

cannot be the focal point of Francophones in North America, I would be the first to ask for amendments in this regard. But the facts are quite the opposite. Under section 95 of the present constitution jurisdiction over immigration is shared equally by Quebec and the central government, and this is why, on February 20, 1978, the Government of Canada and the government of Quebec signed a three-year agreement which gives Quebec a power of veto concerning immigrants to its territory, which veto Quebec has used, continues to use and will eventually still use when it expires since it could be renewed by common agreement.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, nothing in this bill goes against the essential provisions of Bill 101 in Quebec. French continues to be the official language of Quebec, it continues to be the working language; French continues to be the language of business and trade, it continues to be the focal point of the efforts of all governments so that Quebec can remain the principal residence of Francophones in North America. I want my fellow citizens to be aware of this because it is very easy to confuse everyone, to raise the spectre of immigration and of the invasion of Quebec, and because we must know exactly what we are talking about when we speak of immigration and new citizens and when we try to balance the relationships which must exist between Francophones and Anglophones in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this is very important because, for our part, we realize that Francophones outside Quebec, who are very conscious of the subject matter of the resolution being debated by Parliament, are well aware that unfortunately this proposal does not go far enough. They tell us: In Victoria, in 1971, seven provinces had agreed to recognize the use of French during the proceedings in the legislatures. There was Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, Manitoba. In 1971, three provinces were willing to recognize the use of French before the courts. In 1971, five Canadian provinces were willing to recognize the use of French in their services to their citizens. It may be well to remind the House which provinces those were: Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Ontario. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ontario.

In 1971, Ontario was willing to recognize the right of Francophones to be served by their government in either of the two official languages in Canada. We forget that too often. Ontario has backtracked in that regard since 1971. The Ontario government is not solely responsible for that. As we know, it has been pointed out repeatedly, the Quebec government was the one that refused the Victoria charter, by demanding what? That it have jurisdiction in the field of social affairs, a topic that has not been heard of again in eight years, which has never been the subject of another constitutional conference. Yet, at that time, at least seven provinces were willing to make significant progress.

### *The Constitution*

When Bill C-60 was put before the House in June of 1978, the federal legislation contained provisions identical to those of the Victoria formula. When the Right Hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) addressed the provincial premiers on September 10, 1980, less than a month ago, he made identical proposals. Today, Francophones outside Quebec ask us, "Why do you not respect the commitments you made over ten years ago in Victoria, the promises you made two years ago when you introduced legislation?"

We have to recognize that the present proposed resolution does not go far enough in terms of protecting the rights they are entitled to claim in this country. So, Mr. Speaker, in the days and weeks to come when the committee will debate this issue it will have to consider including proposals allowing those provinces which are willing to proceed towards linguistic equality to achieve the basic equality provided in the proposed resolution, to make voluntary commitments and to guarantee through a provision in the charter the possibility of giving Francophone citizens of their province the same rights that are given to Anglophones in Quebec. That is the basis of Canada, Mr. Speaker. The commitment of all citizens to get exactly the same rights in any province, in any region.

Yesterday I heard my colleague from Ontario who was rightly expressing the aspirations of the west and who told us that in that region there are also people who think that the west might separate some day if we are not sensitive enough to their expectations. He was not talking to a brick wall. Francophones and Quebecers are fighting in Ottawa in an attempt to re-establish that equality and we are ready to fight with our other colleagues in the House so that our fellow citizens in the west feel at home in our country. But when they return in the west we expect them not to attack the federal government—and I make a difference between the federal government and the Liberal party, knowing as I do the rules of politics—they should not attack our institutions, they should not alienate their fellow citizens and they should do like we Quebecers do when we return to Quebec. We try to make our fellow citizens understand the advantages of staying in this country but also our duty to change it.

Mr. Speaker, this responsibility works both ways. We are ready to give them all the help they need and to listen to what the Leader of the New Democratic Party said the night when the Prime Minister tabled that resolution. We are listening carefully to the west. We are curious about what is to be done in that part of the country, but what we are asking them is to speak on behalf of Canada when they return home. The reason we are here is essentially to make sure that we have exactly the same perception and understanding of the duties we have with respect to our fellow Canadians. The future of Canada will be based on this, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that when we are called upon to vote on this resolution and to decide, we will choose the extent of freedom the Canada of tomorrow will grant its citizens.