

are subjected from the United States of America. In reconsidering his role, which he tends to see as one of fiscal manager, I want to indicate to him that we have a fiscal manager or an alleged fiscal manager in this House. We have the Minister of Finance who brought in his private sector buddies to try to tell him how to clean up his house. We need a fighter, a fighter for arts and culture in Cabinet. There are many people across Canada who are looking to the Minister to provide that leadership. Unfortunately, what we see instead are statements like the one he tabled in the House of Commons Standing Committee on Communications and Culture wherein he indicated that his number one initiative was an expenditure plan reflecting priorities, government economic priorities, departmental priorities.

Does the Minister talk about what it does for Canadians to have a publicly financed, publicly accessible nation-wide broadcasting system? He talked about investment strategy as an indicator of sound management. The Minister himself, not only today in the House but on a number of other occasions, clearly showed Canadians that he is not prepared to apply sound management principles to his own travel practices, yet he expects the Canadian arts community to bite the bullet on \$7,000, \$8,000 or \$9,000 per year. He expects the Canadian arts and culture community to apply for welfare so that its members can apply whatever abilities they have out in the cultural community. He expects the arts and culture community to stand back while Cabinet Ministers are flown from coast to coast and internationally at a cost literally of thousands and thousands of dollars. Yet that same Minister tells the arts and culture community that he will not speak for them.

Who is speaking for those people? Who is speaking for Canadians who feel that the very future of this country is at stake? Who is speaking for those Canadians who understand that it has been through a mix of private and public sector involvement that we have been able to develop national institutions of which this country can be proud? Who in Cabinet will be speaking for those people? Are we merely to follow the line we have seen expressed so ably by the Prime Minister of Canada? The Prime Minister seems prepared not only to sell out our economy but to sell out our culture because, after all, we can watch American television, we can buy American books, we can have that assault of English culture from the United States, we do not need an indigenous Canadian identity in which the Government is used as an instrument of public policy change and the Government plays the lead role in ensuring that Canadian culture not only survives but thrives.

A number of Members here from the Province of Quebec should congratulate themselves. I think they have done an incredible job against very great odds in ensuring the growth and the flourishing of the Francophone culture in Canada. That same capacity or same availability in the English Canadian community is not as apparent. I am frightened as a Canadian that if the Government persists in cutting back and in refusing to play the lead role in the development of Canadian

### Supply

an culture in an ongoing process, we will in fact become mesmerized by our neighbours to the south.

The development of massive telecommunications within the last 20 years has played a vital role in allowing Canadians from coast to coast to see and hear each other. I love to listen to *Cross Country Checkup* so that I can hear what is happening, what people are thinking in Newfoundland and what people are saying in Victoria. That program allows me an access to the hearts and minds of Canadians from coast to coast. However, that is not a role which should be played by the private sector. The private sector does not have as its responsibility, as its *raison d'être*, the development, the flourishing and the sustenance of the Canadian culture. The private sector has profit as its first motive, and more power to that sector. Profit is not a dirty word. At the same time, we cannot allow the institutions upon which the country was built and upon which it will flourish, the culture and arts of our community, to be thrown to the wind by saying that the private sector can carry it on. We need to work together. We have had a mixed economy approach and a mixed cultural approach, which I believe have been effective for all Canadians. I believe the Government should support that policy, not the policy of annihilation upon which it has embarked since September 4.

● (1720)

### [Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** Questions or comments. The Hon. the Minister of Communications (Mr. Masse).

**Mr. Masse:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First I would like to tell my colleague that, unlike most Members of the House, I admire her personality to a certain extent. She is energetic and dynamic, but I am not overly impressed by her intellectual honesty and her knowledge of history. I must point out to her that since about 1920, for nearly 50 years, her Party has been responsible for administering this country and I share the concern she has expressed today about the urgency of promoting the cultural interests of all Canadians. Today's concern stems mostly from the leadership of her Party over the last few generations, and if we now find ourselves in a difficult economic situation we owe it primarily to the economic mismanagement of the previous administration. In that context and regardless of the harm that may have been done by the Liberal Party at the economic and cultural levels, it is difficult today to make a fresh start towards more challenging cultural objectives. I can assure you that if our predecessors, the Members of her Government, had been as deeply concerned as I am about the future of Canada's cultural community, she would not have spoken as she did today.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** The Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps).