

panacea. One should read that section. Section 6.(2) allegedly grants relief, but one should read on to see what section 6.(3) indicates. It provides that none of the prohibitions set forth in subsection (2) shall be rendered unenforceable unless the purpose was primarily a discriminatory one designed to discriminate against the former province of the intended applicant for a position or job. The hon. member who raised this issue should have studied the law of the province of Quebec. He would have discovered that in fact this is the very justification the government uses to offend the principle this is supposed to correct. Section 6 protecting mobility rights is a sham and a fraud. It will not protect Canadians, and they should be made aware of that.

● (2150)

The hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Bockstael) expressed pleasure that after the passage of this resolution and the enactment of these provisions into our constitution, Canadians moving from one province to another might insist upon their children being educated in the official language of their choice. The great difficulty under section 23 with respect to Canadians moving from one province to another is that if they do not have school age children at the time of their move, they have no rights at all. The children are required to be in school. If a child is four or five years old and not yet in school, his parents might as well forget about that possibility because that child does not qualify. There is no protection there.

Interestingly enough, the real abuse to which members opposite have not directed any attention is that section 23.(1) establishes entrenched second-class citizens in this country. The hon. member for St. Boniface said he did not belong to the English majority or the French minority group in Canada. He indicated that he came from some other background. I welcome him to the underprivileged group because that is what he would be if he came to Canada from a country such as Italy where he did not speak either English or French; his privileges and rights would immediately have vanished. If this provision is passed in its offensive form, he would not be able to go into any province of this country and have his children educated in either English or French because he would have no rights. It is abhorrent that the government dared to present a proposal containing such unparalleled bias against new Canadian citizens. Once a person becomes a Canadian citizen, I believe he or she is entitled to all rights and privileges—not just some of them—which accrue to a Canadian citizen.

I cannot and will not support the entrenchment of prejudice and discrimination in the Constitution of Canada. I am appalled at the audacity of the Government of Canada in bringing forward a package containing such abuses. One wonders how the government ever contemplated the passage, without complaint, of section 41 of the resolution. Simply put, section 41(1)(b)(i) creates a special class of province. It is a class of province without identification in terms of the name of that province or of those provinces which at any time before the issue of a proclamation according to any previous general census had a population of at least 25 per cent of the total population of Canada. It so happens that the only two prov-

The Constitution

inces which qualify under that subsection are the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. All other provinces are specifically identified by name. With respect to rights in connection with constitutional amendments, the other provinces need a combined population in their respective areas of at least 50 per cent of the total population of their area. The guide determining when the population count is to be taken with respect to what are referred to as the Atlantic and western provinces is the latest general census. Ministers opposite have created the grandfather of all grandfather clauses. They have created a privileged set of provinces in Canada which will never lose their right to refuse to consent to an amendment to the constitution.

I come from the province of Ontario, one of those privileged provinces. If I were to follow the example of some hon. members on the government side of the House from Quebec, I would sit down and keep my mouth shut. Apparently that is appropriate. But there is not a thinking resident in the riding of York North who would support such an abuse, who would be prepared to accept forever special treatment denied his fellow countrymen.

There is a drum sounding in western Canada. It is sounding discontent. The echoes of that drum have been heard in the House this evening and earlier. The government has heard it but will pay no attention. The government will not hear until that muted sound becomes a roar of thunder and descends on its head with a vengeance. They will not listen because they believe people are bluffing. The people of Canada want fairness and equity. They want to be treated the same regardless of where they live. If they are not, the slight inconvenience the government recently experienced in the province of Quebec will seem tame by comparison to the anguish it brings upon itself and the entire country. I urge the government to think carefully about second class provinces and about the need for fair play and equity. I urge them to reject what has been, upon examination, nothing but a statute of frauds perpetrated upon Canadians. It is not a statute of fraud in the usual legal sense, where fraud is to be prohibited, but a statute of fraud in the sense that it is to be encouraged and promoted and advanced at the expense of Canadians.

● (2200)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gamble: Mr. Speaker, we are concerned with matters of grave national interest and I rise to speak hoping that in some small way some of my colleagues in this House and on the government side may pensively reflect upon what they are doing to Canada, recognizing that by taking the steps they are taking this evening they may cause irreparable harm to this institution and to this country. Accordingly, I ask them to reflect carefully upon what they do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!