

situation is bound to occur, but there is the risk of the balance between francophones and anglophones being changed to the detriment of the francophone majority, a risk I refuse to take and which is all the more serious that no increase in the natural population growth in Quebec is expected in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, after considering carefully all the migratory movements to Quebec between 1969 and 1978, it is fair to say that the entrenchment in the Constitution of the minority language educational rights will open the doors of English schools to 75 per cent of the new Quebecers in the next few years. It is important to emphasize also that Section 23 would even be at variance with the language policy of the Quebec Liberal party which, according to the latest news, is about to advocate access to English schools only to children of parents who attended English primary schools anywhere in Canada, which would exclude children of all the future anglophone immigrants.

If only, Mr. Speaker, this threat to the future of French-speaking Quebec would improve considerably the lot of the francophone minorities in other provinces, the pill would be easier to swallow. Unfortunately, on the one hand, the government goes out of its way to give constitutional guarantees to Quebec anglophones who already have three universities, six CEGEPs, 410 primary and secondary schools financed by Quebec taxpayers and managed by 31 school boards under full control of the English minority, and on the other hand, it is very different when it comes to francophone minorities outside of Quebec who will not be able, under these constitutional proposals, to set up their own school boards and will most probably have to accept French classes in English schools, and only where numbers warrant it. Incidentally, this restriction will have little effect on Quebec anglophones since they are heavily concentrated in the Montreal area. It is a restriction which will have little effect on the English-speaking people in Quebec because of their large number in the Montreal area. But it will be a different thing for the French-speaking minorities in English Canada where in six provinces more than 45 per cent of people of French origin now declare English as their mother tongue and where francophones are very often scattered throughout the territory. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this is asking Quebec to pay too high a price for their French-speaking brothers in other provinces to enjoy such limited rights.

Besides, I understand why the government is reluctant, even though it wishes strongly to do so, to subject Ontario to the provisions of Section 133 of the Constitution; what I cannot readily understand, however, is the fact that it does not show as much restraint toward Quebec which is as dead against Section 23 of the proposed resolution as Ontario is against being subject to Section 133 of the Constitution. Yet, that would only be fair and logical considering that in Quebec the judiciary and parliamentary institutions have been subject to

*Business of the House*

bilingualism as provided for in Section 133, since 1867. Mr. Speaker, I am as happy to praise the openmindedness and generosity of Premier Hatfield of New Brunswick over institutional bilingualism, as I am sad when I see that Premier Davis of Ontario who after having courted Quebecers during the referendum campaign, has chosen to be narrow-minded which is no credit to his fellow citizens, a majority of whom, according to the latest polls, would favour enforcement of Section 133 in their province. We can only hope that the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark) will try to convince his big brother in Ontario to take a more favourable stance concerning the rights of Franco-Ontarians. I even challenge the Leader of the Official Opposition to show by some concrete action that equality before the law of francophones and anglophones is dear to his heart, as he has so often stated, and to bring forward an amendment binding Ontario to Section 133. I am convinced that he would gain stature in the eyes of Quebecers, and that the party to which I belong would be pleased to support such an amendment.

● (1700)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski)—Transport—Freight assistance program for rapeseed products; the hon. member for York North (Mr. Gamble)—Trade—Importation of Japanese automobiles—Inquiry respecting quotas; the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mrs. Mitchell)—Housing—Introduction of shelter allowance program.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Pinard:** Mr. Speaker, I have consulted with my colleagues opposite and we have come to an agreement concerning the dates of the last two allotted days for the present supply period. You will recall that, earlier today, I designated Wednesday of next week as an opposition day. However, since then we have had consultations and the following change should now be noted: the sixth allotted day of this supply period will be next Tuesday, March 17, and the seventh and last allotted day of the supply period will be Wednesday, March 25, 1981. As my colleagues are now present, I therefore state that this matter has been the subject of an agreement,