

Urban Affairs

URBAN AFFAIRS

SEWAGE DISPOSAL—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS
CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Colin D. Gibson (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and compelling necessity. It involves the recent development of a water recycling system undertaken by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Ontario Research Foundation which will make the probability of the saving of enormous costs for municipalities across Canada a distinct reality in a very short period of time. I urge and recommend that the Minister of State for Urban Affairs take steps to confer with municipal authorities, with the objective—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows that he must indicate what the motion is. The hon. member is now urging the minister to do something or other; that, of course, has nothing to do with the spirit of the motion. The hon. member should indicate the urgency of the motion and then propose the motion.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, the urgency is that throughout Canada there are many pipeline sewage disposal plants being constructed, and if a conference could be arranged with municipal authorities there would be a saving of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. I believe—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

The Chair, of course, cannot disagree with the hon. member's suggestion. All I am doing now is to invite him to put his motion.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the hon. member beside me—

Mr. MacInnis: Who is he?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, the Tories are not interested in saving millions of dollars in taxes.

I would move:

That an appropriate committee of this House be instructed to discuss how communications could be made to municipal authorities for saving millions of dollars of taxes through the use of a new invention that has been researched by the federal government.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Has the hon. member a copy of the motion? The hon. member appears to be on weak ground. There is no seconder and no motion.

Mr. Alexander: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would take great pleasure in seconding the motion proposed by the hon. member.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether the hon. member for Hamilton West has the motion? Perhaps the matter might be reconsidered at a more appropriate time.

[Mr. Stanbury.]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

PUBLIC ORDER

SITUATION IN QUEBEC—ALLEGED STATEMENT BY PRIME
MINISTER RESPECTING ATTITUDE OF VOTERS IN CASE
OF FEDERAL ELECTION

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Right Hon. Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister of Canada was reported today by the press as having stated that the present unrest in Quebec would prompt Quebecers to vote for his party not only because the Liberal party represents a strong government but also because the Quebec government is weak. Obviously, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he can clarify that statement, and also whether he intends to make an election issue out of that important question, namely the unrest in Quebec.

Can the Prime Minister throw light on the statement reported in the press?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

I have been warned that such was actually the interpretation put on my remarks. I should like hon. members who might be interested to read the actual text of my interview. I have it here but I will not quote from it. I can however reply to the hon. member's question by saying the matter was discussed within the context of difficulties our government might encounter, for instance, if holding an election several months from now, let us suppose in the fall, if the disturbances, and what the reporter called a semi-revolution or semi-disturbance, were to continue for several months, his actual words being "If this Quebec problem continues over the month".

My reply was that such a situation would not prevent us from holding an election in Quebec.

I was replying about a hypothetical case. However, I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to be able to say that in my opinion that supposition is not materializing. The interview took place several days ago and the developments of the past few days indicate that, on the contrary, the Quebec government has shown considerable control of the situation and is indeed a strong government.

The supposition is therefore not materializing.

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): I should like to put a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Since the Prime Minister has obviously clarified his statement by saying that the Quebec government is strong, I would like to know, following the creation of a security group by the Solicitor General to investigate social troubles in Canada, whether any security group has reported to the cabinet the true reasons for the troubles in Quebec, and whether the Prime Minister intends to cooperate with the premier of Quebec in order to restore the situation in Quebec?