

*Motion for Adjournment of House*

respect to national defence. At page 8053 of *Hansard* he showed his attitude:

I do not think it would be desirable or in the public interest to do that at the present time.

Why? Simply because ever since the adjournment the minister has been going faster and faster along the road of unification, without regard to parliamentary legislative authority. The minister says it is not urgent. Yesterday the minister refused parliament an opportunity to look into this matter.

I say, sir, in sections 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the National Defence Act there is no authority whatsoever for the kind of conduct that has continued with accelerated force since the house adjourned early in July. What will the position be if we do not act now, if we wait until the minister completes his unification program? How can it be unscrambled? He has proceeded with this matter in a way that is a denial of parliamentary rights. Undertakings were given that changes made would not be of any serious nature. Indeed, when Admiral O'Brien took over on July 20, in a press conference he said:

I did not accept this appointment lightly. Before I did so I met for a considerable time with the minister, chief of defence staff, and defence staff. As a result I have been assured that there is no intention of making changes in the identity of the forces—

That is one of the points raised:

—the uniform or the conditions of service before legislation governing the unification has been passed by parliament.

**An hon. Member:** Order.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Continuing:

Furthermore, each one in the forces will be advised well in advance of the implementation of such legislation and how it will affect him.

Then he says:

He will be afforded—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I do not want to intervene without cause at this time, but I should like to remind the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and hon. members that the question before the house now is the urgency of debate, not the subject matter raised in the motion by the hon. member for Halifax. It seems to me it would be difficult to distinguish between the speech the right hon. member is making and the speech he might make if the motion were allowed.

● (3:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I assure you, sir, that if there is debate on the subject and I have an [Mr. Diefenbaker.]

opportunity to express myself regarding this contemptuous action on the part of the government, the house will find no difficulty in making a distinction.

Yesterday we were told that the minister intends, regardless of parliament and regardless of undertakings which have been given in the past, to proceed with this policy. He intends to do this irrespective of the attitude of parliament. Indeed on July 24, in the course of a national television program with Mr. Lynch, he stated his intention to accelerate the unification program, as well as his belief that further enabling legislation was necessary only in respect to a change of name for the armed forces. In other words he said on July 24 that he intended to accelerate the unification program, for which he has no authority and for which parliament has given him no authority.

This is why, when questions were asked yesterday, we found ourselves met by an attitude of mind which disregards every principle of parliamentary control. He intends to go ahead. In effect he told Charles Lynch in "The Nation's Business" on July 24 that there was no one to stop him. Well, we heard that some years ago from another minister.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** You made it up in both cases.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The hon. gentleman was a colleague of his and they both went down to defeat when the first opportunity given to the Canadian people made it possible. That is an attitude which I thought was cured in 1956 and 1957. Yet the minister says, now, "I do not care about parliament; I intend to go ahead".

**Mr. Pickersgill:** The exact opposite.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** What is this noise which comes from the Minister of Transport?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I rise on a point of order. That is the noise. My point of order is the same as the one I made the other day. There is a rule in this house which applies to all hon. members and even to the arrogant and insufferable Leader of the Opposition.

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

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Standing order 26 provides that one may argue the question of urgency of debate of a topic, but one must not smuggle into that argument a debate on the topic itself. Most hon. members respect that rule,