

road 20 years when their proportion of the total population in Canada will decline even further. They want to know whether their children and their grandchildren will have their linguistic and cultural rights guaranteed in a Canada of the year 2000.

I share those sentiments, and I think that it is incumbent on all members of this House and all those who represent constituencies outside Quebec to make sure that in the lifetime of this Parliament—whether it be unilaterally by this House, as the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko) proposed last Friday or, as I hope, by general consultation at a federal-provincial conference—we, once and for all, enshrine language minority rights in the constitution of this country, if we ever hope to look people of French language background in the eye and say that they are welcome in this country. I came back from forced retirement in private life to this House of Commons because I feel so deeply about the need for constitutional change in this country. I think that we must come to grips with this situation in the next three years before the next election.

Legislatures have not been good guarantors of minority rights or language rights. Let us go back to the Manitoba of 1891 and the schools' question which effectively blocked out the French language in that province and made the French there part of a dwindling minority. That is the effect of legislative action in 1891 in Manitoba.

In Ontario during the First World War, regulation 17 effectively meant the same thing for French language education in Ontario, to Ontario's shame. It is all very well for Premier Bill Davis to go around the country pontificating on the great things which he has done over the last few years. I will admit that Ontario has made great strides, but where was Ontario in the last 50 years?

Let us look at the legislatures and how well they guarantee minority rights. Let us look at Bill 101 in the province of Quebec and how it will treat the English language minority in that province. It is quite obvious that legislatures cannot guarantee linguistic and minority rights. Even this House of Commons was derelict in its duty. I believe that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) was sitting in the House in 1941 or 1942 when this House sat in silence as members of the Japanese minority in this country were interned. That was perhaps one of the most—

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we were not silent. In particular, the late Angus MacInnis was on his feet speaking out very strongly on that issue.

Mr. Collenette: I apologize to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, but it appeared that the House in general was silent on this particular issue, to allow this particular thing to happen.

Mr. Lambert: Not the Liberals.

Mr. Collenette: I will take the admonitions from the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and say that it was the Liberal party. It was not the finest hour for the Liberal party and there are members on this side who want to

make sure that the Liberal party, the Conservative party, the NDP and members of this House will never again see a minority subjugated in the way in which the Japanese were during the Second World War.

● (2200)

Before you call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you that only with an entrenched bill of rights, only with language rights enshrined for all time in this country will we have linguistic and cultural harmony. I do not accept the argument of the premier of Saskatchewan and I do not accept the argument of the premier of Manitoba who believe that this cannot be done.

If I get the opportunity to speak on this subject again before the referendum, I should like to turn to some other aspects dealing with how the referendum is impacting upon the province of Ontario, and how Ontario and English Canada in particular should respond.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

ATOMIC ENERGY—EFFECTIVE AND STRINGENT INTERNATIONAL SAFEGUARDS OVER USE

Mr. Bob Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, Canada is a nation of 23 million people out of four billion people in the world. We have a small armed force of about 73,000 people, very poorly equipped with only conventional weapons. We are but one voice at the United Nations, and only occasionally are we members of the Security Council. In fact Canada's influence on international affairs is, in a number of ways, very limited, to say the least. We can, however, preach disarmament because in fact we are virtually disarmed. While we can preach moralistically on this line, we lack the power and influence because we are, in fact, not a great nuclear weapons state.

There are many areas, however, where Canada does have influence and power and moral consistency, and can show international statesmanship and leadership. Canada is a major supplier of nuclear technology and nuclear energy; Canada is a major player in this game, and a major factor in nuclear proliferation in the world.

This is one of the most important topics facing the world right now, and in the past Canada has shown leadership on the subject. For example, the late Prime Minister Lester Pearson showed an earlier initiative in 1965 when he said that the