

Proposal for Time Allocation

Mr. Diefenbaker: After reading what Walter Gordon said yesterday, if I may use his name, I would say that you do not want to talk about integration when you face extinction.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has already risen on a question of privilege which was out of order. I hope his question this time is more justified than the last.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, following the remarks of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, I could perhaps send him the notes he forgot on the articles written by the hon. Minister of Justice which appeared in the magazine *Cité Libre*.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*English*]

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologize to the right hon. gentleman for saying that he has mellowed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Is the minister rising on a question of privilege?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the hon. gentleman who has just interrupted that while he does not speak much in the house, when he gets outside he has strong opinions.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: After this happy interlude I now quote from a newspaper that worships at the altar of Liberalism. I refer to the *Winnipeg Free Press*. Some of its subsidiary newspapers are also doing a good job in that connection. I am going to deal with them on a later occasion. There are two of them in eastern Canada, if I may put it that way, that used to be independent Conservative newspapers but now belong to F.P. Publications and reflect so often the general views of the *Free Press*. On this occasion I want to quote from the *Free Press*:

The federal government could be making a mistake—

That is the first time in the history of this government that the *Free Press* has ever admitted even the possibility or likelihood of a mistake having been made by the government.

—if, in its determination to impose unification on Canada's armed services, it should resort to some form of closure on parliament.

The government can argue that the unification bill has been through the legislative mill, including the defence committee, and that there is nothing of value to be gained by prolonging the discussion. In fact, not all witnesses who should have been heard were called before the committee. And in spite of all the talking that has been done, some major questions remain unanswered—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is why I suggested that the Prime Minister cancel his temporary vow of silence in this debate. The article continues:

—in spite of all the talking that has been done, some major questions remain unanswered—notably those concerning the effect that unification may have on Canada's military commitments under NATO and under NORAD.

That is what I am asking for. That is what we have been asking for for days. What is the minister going to do with these people? You put them in a uniform, you march them up the hill, you change the present uniform to one that is green, and march them down the hill again. What are you going to do? What are your plans? The article goes on to say:

The suspicion has grown that the reason these questions have not been answered is that the government does not know the answers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is a surprising thing that all the ministers have such a hiatus in their thinking and speaking when it comes to dealing with these questions. Then the article says:

If closure is resorted to, this suspicion will be strengthened.

Unification is government policy, but it is a policy that has met vigorous opposition from many members of parliament who must feel that they represent a substantial body of opinion. The government can press on—

I realize that. All they have to do is look at the battalions they have to our left in this chamber. The leader of the Creditistes says, "I march with you. Away with the uniforms of the past and all the traditions of the forces." Social Credit has not yet spoken with definiteness but I am sure the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), with his infinite capacity for turning somersaults in the house, will be able to explain, with that clarity that always characterizes his utterances, why it is that while he does not agree with the principle of closure in this case he is going to vote with the government. There is also a possibility that he will vote against them, because now that he knows closure will be voted for