

observations on this matter of national unity. The importance of this subject to us all can scarcely be exaggerated.

I think if the English speaking world keeps telling the Parti Québécois, in their struggle for the future hearts and minds of the Quebecers, that they cannot make a go of it economically without us, it may only stiffen their resolve to have a try at it. We must remember that Quebec with its some six million people is, by the standards of the countries that belong to the United Nations, far more populated than most of them and, of course, has much greater territory. Norway, for example, is a well respected country with only four million people.

It may be that economics will defy René Lévesque's siren song of separatism and that it might founder badly on economic shoals in terms of fearful economic cost to the people of Quebec, as I would guess would likely be the case. A 1971-72 study showed Quebec received a surplus of \$600 million from the federal government. André Raynault, a past president of the Economic Council of Canada, estimated some months ago that Quebec was now receiving about \$1.5 billion more than it gave to the federal government; and we all have read that on February 25 the Quebec government released a study which purports to show that between 1961 and 1975 the federal government collected \$4.3 billion more from Quebec than it spent in that province. The accuracy and implications of these figures will be debated for months.

The notion though that Quebec has nothing to offer in economic advantages except cheap labour and natural resources is, to say the least, exaggerated. The market of that province is now rich and sophisticated. The work force is, for the most part, more skilled than that in the Atlantic provinces, and certainly no longer cheap. I would guess that the indigenous capacity for innovation in technology is as great as anywhere in Canada.

Of course, the Parti Québécois is banking a good deal, so far as the economic aspects of its strategy for selling separatism are concerned, on the continuance of a Quebec-Canada customs union. One cannot, in fact, be sure that an arrangement of this sort would be attractive to English speaking Canadians if Quebec goes its own way politically. I find it highly unlikely that two such nations would be able to agree on a central bank issuing common currency and having a monetary union, as Lévesque mentioned in his New York speech, or that they would be able to agree to a common level of tariff. I am sure that the rest of Canada would not consent to giving a new nation of Quebec a veto over these kinds of matters.

An article some months ago by John Downs in the *Financial Times* points out the importance to Quebec employment of industries like textiles, clothing and footwear heavily protected with tariffs. Canadians from coast to coast, of course, pay for this protection when they buy garments and shoes in the stores. We in the maritimes have constantly been critical of the high cost of Canada to us because of the highly protective tariff in Quebec as well as in Ontario. Between them, Ontario and Quebec account for more than 80 per cent of the manufacturing output and employment in Canada.

### *National Unity*

According to a study by the Economic Council of Canada, about 37 per cent of the manufacturing jobs in Quebec and 27 per cent in Ontario are dependent on tariff protected sales to other provinces. We, like other Canadians, have reluctantly accepted tariffs as a means of keeping our fellow citizens in these jobs but, of course, there is no assurance that the political equation would be seen in the same terms if Quebec separated.

However, let us not underestimate the leadership of the Parti Québécois, who have among their members at least a couple of prominent economists. They are aware that the plight of many of Quebec's most vulnerable industries can only be solved by radical surgery, hacking out, as it were, the inappropriate sectors to make way for others of higher productivity. They might be reasoning that this operation would be better performed in circumstances where Ottawa, by shaping English Canada's trade policy vis-à-vis Quebec, would have to do all the dirty work and receive most of the blame.

I think if we were to underrate the possibility and the shrewdness of such manoeuvres, we would be making a big mistake. In any case the very nature of the separatist movement, based upon an old idea of independence, fed by a very strong emotional stream and bolstered by a charismatic leader like Lévesque, who is backed by probably the brainiest cabinet that now exists in any province of Canada, makes its followers rich in potential for self-sacrifice. An old endemic idea of independence, strongly backed by a torrent of emotion and a new found political power, must not be taken lightly by anybody who professes to love this country.

What I am trying to say is that what English speaking Canada must appreciate is that the Parti Québécois has managed to become the focus of the new pride of many French Canadians, their society and its achievements, and thus the calculation of gain from a particular constitutional system is going to be more than a matter of economic arithmetic. The Parti Québécois have, in fact, done what all colonized people, or people who have seen themselves to be colonized, have done: they have sought independence to give their colonists self-esteem. They will find, as others have found, that self-esteem can bring a high economic cost, but again I remind us all not to underestimate the potential for sacrifice in such a movement.

In the immediate months and years ahead, all of us in Canada must try to be wise and civilized to an extent that we may not have reached before if we want our national affairs to evolve toward a successful conclusion, instead of into the kind of strife that has done such unbelievable harm in places like northern Ireland, Cyprus, and Lebanon. In the ongoing debate, strident voices, in their zeal to defend Canada, or English speaking Canada, would do well to remember the fundamentals of good manners.

In this connection it was sad to hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark), who aspires to be Prime Minister of this country, quoted as making the observation some months ago that he would not rule out completely the use of force to hold Quebec in Canada. My guess is that all thinking Canadi-