

*Official Languages*

Let us compare this situation with the regional concept as it relates to the agricultural industry. Some 90 per cent of the problems of that industry today stem from exactly the same concept proposed in this clause. We have in this house political representatives from agricultural communities. The number is certainly not numerically equal to the number of representatives from other segments of our society. As a result, the views and pleas of the representatives of agricultural areas are often virtually ignored. I should like to appeal to the minister to take these views into consideration.

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I should just like to speak briefly in support of the view expressed by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) against the amendment. I find it difficult to do so after listening this afternoon to the eloquent speeches in favour of the amendment by my colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) and others. I certainly would not want to widen the differences between my colleagues on this very sensitive subject.

I think it is possible to exaggerate the importance of this amendment. The bilingual districts advisory board I am sure will carry out its functions which, as I understand it, are to determine whether or not a district shall be bilingual. It does not matter much whether the board is set up under the formula in the bill or under the formula advanced by the amendment. After all, the bill does enjoin the Governor in Council, in setting up the committee, to take as a basis for selection a representation as equally proportionate as possible in relation to residence in a particular province.

Indeed, such an injunction is probably unnecessary because it would be a very unwise cabinet that did not advise the Governor-General to take account of the different regions in different provinces. This has been the traditional way of doing things throughout Canadian history, without tying anyone down to a rigid formula. Although I say it is possible to exaggerate the importance of the issue of the amendment to the original bill, it seems to me if there is a principle involved here it is the principle that we should, in setting up federal boards and federal organizations, have regard primarily to qualifications. We should have regard to the necessity of not setting up rigid provincial representation. We should not get into the habit of thinking that a board or tribunal set up by

the Parliament of Canada is not truly representative of the interests of various provinces because it does not happen to have a representative of any one particular province.

• (7:30 p.m.)

It would be desirable, and I am sure the Governor in Council will bear this in mind, to see that a province like British Columbia—for which the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway made such an eloquent plea—was represented on this board. I am sure the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) will take her plea into account in recommending this to his colleagues. I agree thoroughly with what the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) and some others have said. Much will depend on the calibre of person who is appointed commissioner. I do not think too much will depend on how we select the members who are to sit on the bilingual districts advisory board. In setting up a board like this we should not even think along parochial lines. We should not be concerned primarily with whether so many of the board come from British Columbia or this province or that. After all, in this house there are many people who eloquently and admirably represent their own constituencies as well as their own provinces. In this house we think of ourselves first and foremost as Canadians. Our primary consideration is the welfare of all Canada. I, therefore, suggest that if we adopt the theory behind this amendment we shall not be adopting a truly federal approach to this question. Therefore, although I support the bill, I will vote against this amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is on motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. All those in favour of the motion will please say, yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed will please say, nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Speaker:** As agreed earlier, this vote will be deferred.