

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to participate in the throne speech debate in this Silver Jubilee, or twenty-fifth year of the reign of our sovereign Queen, Elizabeth II. We were very fortunate to have Her Majesty present for the opening of the new session of Parliament, and I join with all hon. members of this House who wish her good health and a long life in which to carry out her many and manifold duties.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1422)

Mr. Crouse: The Queen is the living symbol of all that is good for Canada and for the Commonwealth. All of us present in this chamber are part of Canada. What Canada is and what Canada will be depends upon how much you and I and all Canadians participate in and contribute to making it a Canada of which we can all be proud.

At this point I wish to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mr. Dawson) and the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. Wood) for the capable manner in which they moved and seconded the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

The presence of Her Majesty at the opening of parliament was significant at this point in our history, for it gave visible evidence of the fact that we have in Canada what is known as responsible government under a constitutional monarchy. Gathered in the Senate—or the other place—were not only the elected members of parliament but also the senators and Her Majesty the Queen. The three, together, constitute the Parliament of Canada, and no single authority can work without the other two. We can pass bills in this House after three readings, and they can be given three readings in the Senate, but they cannot become a legal enactment until they receive royal assent, or the approval of the Queen. This is a fact which, unfortunately, is not readily recognized even today by all members of parliament or by all those who have been granted the temporary right to serve as premiers of our provinces.

Ever since the election of the Parti Québécois under René Lévesque, the question of Quebec separating from the rest of Canada and the need for strengthening national unity has been in the spotlight. It has been under discussion and in the hearts and minds of Canadians from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We can no longer pretend that the stunning separatist victory is not splintering our country. No matter how many of the voters who turned to the Parti Québécois in despair over an inept and corrupt provincial Liberal government do not really want to leave confederation, the fact remains that they have put in power a party whose very reason for existence is the establishment of a separate Quebec state.

With a solid Parti Québécois majority in the National Assembly, the real question no longer is, "Will Quebec separate?" The question is, "When, and how, will it happen?" The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) maintains that he has no mandate to negotiate any form of separation with any province. That is correct, but unfortunately it does not mean very

The Address—Mr. Crouse

much. He had no mandate, either, for imposing wage and price controls. In fact, he won an election by ridiculing such measures. Having destroyed his credibility, the Prime Minister cannot expect to be readily believed even if what he says is what people really want to hear.

Yesterday the Prime Minister said that he is going to put before the House a proposition about a referendum. Unfortunately, Canadians have to learn the hard way that what matters is not what the Prime Minister says, but what he eventually does. What he does depends upon the requirements of the "new society" jigsaw puzzle that he is putting together. He, and he alone, knows where to fit the pieces.

For quite some time during the Quebec quiet revolution the Prime Minister and Mr. Lévesque shared basic political ideas and aspirations. Both fancied themselves then—and do today—as democratic socialists dedicated to the structural transformation of our society and its institutions. In this sense their goals remain similar if not identical.

The Prime Minister wants to restructure Canada from coast to coast, while Mr. Lévesque limits his new society blueprints to Quebec for the time being and uses Francophone nationalism for establishing his own sphere of operations. Neither has, as far as I know, renounced his ideological base or his objectives. This means that they disagree only over methods and not over substance.

In his political essay, "The Practice and Theory of Federalism", Pierre Trudeau, the writer, said:

Radicalism in different parts of Canada must be implanted in different fashions.

He also said:

Perhaps even parties with different names may preach the same ideology in different provinces.

Mr. Lévesque and his Parti Québécois are doing exactly that. The Prime Minister's only objection concerns Mr. Lévesque's selection of nationalism as the principal tool of socialism. This is not far-fetched speculation on my part, for Mr. Trudeau, the writer, said:

I should like to see socialists feeling free to espouse whatever political trends or to use whatever constitutional tools happen to fit each particular problem at each particular time.

Mr. Lévesque could argue that he is following the Prime Minister's advice, and he does—except for his separatism plan, which violates the Prime Minister's injunction, stated as follows:

—federalism must be welcomed as a valuable tool which permits dynamic parties to plant socialist governments in certain provinces from which the seed of radicalism can slowly spread.

That is the only point on which these two French Canadian socialists really clash. It is also the point on which Mr. Lévesque parted company with the Liberal party in Quebec just at the time the Prime Minister was beginning to exploit his switch to the Grits from the impotent New Democratic Party—where both he and Mr. Lévesque belong. Neither the Prime Minister nor Mr. Lévesque is likely voluntarily to give up his chosen approach to the building of socialist strongholds in Canada. It should not be impossible, however, or even too