

Official Languages

would particularly like me to sit on this board on their behalf.

An hon. Member: Why not?

Mr. Horner: Because I am not likely to know the province as well as someone who resides in it, and I would not know the specific areas which will be affected by this legislation as well as one who resides in that province.

There is no reason whatever why the government cannot accept this amendment. If they believe in a participatory democracy, if they believe in subclauses 2 and 3 of clause 15, there is no reason why they should not accept the amendment. If clause 14 is drafted on a premise which, as the minister suggests at page 51 of the proceedings of the committee, is based on the recommendations of the B and B commission that only eight provinces will have bilingual districts, then I suggest that that premise is false because clause 13 contradicts it. I see an hon. member over there shaking his head. I would like to hear him explain why clause 13 does not contradict that premise.

I read the report of the B and B commission in that regard. The report says specifically that districts will be established on census divisions and not according to the size of school districts, municipal districts or provincial or federal ridings, and this is what this bill deals with. If the government wants to promote the idea that it is interested in bringing this legislation into being and fully recognizes the uncertain mood that exists in this country with regard to this legislation, then in all fairness to the house it has no alternative but to accept the amendment. If the government wishes to disregard the suspicions about this legislation in these areas, if it wants to ride roughshod over these feelings toward the bill, then it must bear the consequences. If the government wants to choose representatives from the five or six major provinces and one member from the maritimes and one member from western Canada to make up the proposed membership of five up to ten on the board, then I believe it will only add to the suspicions that are rampant across the country concerning this legislation.

The minister can sit there with a studied look on his face as if he did not care about what is being said in the house. This legislation is under his jurisdiction and it is his duty to pay attention to the mood of the public of Canada as a responsible official and an elected representative. If he wishes to sit

in sullen silence and disregard this amendment, then I can only conclude that he does not care. He is like Pierre, he does not care. As I have already pointed out, clause 14 is based on a false premise. Clause 15 directly involves the provinces, and there is no one in the house who can honestly say that his province does not want its own representative to sit on the board. It seems to me that the issue we are debating this afternoon is a very important one because of the unrest and the suspicions which exist in the country today concerning this legislation. The government has an opportunity to set those fears and concerns at rest by accepting this amendment.

I am pleased to see the Minister of Justice come into the house; I am sorry that I have nearly concluded my remarks and I would hate to have to repeat them for his sake.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Pelletier: Dispense.

Mr. Horner: Finally we have a comment from the studious minister. As I was saying before the Minister of Justice came in, I was disappointed with his remarks.

An hon. Member: Oh, no, not again.

Mr. Horner: I will try to be brief.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will read the hon. member's remarks in *Hansard*.

Mr. Horner: Is this bill a laughing matter across Canada?

An hon. Member: You are.

Mr. Horner: That is an interesting remark by the hon. member.

An hon. Member: Don't provoke us.

Mr. Horner: I do not worry about provoking hon. members. What I worry about is the representation that my constituents will have on the board and about the way in which the application of this bill will affect my province. I certainly do not worry about whom I may provoke.

I suggest that this amendment should be accepted. It seeks to amend a clause which is based on a false premise. As found on page 51 of the committee's proceedings the Secretary of State made the following statement:

Mr. Chairman, I might take a remark that might be useful to Mr. McQuaid when he drafts his amendment. There are only eight provinces who have bilingual districts according to the recommendations of the Bilingual and Bicultural Commission, which means that ten was deemed to be