

been created with both sexes, then for us sex is not a necessary evil, it is something which is rather essential to reproduction.

● (1732)

Mr. Speaker, in some other system or humanity, virgin birth might be a possible and desirable thing but that is not the present reality. The fact is that mankind is made up of both sexes and it must not be regarded as a necessary evil. It is exactly the same thing for Canada. There are two linguistic communities. This is not a matter for division; on the contrary, Canada exists because they can and must get together. It is the government position.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: Either the translation or the mind of the hon. member is slow! I would not know. I would like to speak about the problem arising from the election of the Parti Québécois last November 15. I would like to add a few words on the strategy and tactics that we are preparing on this side of the House because I think it is important that Canadians in general and members of parliament in particular be made somewhat aware of the reason for some of our actions. It will be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that as early as November 24, I said on television that, in the final analysis, the solution had to come from the Quebec voters, that they are the ones who eventually will have to get rid of a government that wants to break up this country, the PQ government. I even said a week or two later in an interview on the English network that come referendum time, we had to clobber the PQ.

Well, that was our strategy, and it still is. What we need after all is to win that debate, win it at the polls, win it by convincing the people in Quebec that they will be happier, that they will be able to develop more fully culturally, economically and socially within Canada than outside Canada. That is the basis of all our actions. That is quite simply the reason why we refused to use our power of disallowance when urged to do so by English-Canadian groups, particularly from the province of Quebec, who asked us to disallow Bill 101. Others suggested that it be referred to the Supreme Court, as did the Leader of the Opposition. They took the position that the way to get rid of bad laws, of a bad government, was on the authority of either the Supreme Court of Canada or the government in Ottawa. I know that view is not shared by all members of the party of the Leader of the Opposition.

I believe the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) expressed himself rather clearly in the month of September. One of the only two French Canadians in the party of the Leader of the Opposition is in disagreement with the Leader of the Opposition on that point. He said quite clearly before the press that he did not believe that referring the bill to the Supreme Court was the solution. Well, we agree on that. Why? Because I believe that the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) understands, as we do on this side, that a case referred directly to the Supreme Court cannot give the desired results. If the Supreme Court decides that the act is *ultra vires*, well, of course, the Parti Québécois would be quite

The Address—Mr. Trudeau

happy and that would take away from Quebecers the indignation they now feel against that law and their desire to have it changed through the democratic process. Should the Supreme Court decide that the act is *ultra vires*, of course, independentists of every ilk in the province of Quebec would certainly say: You see, once again it is a court made up of a majority of English Canadians who want to interfere with our educational system.

Mr. Speaker, from the beginning we had no hope of winning. At first, had we applied the solution proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, we would probably have given the Parti Québécois the pretext they need, the one they were always looking for to call an election and blame the federal government for the resulting confrontation. This was not understood only by the government and the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle), but I also saw it very clearly stated in an editorial which I find remarkable in the *Vancouver Sun*, in which a very forceful argument was made against referring Bill 101 to the Supreme Court. In a word, they say we should not try, as the opposition leader suggests, to solve this problem too hastily.

This problem must be settled before the courts of the province of Quebec. The Superior Court, the Appeal Court of the Province of Quebec must rule on these problems before appealing to the Supreme Court of Canada. It will give Quebecers time to think about the unacceptable aspects of Bill 101 instead of being distracted by a political manoeuvre, a defence manoeuvre against the federal government which is trying, through confrontation and interference, to overrule legislation approved by the Quebec majority and passed by a democratically elected government.

The people in Quebec, and particularly French Canadians in Quebec, must realize to what extent this Bill 101 is encroaching upon their rights. From a cultural point of view, it is obvious since this bill deprives them of a freedom of choice, the freedom to send their children to an English or a French school, according to what they think is best as parents. Even from an economic viewpoint, Quebecers must realize how harmful this legislation is.

I think it is perhaps too soon to give definite statistics on the economic situation of Quebec, but already there are some fairly conclusive indications that the November 15 election is turning into an economic handicap for Quebecers. I am thinking in particular of Montreal. Montreal is my hometown, and I can say a lot of good things about it, it is a great city. It is a city which, because at its location, its human resources and its financial resources has been a great city and can continue to be a great city because of its urban as well as industrial infrastructure.

But it must be said that the figures we have for the last year indicate that Montreal's economy is now stagnant. Why? Simply because the coming to power of the Péquiste government and such measures as Bill 101 rob Montreal from a part of its calling. Let us look first at these figures. If we compare the first ten months of the year 1977, from January 1 up to now, with the first ten months of the year 1976 until the