

Canadian Unity

be legislation allowing the building of houses for those who need them, although that also is urgent.

● (2:50 p.m.)

It must be realized, Mr. Speaker—and that is where I want to prove the urgency of debate—that the separatists in Quebec are creating a climate of anarchy and terrorism and that the fanatics in other provinces are making false representations and we even have to put up with international vexations of the part of some heads of state who meddle in our problems.

I think it is urgent, Mr. Speaker, because there is some anxiety throughout Canada at the present time about whether Canada will survive or not, and the problem is mainly one of understanding, of finding the meaning of the words. What do we want exactly, what is the meaning of all those words said before public opinion, especially by people seeking political advantage.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that even if the present debate were considered as urgent this afternoon, it would still be helpful in clarifying what Quebec wants exactly and in finding out the right meaning of the words we are discussing. We run the risk of waking up to-morrow in a dead-lock; this would mean, for Canada, endless years of difficulties and perhaps the disintegration of this national unity in which we so firmly believe.

Apart from this, I think the initiative should spring from the federal government and not from the provinces. If the government wishes to retain its prestige—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member suggested himself a moment ago that I might call him to order if, in my opinion, his contribution was somehow exceeding the scope of the debate.

It seems to me that at the moment he should be called to order. The only matter which the hon. member can discuss, if he wants to, is the urgency to move the adjournment of the house this afternoon to discuss that question.

Mr. Mongrain: With all due respect for your decision, and I admit that you are much more familiar with parliamentary procedure than myself, I am trying to bring forward some arguments to prove the urgency of the debate, because I feel that the future of Canada is much more important than the future of housing in Canada.

I have enough faith in the good will of all my colleagues in the house to think that, in the opinion of the hon. member for Villeneuve, what we want this afternoon is first to define the terms in order to know whether we agree to secure the future of a united Canada. In my opinion, this is more urgent than to discuss whether a housing program will be launched tomorrow morning for the benefit of homeless persons.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Trois-Rivières for his comments. I should have pointed out more clearly than I did earlier that the situation this afternoon is quite exceptional.

A motion was moved yesterday under standing order No. 26, and it was agreed to discuss that motion today. I therefore asked the hon. member to postpone the subject matter of this new motion to another day that we might deal with the matter brought up by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), I repeat, under order No. 26. To proceed otherwise would be illogical. That is why I suggested, at the start, to the member for Villeneuve that discussion of his motion could not be allowed today.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, might it be possible to discuss it Monday, for instance?

Mr. Speaker: The member can discuss the matter with the representatives of the parties of the house. Unfortunately, I cannot take that decision.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I would not want to prolong the debate since you have made your ruling, but it might be preferable that the Prime Minister indicate to the house a tentative date when we could deal with this problem which is of such significance that we must not close our eyes on the subject. Perhaps the Prime Minister would have some explanations to give us which would be helpful in finding a solution to the present deadlock?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would suggest to the hon. members that it is almost sure that very shortly the house will be asked to consider a supply motion and the budget, and, within the scope of these two subjects, the debate proposed by the hon. members for Lapointe and Villeneuve could take place.

Once again, I am asking the co-operation of the hon. members, and I suggest that the comments they might wish to make now might easily be made when the debate proposed by the hon. member for Villeneuve