

mere drop in the bucket compared with the \$500 million we are spending on post-secondary education. I should like to ask the minister, parenthetically and rhetorically, what he intends to do and how he is going to use his influence to increase second language instruction in universities. It does not necessarily have to be French, but I suggest it is the mark of an educated person to be able to converse in more than one language and I think that we in North America are unique in the world in being limited in our ability to communicate in a language other than our mother tongue.

[Translation]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I am not as satisfied as the hon. minister, and I should like to make a few comments to prove it to the House.

We have often heard fine statements about the intentions of the government, and I think this is mostly what this is, since we would have to know exactly how these programs will be applied for the simple reason that we agree with the suggested assistance for the teaching of a second language. However, as concerns the teaching of the language of the minority, Quebec has had experience in this field with Bill 63, which was introduced with the best of intentions and allowed everyone to choose the teaching language he preferred. This experience was a catastrophe and all Quebecers now want to have this bill amended.

We are faced with a somewhat similar situation. Mr. Speaker, when it is a matter of teaching the language of the minority, we must distinguish between the French- and English-speaking groups. I find the reason in the first page of the minister's statement where he says that he sent a letter to his colleagues in which:

... I mentioned also the renewed determination of the French-speaking minorities outside Quebec to preserve their language and culture and I spoke of a related desire on the part of many English-speaking Canadians to establish bonds of co-operation and understanding between the two language...

**Mr. Speaker,** there is the difference. For one group, the French-speaking minority, it is a matter of survival while for the other group it is a matter of understanding. Now, considering that distinction, the special assistance granted to the English-speaking minority in Quebec is unjustified. There is in Quebec an important English-speaking minority which as a result of historic circumstances or others, is richer and has better structures than French-speaking Quebecers. Therefore, helping this linguistic minority would only serve to worsen even more an already quite disastrous situation.

**Mr. Speaker,** there is a way to solve this problem. The money would be used wisely if it helped create in the province of Quebec an education system where, at the elementary level, French only were taught in French schools. English-speaking Canadians would benefit from that. I am sure, as the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) himself indicated, that if he had had the opportunity to attend a French school at the elementary level up to Grade 7, and then move on to an English school at the secondary level, he would be a lot more fluent in the language spoken by Molière and could represent more effectively the 80 per cent of his constituents who speak French.

#### Veterans Land Act

These are facts, Mr. Speaker, and they certainly deserve being emphasized. We agree with the assistance given to the teaching of the other language, but as far as the minority in Quebec is concerned, we must discriminate, for there is no linguistic problem for the English-speaking population in Canada. There is only one such problem in Canada, and it is the one with which French-speaking Canadians are faced and which affects the French-speaking minorities in all Canadian provinces, except Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I felt it was necessary for me to make these remarks, and I hope these programs will be directed along these lines.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### AGRICULTURE

##### SUBSIDY TO BEEF PRODUCERS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

**Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43 I rise to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity arising out of the chaotic condition that prevails in the beef industry, aggravated by the government's subsidy program which has caused panic selling, the accumulation of large numbers of unsold cattle at yards, markets and feedlots, together with a serious depression of prices to the extent that the subsidy of 7 cents per pound has now been nullified. Reports today indicate that a number of major markets have suspended their operations in Alberta. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Hollands):

That the deadlines of April 13 and April 6 on A3 and A4 grades of beef, respectively, be removed and that eligibility for subsidy on these grades be extended until the market returns to orderly and profitable levels.

[Translation]

**Mr. Speaker:** The House has heard the motion of the hon. member. Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent; therefore the motion cannot be put.

[English]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On page vi of the notice paper attached to today's order paper there appears an indication of the introduction of a bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Veterans Land Act." According to the notice paper it is to be introduced by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp). Mr. Speaker, there are a number of instances of ministers intruding into portfolios other than their own, but I hope that in this case this bill can be presented to the House by the distinguished Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald).

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!