

(7) that discussions begin with only one precondition, a desire to remain within a renewed Canadian federation;[-]

With this condition, the majority of the people who took part in the hearings of the Bélanger-Campeau Commission are excluded from the start. It excludes central labour organizations who, by the way, had very good relations with the NDP among others in the past, but took a stand for the sovereignty of Quebec and will therefore be excluded from the debate. And that, for me—

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Duceppe: If you wish to speak, my hon. friend, you will have a chance to do so later.

So, we would have wanted to make an amendment at this time, but it seems that, although we have been here since the beginning of the debate, the procedure will not allow us to make one. The right to speak is curtailed. I will, however, clarify a few things my hon. colleague mentioned about language, when he said it was very well protected. I would like to remind the members of this House a couple of facts. First, Quebec had to legislate on the subject, that the Supreme Court of Canada restricted the application of Bill 101 and that the rest of Canada opposed it. Second, the assimilation rate of francophones outside Quebec is extremely high.

Nonetheless, it seems dangerous to say that, once Quebec will have separated, the French-speaking groups outside Quebec would be in danger. That is a kind of blackmail Quebec will not lend itself to, arguing in turn that the survival of the anglophone minority in Quebec would be jeopardized. Quite the contrary, in Quebec, we will recognize their rights. We are led by higher principles than some second-rate political party.

I appreciate the fact that the NDP was the only other party to recognize the right of Quebec to self-determination. It was a very noble gesture on their part. That makes sense because that is what the UN Charter says. It seems that all parties here have signed and accept it, but when you ask Conservative or Liberal members to recognize the right to self-determination for Quebec, it is as if they could not speak because something is stuck in their mouth.

Mr. Speaker, I have a specific question for my colleague on the Referendum Act. If a referendum is held in Quebec, and there should be one in 18 months at the most, there is a law in Quebec governing expenses on

Supply

both sides, those who oppose and those who support the question.

Would a NDP government respect that law or would it do like the Liberals did in 1980 when they poured \$25 million in the campaign even though the maximum allowed was \$2.1 million. Would it do like the Conservatives with their Spicer circus and their national unity group? Would a NDP government respect the Quebec Referendum Act? Obviously, as a federal government, it would sing the praises of federalism, which is quite normal I presume, but in the framework of democratic institutions in Quebec, or would it disregard it like Liberals did in 1980?

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, I have three things to say to my friend. First of all, last weekend, our national council met in Montreal and we have published a four page document in which we say we respect the right of Quebec to self-determination. Quebecers themselves will have to decide freely of their future and fulfill their unique collective responsibility. They must do it through a democratic and fair process. This could be a fair and democratic referendum, but that is for Quebecers to decide.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I am not a Quebecer and I want my country to include Quebec. I am for a Canadian Federation; I want Quebec to remain a part of this country but in the context of a renewed federation. For me and my party, the reality is one of a country that includes Quebec, Saskatchewan and the other provinces and territories. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we have included this proposal no. 7 in our motion today.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the issue of francophones outside Quebec is a reality. It might not be always fair, and it might be sad, but a Canada without the province of Quebec would be a Canada where protecting francophones outside Quebec would be more difficult since they are a minority of 5 or 6 per cent. In fact, it will be more difficult for them, and that is a reality, to preserve the rights they enjoy now.

We have a country which is officially bilingual at the federal level and in Canadian, national institutions. Language rights have been enshrined with much difficulty in our Canadian Constitution, as well as education rights in the language of the minority. Anglophones in Quebec have exactly the same rights and I know these rights are well protected in that province, better than the rights of francophones outside Quebec. I agree with that. The rights of anglophones in Quebec are better pro-