

The Address—Mr. Roy

had received 44 per cent of the votes against 21 per cent in favour of sovereignty-association, Mr. Lussier, a sociologist, wrote a letter to Mr. Lévesque, leader of the Parti Québécois, saying, and I quote:

—that the Parti Québécois is losing ground, that is certain. Let us not be ostrich-like, let's face the facts.

He was advising Mr. Lévesque of an explosive strategy in several points to be applied before the battle. Here then are some of those points which they called lessons, and I quote:

The fourth factual lesson is to get Quebec nationalism worked up with all the means at our disposal, subtly yet constantly, on a day to day basis and massively.

The sixth lesson mentioned is to serve as propaganda material:

—the best form of defence is attack. Public opinion should be warned of the kind of people federalist Quebecers really are: timorous, political retards, dead weights—

—and even—

—traitors practically.

I quote from the same letter:

As for the undecided, we must succeed in making them feel guilty of not jumping on the bandwagon to freedom.

And I continue. The letter stated that under that strategy:

—it is absolutely necessary to secure the support of the labour movement.

This was done a couple of weeks ago. Last week, we even saw the labour movement identify with the Yes team. Which does not necessarily mean that the rank and file will follow the stand taken by their leader—

—that the only way for Quebec to achieve independence is never to talk about it. It is stupid, but that is the way it is. A strategy is not built on what we should like things to be but on what they are.

And there is the part on the unions.

There is something else which seems to me to be of paramount importance. We must strive to secure the active participation of the labour movement. The hell with big business: it is against us anyway! As for unionized workers, we cannot afford not to have them on our side on the referendum question. We shall have to keep this notion in mind during the next round of collective bargaining with the public and near-public sectors.

And that is Mr. Doris Lussier's letter which appeared in all the papers on April 21, 1978. We can see how all the points mentioned in this letter are currently being applied according to a planned strategy. Mr. Speaker, it must be realized that the federalists can hardly compete with independentists with respect to propaganda. Contrary to separatism, federalism is a form of government which is essentially human, pluralist and which does not lend itself to great crusades. Federalism cannot hope to compete successfully with separatism in terms of propaganda and demagoguery, but we prefer to rely calmly and serenely on the intelligence and good sense of Quebecers with the greatest respect for the innate qualities of these people.

● (1610)

I heard the president of the committee for a Yes vote, who came back from holidays last week, accuse the federal liberal caucus of being a bunch of cuckolds. That only serves to confirm what I just said, and it is an insult not only to all my

colleagues from Quebec but also to the Quebec people, 68 per cent of eligible voters, who elected those members to the House. Mr. Speaker, as a premier who got elected with only 41 per cent of the registered vote, Mr. Lévesque would have been better to study the file on which the trained experts of the three departments involved spent 200,000 hours before deciding on the right fighter plane for Canada. This decision will represent an injection of \$1,573 million for Quebec, where 49 per cent of the investment will be made. It would have been much more proper for a premier to study the file before following Mr. Lussier's advice.

—on every decision that comes from Ottawa. It has to be wrong. It must be, and those decisions have to be turned down.

Federalism is nevertheless a noble ideal from many standpoints. It requires of men and women the greatest virtues of heart and spirit: intelligence, respect, tolerance, fairness, sharing and peace. Federalism is a mutual insurance. In a federation, people support each other and share their wealth in order to get stronger while having total respect for one another. We believe that unity can exist in diversity and that harmony can emerge out of variety.

Now as regards equalization. It is true to say that in a federal structure there is mutual support and sharing because the structure is flexible and the same standard of living applies to everyone from coast to coast thanks to an equalization system which was established in 1967 and which is the foundation of our Canadian federalism. For Quebec, this system means a gain of \$12 billion, that is \$1.3 billion for 1980 only, or 15 per cent of the total revenues of the Quebec government. This represents an amount of \$216 for each Quebec citizen. Of course since Quebec has more than 6 million inhabitants, we get close to 50 per cent of the total amount of money distributed under the equalization scheme. In Newfoundland, for example, the per capita amount is about \$592 for a total of \$340 million, while in Quebec, because there are 6 million people, we got \$1,352 millions out of the equalization system. That is a kind of language quite unknown to our sovereignist opponents, the Parti Québécois.

At all levels, the Canadian government has contributed to the prosperity of Quebec and unless you are dealing with a hypocrite who refuses to face reality and prefers to spread feelings of linguistic division and resort to emotional arguments and sentimentality in order to serve objectives tinted with non-objective political partisanship, at the risk of being accused of all sorts of wrongs I say that federal policies have not only respected but even encouraged certain Quebec particularities which constitute a historical and fundamental wealth in the Canadian context. In that respect, let us emphasize that the Canadian government has greatly contributed to the cultural development of Quebec. Without the efforts of the Government of Canada in the field of culture, the French network of the CBC would have never seen the day. I am also thinking about grants to universities. Canada Council, the National Research Council of Canada, the National Film Board which has enabled many Quebec moviemakers to earn a