

and will probably come from these proceedings, hon. members opposite say we should not do this by persuasion, that we should not go to the public and to the legislatures to get agreement. We are criticized because there is a possibility of a checkerboard. In fact, the hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam, a very distinguished lady, said she has given up all hope that it will ever come about.

Let me remind hon. members on the government side that they have left the biggest checker on the board, and let me remind them what it is. In order to gain support in central Canada, in the province of Ontario, the Liberal government has left half a million francophones outside the protection of Section 133. There is no use running away from it. If hon. members want to talk about a checkerboard, just look at that. I would suggest that is a black spot. I do not agree with unilateral imposition. But if members opposite are going to criticize our formula because it may take a little longer, and it may not happen all at the same time, then in fairness they better look long and hard at what they are doing themselves.

The question is this: How do members opposite explain to francophones in Ontario that Manitoba, Quebec and now New Brunswick will be protected by Section 133 but the largest single majority of francophones outside of the province of Quebec will not be? If the Liberal Government wants to talk about a checkerboard, let me talk about a checkerboard.

What about immigrants coming to the province of Quebec? They are not going to be treated in the same way respecting the education of their children. I can live with a lot of differences in this country, but I think it is pretty hard to live with what gets to be near hypocrisy when the only criticism hon. members opposite can make about us saying we have a little more faith in our fellow Canadians than they have, and we think we can get it with a little time and persuasion, is that there will be a checkerboard. They have got a checkerboard.

On the question of the checkerboard and the rights, our proposal is that we take a little more time. The argument put forward by the government is that the premiers would never agree to anything. I ask hon. members opposite how they know that? I can see it on their lips already. They will say the premiers have not agreed to anything for 53 years. But that is not true. All kinds of changes have been made, many of them by agreement and consultation.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Eighteen.

**Mr. Fraser:** We have lived together as a country for 113 years. We have lived together, not as the Dominion of Canada, but we have lived together before that and we have done a lot of things by agreement. To come before the public and say there is no possibility of ever getting agreement again shows an extraordinary lack of faith. The hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam said that for two years the New Democratic Party would like to work on something which they could present as an amending formula, and that they would like some amendments with respect to women and the charter of rights. There are a number of things she wishes will come about and she hopes that everyone will agree. Does that not

indicate the thought that we will be able to make changes as time goes by? That just contradicts her position completely.

My hon. friends from British Columbia have a dilemma. The hon. member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson), unfortunately is not in the House right now, but he is a very strong defender of rights—so am I—and I understand how he feels. He said he did not like the amending formula but he would go ahead anyway because he wanted those rights very badly.

• (1750)

Yet that apparently is the position of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton), the hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam, the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Kristiansen), the hon. member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly), the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mrs. Mitchell), the hon. member for Kootenay East-Revelstoke (Mr. Parker), the hon. member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis), the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. Rose), the hon. member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) and the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell). That is the New Democratic phalanx. They have ganged up with the senators from British Columbia to defend British Columbia interests by selling them out on the amending formula.

Let us take a look at what that amending formula does. Section 41, which is now section 45, gives eternally and for all time an absolute veto on constitutional change to the province of Ontario and to the province of Quebec.

Before I go any further, let me make something clear. I am prepared to put a veto in the hands of Quebec on some things, but I am not prepared to put a veto in the hands of the province of Ontario, no matter what its population will ever be and enshrine forever first-class and second-class—even third-class—status among provinces. If hon. members think this is not bothering people in western Canada, then they have not been listening. It is, and it is serious. That amending formula is seen by westerners as, first of all, unfair; and second, armed with the referendum, unnecessary.

Hon. members might ask, "Why is it unnecessary?" They want to break a deadlock. Let me tell hon. members why. Let us assume for a moment that the Victoria formula is fair. I do not think it should create first-class and second-class provinces, but let us assume it is fair. Why did the government put it there? The government put it there because it thought that to be a fair way of deciding how to make changes. But then the federal government came along and said, "If we do not get our way by putting it through Section 41 (which is now Section 45) we will have a referendum and go over the heads of the provinces because there is a deadlock". For the life of me I do not understand what my friends on the government side mean by a deadlock.

If we have an amending formula which calls for passage by so many legislatures of different provinces in different regions, and if that is a fair proposal, why not live by the result? Why come along with a further amending formula which says that if the federal government does not get what it wants under