

of the areas of cultural control in the province of Quebec or in other provinces are within provincial jurisdiction. René Lévesque or any other premier in the province of Quebec has control over the educational system. They have the opportunity to use cable television, and we need to make certain amendments to our legislation to open up to all our provinces the exclusive control of 80 per cent of 90 per cent of the cable outlets. There is no reason why they should not have it. It is good for Quebec and it is good for all the other provinces, so long as we keep a few networks national.

The essential point I want to make in the national unity debate vis-à-vis the provinces, and particularly the province of Quebec, is twofold. First, we should not say to Quebeckers that they have to choose, that in their psychic make-up they have to be either Québécois or Canadian. I say that the attitude of the Prime Minister—and I respect it because I know it is honest—has been, in my understanding of his career in politics and his political writing, to say to Quebeckers, “You must choose. You must renounce your nationalism. You must renounce your sense of being a Québécois and be a Canadian, or the other way around”.

An hon. Member: Oh, come on; that is not so.

Mr. Broadbent: The Liberals say no.

Mr. Prud'homme: Not the Liberals; the Prime Minister.

An hon. Member: Give us an example.

Mr. Broadbent: I am asked for an example. I will give the hon. member an example. It was not the former leader of the Conservatives or their present leader, nor was it my predecessor, who said of Quebec nationalism that it was a form of tribalism. It happens to have been the Prime Minister. There was no attitude on the part of the leadership on this side of the House of any of the parties that Quebec nationalism was unacceptable.

I repeat my argument and I welcome any challenging of the facts. The prime Minister was honest in his argument. He has always seen nationalism in Canada, as well as elsewhere, as being regressive, reactionary, as being an oppressive force, and he believes that with conviction. I say he is wrong. Nationalism need not be regressive; it can be creative. What we have needed in our country is not the repression of Quebec nationalism but a heightened sense of nationalism elsewhere, so that we can bring the two together to do something in our land.

● (1822)

The question of Quebec nationalism or cultural life is not primarily a constitutional matter; it is very much an attitudinal matter. Those of us in federal politics must open ourselves in a spirit of equality to our fellow Canadians in the province of Quebec and say to them that they need not choose between being Québécois or Canadian. They can be both. We must understand that their historical, cultural and linguistic roots are very deeply embedded in their province, but there is no

contradiction between living that cultural reality as a Québécois and being a Canadian.

I do not know if we are going to win that battle, because if there is not cultural vitality going on in English Canada—no question about independence—there is, indeed, that going on in the minds of Quebeckers, and any one of us would be dishonest if we did not address ourselves to that question. If I understand my Quebec friends well—indeed, if I understand my wife, who shares that culture—there is an identity problem, and the Quebecker is going to be trying to sort out, in this period in history, whether it is sufficient to work it out within a federal framework and whether a Québécois can really make it as a human being within the Canadian structure.

I do not know in advance the answer to that question, but I do know that all we at the federal level can do on that important issue is welcome that attitude in Canada which says that we want Quebeckers to feel part of our land and that we are going to do everything we can. That does, indeed, include minority language rights right across the country. I agree with the Prime Minister on that, but where I disagree with him and his analysis about the significance of that, is that for me, as I understand what is going on, establishing rights for Francophone minorities in other provinces is not what will ultimately persuade Quebeckers to stay within our union or to depart.

I plead for serious understanding of that point, if I am right. Those rights are important, but for Quebeckers what is really important is not the welfare of minorities outside the province of Quebec; what is important for Quebeckers in 1977 is to be convinced that their homeland, the province of Quebec, is a place which can continue to exist as a vital and creative Francophone community within the union.

That, to me, is the issue which has to be sorted out, fundamentally by Quebeckers, and if I understand the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) correctly, that is his argument too. He says that minority rights are important across the country, and certainly they are in the long run, but in dealing with the Quebecker as he or she is now, we have to persuade the Quebecker that it is within the province of Quebec, basically, that he or she can live as a Québécois.

In the great debate which is going on with regard to the cultural domain there is not a lot we at the federal level can do except be persuasive and perhaps modify cable television legislation. We must win the hearts and minds of the people of Quebec on that issue. However, there is also something we can do in the economy. I have repeated that with considerable emphasis in the past year. I have not disregarded the cultural domain, by no means, but the cultural domain ties into the economy. I was in Trois-Rivières and in Sept Isles on a trip not long ago. Quebeckers there told me that they wanted jobs. They were concerned about textile policy and about shipbuilding policy. They said they would respond just as Canadians in Newfoundland, British Columbia or Sudbury, to a national government which wants to deal with the national economy.

So if we want to deal with national unity, it is not a matter of separating something called national unity from the economy. Both go together. What we need, particularly now in our