

arisen as a result of the manner in which the bilingual policy has been applied. It has caused great unrest, great apprehension and—this is not too strong a word—great fear in the public service.

As we all know, the problem is that for many years the public service was predominantly English speaking. The attempt, which all parties in this House supported and which I support, to create a bilingual public service, one which is more bilingual than it is at present, one which will afford greater opportunities to all people in this country, is important. But the object can be defeated if the means for accomplishing it are improper.

Very briefly, it is my hope that as a result of the discussions which have taken place, and the serious study which has been given to this matter, the government will review the policy and its application with a view to avoiding the difficulties which otherwise might lie ahead. First and foremost, regard must be given to the pledges given by two Prime Ministers that the operation of this policy would not prejudice the careers of public servants who entered the service before the policy was effected.

I think that we should give much greater emphasis to a person's willingness to learn the other of our official languages. We should be glad that the government has announced, as did the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury), that departments are now required to undertake pre-planning so that there will be designation well in advance of positions which are to become bilingual. We should be concerned about the operation of the language schools to be sure that people who enter these schools are given an opportunity by their departments to complete the course. I think, also, that we should be concerned about increasing the opportunity to learn the second language to all echelons and all ranges in the public service, so that those who now occupy lower positions in the service will not feel, as they do at present, that they are precluded.

My suggestion is that the operation of the bilingual policy requires to be reviewed. It is the duty of this House to take cognizance of the difficulties that have arisen and I make these suggestions in the hope that they will contribute to better administration of the policy in the future.

May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

[Translation]

Mr. Gervais: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The hon. member raising a point of order?

Mr. Gervais: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

With the consent of the House I would like to revert to the tabling of committee reports.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The hon. member for Sherbrooke is requesting the consent of the House for reverting to the tabling of committee reports, as the hon. member wishes to submit a report.

Is the House granting unanimous consent for the tabling of the hon. member's report?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Eight and ninth reports of Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs—Mr. Gervais.

[*Editor's note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It being six o'clock it is my duty to interrupt this debate pursuant to order of the House made June 16, 1971. I do now leave the Chair until 8 p.m., at which time the House will proceed to another government order.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PRAIRIE GRAIN STABILIZATION ACT

PROVISION FOR PAYMENTS TO WESTERN CANADA PRODUCERS IN YEARS WHEN RECEIPTS BELOW FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-244, respecting the stabilization of prairie grain sale proceeds and to repeal or amend certain related statutes, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand that that there have been consultations regarding the possible grouping of the numerous motions which stand under this order of business and the Chair would be prepared now to indicate the suggestions to the House. They are as follows: Motions Nos. 1 and 2 would be grouped for debate and the vote on motion No. 1 would dispose of motion No. 2. Motions Nos. 3, 4 and 5 would be grouped for the purpose of debate and the vote on motion No. 3 would dispose of motions Nos. 4 and 5. Motion No. 6 would be considered and disposed of separately. Motion Nos. 7 and 10 would be grouped for debate and the vote on motion No. 7 would dispose of motion No. 10.

Motions Nos. 8 and 9 are identical. It is suggested, therefore, that they be grouped for debate and the vote on motion No. 8 would dispose of motion No. 9. Motions Nos. 11 and 12 might be grouped for debate and the vote on motion No. 11 would dispose of motion No. 12. It is suggested that motion No. 13 be considered and disposed of separately.

So far as motion No. 14 is concerned, the Chair has serious doubt as to its acceptability from a procedural standpoint, although when it is reached the Chair will be