

*Motion for Adjournment of House*

but I have not heard the right hon. gentleman respect it yet and I think the time has come to enforce the rule.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I do not know whether the hon. gentleman intends to take over your place, Mr. Speaker. He must recently have been in communication with a former prime minister extramurally, because those words are practically what Mr. King said on one occasion regarding another leader of the opposition, which indicates that the hon. gentleman has not learned anything with the years.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** That gentleman was humble compared with the right hon. gentleman.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** It indicates that the hon. gentleman does not regard parliament as being of any importance, and I had always thought he did.

Parliament has had no say on this issue. Parliament will have its say only after the minister of defence has done all his work. He admitted on July 24 that he intended to go ahead with the unification policy because he had the authority to do so; all that required legislative enactment was the change of name. Yesterday, he gave his answer. That answer was, "I will act as I please."

**Mr. Pickersgill:** He said nothing of the kind.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** His answer was "I, along with Mr. Lee, the two clean-cut kids, will determine Canada's policy on defence; after we have done it and made it impossible for any legislation to remedy what we have done, then we shall give parliament a chance."

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** On the question of urgency, I would simply say that since we have now had the speeches we might as well have the debate too.

**Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich):** I should like to address a few words to Your Honour on the question of the urgency of debate.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Chatterton:** In exactly the same manner as the Leader of the Opposition has done.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh.

**Mr. Chatterton:** I too wish to demonstrate the urgency of debate on this important subject of unification. The Minister of National

Defence very cleverly tries to confuse integration with unification. The fact is that there was no exodus of our most valuable people from the armed forces until he began this process of unification. I have first hand information that all the senior staff tried to help him with his policy of integration. It was when he started implementing unification that the trouble began.

I maintain that the minister has laid all the groundwork for effective unification without approval or consent from parliament and without making any statement in parliament in explanation of his policy. I maintain he should have taken no action with regard to unification before a bill had been approved by parliament giving him the necessary authority. The minister is now carrying on a process of education among the junior ranks of the armed forces for the promotion of unification.

**An hon. Member:** Brainwashing.

**Mr. Chatterton:** I heard someone say "brainwashing". Perhaps that is a better word. I contend that before the hon. gentleman does greater harm to the armed forces of Canada than he has already done with his unification policy, it is essential, as a matter of urgency, that parliament should have the opportunity to discuss this subject today. We intend to get a clear statement from the minister as to precisely what he proposes when he speaks of unification.

[Translation]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve):** Mr. Speaker, just a few words to point out to the house that when we were called last week it was to examine Bills Nos. C-230 and C-231.

At that time there was no question of unification of the three services and neither was it understood that we would examine this matter of unification of the armed forces of Canada. Normally, we should have come back here for the session on October 5 only.

The Conservatives would have had no opportunity to introduce their motion of urgency at this time, if we had only convened on October 5.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances we should limit ourselves to the discussion of the bills for which we were called in emergency session. And, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and his colleagues hold the matter of the unification of the armed forces so much at heart, they will be free to discuss it after October 5, and this