

Official Languages

bilingual districts. We shall use the census division as the statistical base for discovering linguistic clusters, at least in an approximate sense. It is not technically an administrative division, since it is used only for the census—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but I would like to point out he is not in his seat.

Mr. Stanbury: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I continue:

—but it is a more accurate and stable base than most administrative divisions. One of its purposes is to report upon Canada's linguistic make-up; using it, we can follow locally from census to census the development of each official language group.

I now quote from the bottom of page 108:

However, none of these census divisions will necessarily form a bilingual district. Although the census division indicates the presence of French and English speaking minorities within a given area, it does not show their distribution. For example, two neighbouring divisions, A and B, might have official language minorities forming 20 and 3 per cent of their populations respectively. On closer examination we may find that the minorities are not distributed at random; for example, most of them might be living in only one part of the area. We can express the situation graphically as follows:

Then is shown a graph and the report continues:

If we chose the census division as the basis for creating a bilingual district, all of division A would likely become bilingual, and all of division B would remain unilingual. Our diagram shows that most of the members of the minority live in one section of division A and in the adjacent part of division B. Should official bilingualism be imposed on the unilingual parts of the former, and the bilingual fraction of the latter be ignored? We do not think so. In such a case, all of the area marked in black, excluding the rest of the divisions A and B, should become one bilingual district. This theoretical example—simpler than the actual situation in most cases—shows how the census division will help determine the bilingual district, although in the end the boundaries of the two might be quite different.

That is the end of the quotation, Mr. Speaker. I put it on record simply to avoid any misunderstanding about the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I wish to take part in this debate and support the amendment advanced by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) which has already received basic support from many members on this side of the house. Having delayed entry into the debate on the bill respecting the official languages of Canada, I now wish to take part at this point

because I was one of those who had no hesitation on second reading in feeling that this bill was important enough to send it to committee for the committee to do constructive work and have it come back to the house with amendments to be dealt with here.

The committee has done constructive work. The bill is now back before the house with some amendments. As we begin studying these amendments it is, quite frankly, hard to comprehend the position of the government and, the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), and the interjection of the parliamentary secretary, although undoubtedly meant to illuminate, really was not germane to what has been said in this debate about what this amendment does. It is difficult to comprehend the position of the government on this amendment. The government, for some reason or other, has dug in its heels and is suggesting that the present clause 14, appointing not less than five and not more than ten persons to a very important advisory board, reflects the true identity of Canada. The men who administer this act will really have to work.

As one catalyst taking part in this debate, I do so because of the suggestion of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) in the house this afternoon that because this amendment was dealt with in the committee the debate is *res judicata*. That argument is so weak and flimsy it amounts to straw and I will not waste any more of my breath on it. I hope when reading *Hansard* tomorrow I will be able to arrive at a different interpretation than I have placed on the minister's argument. However, that is not my main point.

I will refer later as to why we should be on guard about this type of loosely worded clause which affects Canada as a nation because this bill is called an act respecting the official languages of Canada.

I am glad to see the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) here. I was amazed to hear his reasoning. However, I will deal with that later.

Having dismissed the minister's argument as straw, I will now come to the whole purpose of this bill as it is being promulgated, proclaimed and debated in many areas of the country. The purpose of the bill is to unite the country from coast to coast. We all know, and would be naïve not to admit, that there are worries and concerns from coast to coast about the purpose and principle of the bill. My friends and colleagues from the west, including the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg), as well as members from