

is my understanding that the debate on Monday will commence on our message to the Senate about their behaviour in the other place.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I am rising as the communications critic for our Party. I understand that my hon. friend's Party was able to get 100 telephones installed at their campaign headquarters. Given that information, I wonder whether the House of Commons will be sitting on Tuesday?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am not sure it is a relevant question, but the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. Hawkes: I heard conversation in the lobby today about the difficulty in getting telephones for a number of people who intend to run again. It has been suggested it may take six weeks, a fair portion of an election campaign. I want to thank our Party activists who have had such foresight to make those orders such a long time ago that we are prepared for every eventuality.

• (1410)

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Assistant to the Deputy House Leader indicated that ACOA would be up, but could he give us an idea of what other legislation is on line? There is nothing under Government Orders that is obviously going to come forward.

Mr. Hawkes: I think, Mr. Speaker, that you can expect all the projected kinds of things. We do have a lot of votes at six o'clock on Monday. There seems to be a predisposition in the case of some of those Bills to move immediately after the votes, perhaps, to the third reading stage so they could go on to the Senate as well.

We have made commitments to members of the opposition Party to make sure that the ACOA discussion is still alive after Question Period on Monday, so I think that will take us very close to the votes and there will be negotiations on the Order, I think, throughout the day on Monday, if that is agreeable.

[Translation]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being two o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--MOTIONS

[English]

CULTURE

SUGGESTED REVIEW OF CULTURAL ASSISTANCE POLICIES

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy—Royal) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of undertaking a review of its cultural assistance policies with regard to the funding of semi-professional and amateur organizations that are

Cultural Assistance Policies

exemplary of Canadian culture but which are ineligible for any federal assistance program under the current criteria.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to debate this Private Member's Motion, M-171, today in the House of Commons. As you, Mr. Speaker, have just advised the House of the content and substance of the motion, I will not take the time of the House to read through it once again. As Hon. Members will note, M-171 calls upon the federal Government to reassess its cultural assistance policies dealing with semi-professional and amateur organizations.

I have been a member of this place long enough to know that doubtless there are some here who would say that the federal Government cannot afford to fund every group that comes knocking with tin cup in hand. In case there are any of those Hon. Members in the House, I would ask that they hear my arguments and decide for themselves whether Motion M-171 is worthy.

The introduction and debate of this motion is really the culmination of a long chain of events that began back in 1983. I will elaborate on this in a moment or two. Naturally, when I undertook this project and began to look into the programs and funding available to amateur groups through the federal Government, I also did some research into federal initiatives for funding for similar professional groups and amateur sports. I should say that Canada should be very proud of its commitment to both our professional artists and to our young athletes.

The year 1987 marked the thirtieth anniversary of the Canada Council which was set up by an Act of Parliament in 1957 to "foster and promote the study and enjoyment of and the production of works in the Arts". That quotation comes from the object of the Canada Council Act. This Government increased the 1987 budget for the Canada Council to \$98 million, a \$5 million increase from the previous year. The Government has indeed demonstrated by its actions a deep commitment to fostering the arts.

In 1986-87, the Canada Council administered 100 programs and some 4,000 grants. This contribution to the development of the arts in Canada is significant and the Canada Council should be applauded by every Member of the House, and indeed, every Canadian, for its undeniable contribution. It is very difficult indeed to find fault or criticize the way in which Canada treats its professional artists. Like all things, however, those who are professional today were once children or young adults aspiring to be artists, musicians, writers and so on. At some point in their careers, these artists were once amateurs who, I am sure, found it very difficult to gain recognition, let alone be taken seriously as an artist.

I mention the professional artists in arguing for support for this motion because I think it is very important to note that Canada is very supportive of the arts as a profession. However, there is a void in our support for young people who wish to participate in an art form. By way of example I will explain my motivation behind introducing Bill C-171.