

*Oral Questions*

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know exactly what Mr. Bourassa or Mr. Kierans have recently been thinking or saying.

● (1420)

But I do know what they said at the time the War Measures Act was invoked. From Premier Bourassa we had a letter which I believe was read by the President of the Privy Council for the record a few days ago, a letter which specified that he as well as the authorities of the City of Montreal apprehended insurrection, and they were asking us to take these strong measures so that they could do their proper job of maintaining the peace.

In the case of Mr. Kierans, he was a member of the cabinet and he supported the cabinet at the time.

INVOCATION OF WAR MEASURES ACT IN 1970—BELIEF OF  
PRIME MINISTER THAT STATE OF APPREHENDED  
INSURRECTION EXISTED IN QUEBEC

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Since, as the Prime Minister knows, ultimate responsibility for the invocation of such an act rests with the federal government, no matter what a particular provincial government might request, I should like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether it is still his view that a state appropriately described as an apprehended insurrection existed in the Province of Quebec in the fall of 1970.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I can say quite clearly that if people in Quebec, the government of that province and the administration of the City of Montreal, had not told us they were convinced that there was a state of apprehended insurrection we would probably have looked twice before invoking the War Measures Act. But they did make this statement quite clearly to us; it was our judgment that they were right, that they were well informed; it was our judgment that there was a state of apprehended insurrection and therefore we declared the War Measures Act.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Since the then Minister of Justice and other ministers of the Crown said they hoped that after some time had elapsed a full revelation of all the facts which led to the government's decision could be made, given that kind of commitment, which was no more than an asserted plan of intention, does the Prime Minister not feel, now, that in the light of recent statements by Premier Bourassa in particular, the man who was then, as he is now, premier of the province, to the effect that his view was wrong, that if not under the Inquiries Act then in some other way a full public investigation of all the circumstances leading to the original decision should be made?

**Mr. Trudeau:** I repeat, I do not know exactly what Premier Bourassa thinks about this, but I do not take for granted the hon. member's assertion that he is now saying there was not a state of apprehended insurrection. It would surprise me greatly if he were to say that.

**An hon. Member:** He said it on TV over the CBC.

[Mr. Broadbent.]

**Mr. Trudeau:** He said the contrary in writing, and I would be very surprised if he were to say the contrary now if one listened to everything he had to say.

**Mr. Broadbent:** He did.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Well, will the hon. member send me a record of what he said on Sunday night?

**An hon. Member:** You were more interested in Kojak!

**Mr. Trudeau:** As somebody said, Mr. Speaker, I was more interested in Kojak.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Trudeau:** With regard to the other part of the question as to what certain cabinet ministers think, the hon. member is free to ask Mr. Kierans. I do know I stated publicly both at that time and since, that the essence of the reason we invoked that act lay in a circumstance of which everyone was aware because I read a document to the House saying there was a state of apprehended insurrection in the minds of the authorities of the Province of Quebec. Our judgment was that they were making the right estimation at the time, and therefore we acted. I am not asking for any hidden evidence to support our action. It is all on the record and I will debate the subject any time with the hon. member.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## OLYMPIC GAMES

### FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN COST—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

In answer to a question asked by my colleague from Rimouski yesterday, the Acting Prime Minister stated that the federal government would not assume any obligation toward the anticipated deficit of the Olympic Games. Therefore, I would ask the Prime Minister whether this decision is irrevocable and whether one should take it for granted that there will not be any kind of monetary participation in financing the games. In other words, does the government accept that these games, involving all of Canada, does he accept in principle that Montrealers or the province of Quebec should assume the cost of the games?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I think there is a misunderstanding. The hon. member suggested that the federal government is taking no share of the cost of the games. That is of course a false impression. The federal government is contributing to the organization of the games in several ways: through military and police support, diplomatic services, housing assistance and so on, which amount to tens of millions of dollars.

As to the financing of the games, the hon. member also knows that the federal government—our government—introduced legislation that allowed the games to be self-financing: measures relating to coins, stamps, the lottery and so on. Therefore, it would be spreading a falsehood to say that the federal government is not supporting the