

army man at the head of our forces has the right here to make political statements. It seems that those who bear the name of Allard often speak too long and too often.

**Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe):** Mr. Speaker, a while ago, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) said that this house has already had the opportunity of discussing the subject mentioned in the motion made by the Conservative party. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that since we have had the opportunity to discuss the unification of the armed forces there have been new developments, new facts which not only add a significant factor to the situation in the present circumstances, but also an element of urgency.

Among those facts there are the statement of the admiral, the statement of the minister and especially another fact directly related to unification, that is the notice posted at the base in Bagotville to the effect that French Canadian service men should speak English when on duty.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is one of the effects of unification, I think it is important and even urgent to discuss that matter today.

[*English*]

**Hon. George Hees (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, I believe this whole matter of urgency revolves around the statement which the minister made on national television to Mr. Charles Lynch, and if he meant what he said then it is a matter of urgency. He said at that time that unification was to be accelerated, and that the only matter for which he needed the consent of the house was the change of name. If that is the case, if that is what he meant—and I take it he meant just that—then obviously this is a matter of great urgency to be debated at this moment.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Speaker:** I think the hon. members who took part in the discussion on the motion made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Forrestall). I want to assure them that I took into due consideration the arguments they submitted to enlighten me before making such a difficult decision.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Forrestall) has asked leave to move the adjournment of the house in accordance with standing order 26 in order to discuss a matter of

*Motion for Adjournment of House*

urgent public importance. We have had argument as to whether there is sufficient urgency of debate at this time to adjourn the ordinary business of the house. As hon. members know, the day to day order of business in the house is the responsibility of the government, and it is only when the conditions prescribed by the rules and the practice of the house are strictly met that we can adjourn this business and go on with the consideration of unannounced business.

Hon. members know as well as I do what are the relevant citations. They have been quoted on a number of occasions in the past. There is citation 100 in Beauchesne's fourth edition which prescribes:

"Urgency" within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but it means "urgency of debate", when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the house do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately.

It is not easy to decide whether, in relating a particular item which is on the order paper to another item proposed by an individual member of the house, which one should be given precedence and whether there is such urgency to debate the new subject matter that the ordinary affairs of the house should be set aside. On balance I would doubt that the matter raised by the hon. member does meet the requirements of the citations and the precedents of the house.

I would also refer hon. members to citation 100(8) in Beauchesne's fourth edition, which reads in part:

"I do not think that, under the standing order of 1882—

—which is a similar standing order to the one we are considering now—

—a motion on a subject of this kind, having such a very wide scope, was ever contemplated. What I think was contemplated was an occurrence of some sudden emergency—"

This is the second requirement. It should be a matter of sudden emergency, something completely new.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I realize that the subject matter of the motion is extremely important, and that has been recognized by the minister and other hon. members who have made comments for the guidance of the Chair. There is no question whatsoever that it is an urgent matter in itself, but the question I have to decide now relates to the urgency of debate, and whether it relates to such a sudden occurrence that the adjournment of the house should be allowed.