

*Official Languages*

Quebec, I imagine, have no monopoly on the concern and worry in taking a good principle and implementing it into legislation. Sometimes the difference between principle and practice is really the difference between the pulpit and practice. It is sometimes hard to practice what some people preach.

• (5:30 p.m.)

This bill refers to the official languages of Canada. When I last looked at the map Canada stretched from coast to coast, from Newfoundland to British Columbia. It did not consist of the maritime region, the Quebec region and the Ontario region. And when you get to Ontario do you take northern Ontario, do you take Toronto, Ontario, and do you take southwestern Ontario? It did not consist of the breadbasket of this land, the three prairie provinces, and it certainly did not consist only of British Columbia. It consisted of the ten provinces.

The hon. member for Moose Jaw, the hon. member for Crowfoot, and other hon. members and I are talking about a communication that is supposed to help unite us. All of us in this chamber recognize and appreciate that there is sincere concern about implementing this principle. So it is difficult to understand why the government is suggesting that we can have a board of not less than five and not more than ten which supposedly reflects the national boundaries from coast to coast. All this amendment suggests is that there shall be a representative from each province, the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories. The Secretary of State might have some objection in regard to the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories. However, basically coast to coast each province should be represented. This is the basic reason we exist as a nation and is the very fact of the existence of this nation called Canada.

The minister interjected with his argument of straw by saying that the matter is *res judicata* because it has been considered by a committee and thus cannot be considered in this house. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) said that if we accept that type of argument the whole committee system will grind to a halt. I suggest that the face of the bill itself, the very title of the bill, the reason the Secretary of State went to western Canada to preach about the bill and the reason the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has given for introducing the bill, indicate that the purpose of the bill is to help make Canada one country from coast to coast. When the government suggests such things as participatory involve-

[Mr. Nowlan.]

ment, the politics of involvement and the politics of participation, why then when we set up this advisory board should we eliminate parts of this country, provinces of this country. This is beyond all comprehension and understanding. The very name of the bill implies ten provinces. I must say that so far as I am concerned, having had no discussion with the hon. member for Cardigan, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory might be in a different position, but those areas are part of this country too.

In respect of the argument of the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) I should like to say I can remember a recent federal-provincial conference when headlines blazed out across the country saying that the Premier of Newfoundland, a province which evidently does not have a bilingual district, was in support of the principle of bilingualism. Abraham Lincoln said many years ago that it is easy to be tolerant and that the racial problem in the United States as he described it then was in direct ratio to the numbers in the country which had the problem. For Mr. Smallwood of Newfoundland, with no bilingual districts, it might be very easy for him to say, if you chose to believe him, that Newfoundland will now be bilingual.

Most of us saw Mr. Smallwood either in the conference or on the television screen. We were most impressed by his contribution to the earlier debates when without any hesitation at all he was one of the first premiers to endorse the principle set out in this bill. No one then suggested and no headline then suggested that we should discount Mr. Smallwood and his little province because that province is only one of ten and is situated on the east coast and does not even have a bilingual district. That in effect, with a little twisting but not much, is the argument of the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria. He comes from New Brunswick and I come from Nova Scotia. New Brunswick has a very strong, healthy and constructive Acadian group reflecting one of the majority languages. But Nova Scotia also has bilingual districts reflecting both the majority languages set out in this bill.

I must say, without any aspersion on anyone who might be appointed from New Brunswick, that I would feel much more happy and much more involved and Nova Scotia would feel much more involved if there were a representative from Nova Scotia on this board to look after the boundary lines and problems in respect of joining up bilingual districts in Nova Scotia rather than have that