

unity we shall welcome them, of course, but it is not apparent to me that that is the case.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I will try a further question—I have been through this with the Prime Minister for some eight years. Does the Prime Minister consider it inappropriate for a question to be directed to him asking him what is being prepared by the federal government by way of information to give to the Canadian people to try to offset the kind of propaganda in which Mr. Lévesque indulged in New York? Does he consider it inappropriate that he should be asked in the House what measures he intends to take to counteract any undermining of confidence in Canada created by that speech? These are perfectly simple questions which have been put to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Trudeau: They are perfectly simple questions, Mr. Speaker, and I gave perfectly simple answers. The House and the opposition may not agree with them, but in all earnestness I repeat that we have been for many years now engaged in the task of trying to counteract separatist propaganda in the province of Quebec. The question has achieved new urgency now because of the recent election, but we did not discover the danger of separatism in the last two months, Mr. Speaker.

● (1420)

Mr. Paproski: You said it was dead six months ago.

Mr. Nowlan: What is this, a resurrection?

Mr. Hees: You had better tell him what to say, Marc; he is getting into trouble.

Mr. Trudeau: Judging from the nervousness of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, they seem to have discovered the danger only last night.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I am glad that the lecture in New York by the premier of Quebec has made all Canadians come to the realization that we are in a certain danger. I talked about crisis just six months ago in this House but the opposition pooh-poohed it. I talked about a crisis then because the government's policy on official languages in Canada was not taken seriously enough by a lot of powerful people in this country. So it is not possible today, just because of what happened last night, for me to work myself up into a fervour and say that we are doing a whole lot of new things.

Mr. Paproski: You have not done that for years.

Mr. Trudeau: We are going to continue to fight for the unity of this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I would remind the

Oral Questions

Prime Minister that it was he who six months ago said that separatism was dead.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: With regard to what he said was his policy—and I should like to get a clear answer on this—in reply to both questioners from the official opposition he made reference to one policy of the federal government, and I want the Prime Minister to be clear so that we and the people of Canada understand where he is going. Is he saying that the Official Languages Act is the sole foundation of the Liberal party's approach to this question? Because that is all he referred to today. I ask the Prime Minister this because, given the fact that it has created difficulties in the rest of Canada, even though all parties accepted it, more importantly it remains monumentally uninteresting to the people of Quebec. Is the Prime Minister saying he is going to keep Quebec in the federal union by pushing a policy they are not interested in one bit?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, I find it a bit misleading to say that it is monumentally uninteresting in Quebec when there has been a great deal of discussion before, during and since the election by people in Quebec, separatists and non-separatists, who have been complaining about the fact that our Official Languages Act had not had the effect they had hoped, particularly in the air traffic controllers and pilots affair. Obviously, they had always assumed that this act was going to work. They assumed that it would be acceptable. They assumed that it would have more effect than it did. So this seems to me to prove, Mr. Speaker, that it is a matter of very great importance to them.

As for the preamble to the question, all I said—I repeat it and I think anyone who knows the events of the last provincial election will confirm this—was that when a separatist party has to say that it wants to get elected not on separatism but on good government, it proves that that party itself, the party of the separatists, does not believe that separatism has the support of the electorate of Quebec.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: That was my point, Mr. Speaker, and it remains my point, that the Parti Québécois had to hide the fact that it was separatist in order to get enough votes to be elected in the province of Quebec. That supports my point that separatism was not willed by the people of Quebec.

There is a greater danger now because, having been elected on good government, it is obvious that Mr. Lévesque and his party are forgetting that they do not have a mandate for separatism. Mr. Lévesque apparently talked of little else last night in New York. He enumerated the things that his government would do, none of which require a change in the constitution; that is to bring in good government, to follow priority, to save money, to bring in better social security, to nationalize asbestos—none of those things demand separation. He continues to prove that the people of Quebec do not believe in