

dians are in favour of having the children of their province learn the other official language.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): These figures represent an increase in favour of second language training over a similar poll six years ago. They show that in all parts of Canada a majority supports second language education.

Referring to the survey, Kathryn Manzer, the president of Canadian Parents for French stated:

These findings affirm my faith in Canadians and in the future of our country. It's good to know that Canadians really do share a desire to understand and communicate with one another.

I agree with these sentiments.

[*Translation*]

We have built a strong and unique democracy, founded on justice, tolerance and understanding. True, we have had the occasional set-back, but I believe we have made considerable progress in building a society that gives equal opportunities to all citizens, regardless of language or origin.

• (1630)

I would like to quote my predecessor who said last year in the House of Commons, on April 5:

The whole history of Canada, since the very day it was founded, reflects the fragile balance between the two founding peoples and the two language communities. It is the duty of all of us here in the House, the elected representatives of the Canadian people, to work zealously, carefully and generously to cement the links between these two language communities.

[*English*]

My background is neither French nor English. My parents were Jewish immigrants from eastern Europe who became proud Canadians, as I am. Today, I have the honour to stand here as a member of Parliament and, even if for a limited period, as the Leader of the Opposition. I am proud to work for our country, to speak for Canada in both official languages.

I believe that if we begin to undermine the concept of bilingualism, we are also beginning to undermine the concept of multiculturalism. After all, if we cannot recognize the value of having two official languages in this country, can we long continue to recognize the value

Government Orders

of the many non-English and non-French cultural heritages of some one third of Canadians?

I believe, and I hope all Canadians will agree with me, that you do not build yourself up by tearing someone else down. In the long run, you do not increase your rights by attempting to take away the rights of others.

More than that, diminishing the rights of Francophones outside Quebec does not increase the rights of Anglophones inside Quebec, just as limiting the rights of Anglophones inside Quebec does not increase the rights of Francophones elsewhere in our country. If anything, actions such as those we have seen in recent months only serve to make matters worse for minorities in all parts of Canada.

The English-only municipal resolutions we have seen recently represent a very backward step. They are based on misconceptions and misunderstandings about the financial implications for municipalities of Ontario's Bill 8. As I understand it, that bill does not require municipalities to spend any money. It does not require their citizens to pay more. It also does not require municipal governments to do anything they do not want to do. But, unfortunately, French language rights and services have become the undeserving scapegoats for concerns about municipal taxes and services.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, when I sat in the House of Commons for the first time in 1962, we were just starting to provide services in both official languages. I want to pay tribute to all members of the House of Commons who pursued that objective. Under the Pearson Government, the Laurendeau-Dunton report on bilingualism and biculturalism was published. The result? Under the government of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, we tabled the official languages bill.

[*English*]

The task of winning acceptance of that legislation was not small. My predecessor, the member for Vancouver Quadra, played a leading role in that process. As Minister of Justice in 1969, he criss-crossed the country consulting with provincial governments. He negotiated with the attorneys-general of the four western provinces because there were objections. He appeared before provincial legislative committees throughout Canada, because, as he told this House last April: "As in all cases involving language, this law to legitimize equal status for