

National Defence Act Amendment

As far as the change proposed in Bill No. C-243 is concerned, I think it cannot be effected overnight. It will take ten or 15 years perhaps before unification can be accomplished. But I am pretty sure that at that time, the cost of national defence for the country as a whole will be less than it is at present. We shall then be able to take out of the billions saved through unification certain amounts that we could appropriate to agriculture, to our domestic expansion, to the development of our natural resources.

Then, as I say, we will have helped every class of our Canadian society, every Canadian, regardless of political consideration. I am convinced of that.

That is why we, of the Ralliement Cr ditiste, have decided to vote in favour of Bill No. C-243. There are no other reasons. It is not for the reason suggested by the hon. member, to the effect that the Liberals opposed the debate yesterday, though it is true that they did oppose it.

Had the ministers, had the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) suggested yesterday that we should debate the matter of the Canadian dairy industry, Mr. Chairman, we would probably be still at it today, had the house given unanimous consent. But no, there is no wish to—

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. I believe that the hon. member has no right to speak as he is doing at present, because we are quite familiar with standing orders on this side of the house and we knew that the motion introduced yesterday would be lost, as it actually was.

I would ask my good friends of the Ralliement Cr ditiste to learn the rules of the house properly and not to introduce to no avail motions for an urgent debate when the said rules do not allow it.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order. This might be a good time for the Chair to remind hon. members that the question before the committee is clause 2 of Bill No. C-243.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Lotbini re (Mr. Choquette) rose last night and took the time to say what he had to say. Again this afternoon he is allowed to repeat exactly the same stupidities he uttered last night in this house.

I want to say this: if the Liberals had accepted the debate yesterday, we would have

[*Mr. Caouette.*]

had it. They know that the motion has not been ruled out of order. It was said yesterday specifically that it was not the proper time for such a debate but that it might be the proper time today.

When the time comes for a vote of non-confidence Mr. Chairman, the member for Lotbini re may take a position for or against the farmers of his constituency of Lotbini re.

As far as the standing orders are concerned, I believe the members of the Ralliement Cr ditiste understand them as well as the hon. member for Lotbini re who is 100 per cent wrong and far afield when he rises in the house to make a speech or on a point of order.

Mr. Choquette: Sure. That is because I like the fields.

Mr. Caouette: Precisely, but perhaps you do not like the same sort of things.

Mr. Chairman, I do not hold a grudge against the member for Lotbini re, not at all. He is a fine fellow, a gentleman. His only weakness is being too Liberal. When he is not overly Liberal, he is otherwise intelligent.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, I conclude my remarks here with a specific and clear reminder that we want to be objective in this debate. The Conservatives know that we are wasting the time of the house and that there are other important items of legislation to pass. They have been told that we could stand section 2 temporarily, in order to pass other sections, and that we could come back to section 2 later, but no, they do not want to do so; they are stubborn.

All I ask is that the debate make some progress, that we get on with our discussions and that we stop ridiculing the Canadian people and making ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the Canadian people. This question of unification must be settled. Very soon the government will be charged with dictatorship because of a motion calling for the end of the debate in committee. I do not consider that as the application of a gag but rather as the establishment of some kind of order to make us stop wasting our time here.

We must be objective and see the bill as it is. If we must try something new, let us go ahead. Something must be tried. If it does not work, it is possible to make a change, but let us try it. And if the experiment proves to be useless, unsuccessful, I will be the first to turn against it and to look for a new way of creating a Canadian army which will be