officers that certain steps were going to be taken.

Why were so many senior officers forced to resign? Were they all wrong and the minister the only one who was right? These are things the house has a right to know; because it is also a fact that many times the minister has indicated that by October 1 he intends to implement possibly a change in pay rates, a common rank structure, a concentrated trade classification structure; and if this is done

[Mr. Caouette.]

the house will be presented with a *fait accompli* when we meet on October 5.

I contend, as is suggested in the motion, that under the provisions of the National Defence Act the minister does not have the power to do these things. In fact he is forbidden to do them. This is what the house wants to know.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have dealt with the major emergency of last week. We are now considering a long term bill and, because we do not know when the house will adjourn again, I suggest this matter must be discussed now. Respectfully I suggest to Your Honour that you accept the motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** I wonder if hon. members feel there is any case to be made in favour of pursuing the argument at this time. If there is I shall hear other hon. members who may have arguments to contribute in addition to those that have already been submitted for consideration by the Chair.

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have such an argument. Admiral Landymore was dismissed by the minister after giving evidence before a parliamentary committee. I think that is a gross abuse of the privileges of the house, and I think that is a very impelling reason for debate on the whole matter at this stage.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke):** Mr. Speaker, I grant the hon. member who moved that motion that this is an important matter. But as the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) pointed out so well earlier, it is not urgent in view of the circumstances under which we have been meeting for a week. What is important for the Canadian people, and the railway workers in particular, is that the government agreed to submit two bills last week and we are now at the stage preceding second reading of the second bill. That is what matters and that is why we were called back. There has been for a few days a lot of talk about a new recess this week to allow us to go back to our respective ridings where our constituents are waiting for us to deal with problems as important and even urgent. If I may be allowed a suggestion, it would be a good thing if the house adjourned on Friday and came back on October 5.

But coming back to that highly important matter, and even if General Allard bears a very dynamic and sympathetic name, I would like it if, when orders of the day are called, the minister would indicate clearly if an