

you, cannot ignore the historic English language domination of most key elements of Canadian society, even in Quebec. The intangible effects of this traditional situation are legion, and are responsible for many of today's instinctive and negative reactions on both sides.

The frustrations and, hence, resentments caused by these developments must be recognized and understood. Such reactions are particularly acute in bilingual areas where job security and advancement are seen as being threatened, but everywhere in Canada there is an underlying concern that future economic and other opportunities will be denied those who are not bilingual. It is true, of course, as many bilingual Francophones—and I am sure some of my colleagues here would agree—are quick to point out, that they had to make the effort. But whatever the errors of history, these imperatives, in addition to providing the necessity also provided the opportunity, not only in bilingual communities but in a continent of over 200 million where English predominates. And, of course, although I have stated these concerns from the perspective of Anglophone Canadians, they are no less real for millions of unilingual Francophones.

● (1542)

Clearly, for practical, as well as less defensible reasons, educational systems across Canada have been and generally remain woefully deficient in their ability to teach the second language effectively. We now know also that language training for adults, as sponsored by the Government of Canada and others, cannot, in many cases, produce the desired results even for students whose motivation is strong.

When these practical considerations are linked with the less tangible, but no less real, concerns of Francophones for the preservation of their culture and heritage, the full dimension of the national unity problem is very obvious. In the minds of confirmed separatists many of these goals are mutually exclusive. The task of federalists, members of this House and all who are concerned about a united Canada, is to prove that they are not.

A key tool in this task is education. It has been noted repeatedly, but not always believed by Anglophones, that even today, after the introduction of Bill 101, Quebec still provides more by way of educational guarantees to its English-speaking minority than is provided for French language equivalents in other provinces. Yet, this is the case, and the faster corrective measures are taken, by way of constitutional guarantees and the implementation of new realistic approaches, the faster one of the main and most legitimate sources of Francophone grievance will be removed.

Education, and the greater comprehension and understanding it produces—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order. I regret to inform the hon. member that his allotted time has expired. However, he may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

### *The Address—Mr. Jamieson*

**Mr. Jamieson:** I am very grateful to the House, Mr. Speaker, and I assure hon. members that I will not impose on their time unnecessarily.

A key tool to this task is education, and the greater comprehension and understanding it produces is the only alternative to the seige mentality, to the "two nations" concept, and to separatism itself. Those who argue for these alternatives fail to realize in most cases that they would produce, not just one watertight compartment, but two, and this situation might very well lead to still more as other regions, although all in English-speaking Canada, sought to erect their own barriers to protect characteristics or advantages they consider important. I am seeing signs of that already in my own part of the country. I believe it to be very, very negative in terms of national unity. I hope that I will have the opportunity to persuade people in my province, for example, that this seige mentality, this idea that it is a "we and they" situation is counter to the very thing for which we fought such a bitter referendum 30 years ago.

Canadian federalism—and I know now after 30 years perhaps better than most because of this unique background that I happen to have, which is not of my own doing—is either totally open or eventually it is nothing. The diversity various regions prize can only be assured through a climate of openness and through policies and approaches that encourage and nourish regional attitudes, including language rights, while at the same time exposing them to the test of relevancy and value.

While putting great emphasis on education, we must, of course, continue to take other steps toward greater national unity. Some of considerable importance have their roots in constitutional reform, a subject that will be much discussed in coming months. It is clear from all of the dramatic developments in Canada in recent years that the time for leisurely, piecemeal dialogue on national unity is over. The election of a separatist government in Quebec is not the only reason for the new urgency; in some respects it is not even the most important. Its greatest significance is the much sharper focus it has given to an historic, ever present problem. It would be a major mistake, however, to assume that the defeat of the Parti Québécois will end the problem. The task of reconciliation and reform pre-dates the Parti Québécois victory and will remain to be completed after the Parti Québécois is gone.

Those who maintain that defeating the separatists can be left solely to the people of Quebec are only right in the narrow sense that it is Quebecers who will vote in the referendum, and the provincial election when it comes. But, while these actions may defeat Quebec separatism as a referendum issue, they will not of themselves save Canada. There is a real danger that the ousting of the Parti Québécois government will be seen by many Canadians—indeed, it is already being perceived by many Canadians—as the definitive judgment on separatism.

But, even on the narrower issue, all Canadians have an obvious stake in the referendum. That stake is not just the future of Quebec, but the future of Canada. Therefore, in addition to stating unequivocally what is unacceptable to