

cake was the aboriginal peoples at the base, and they are recognized in this Bill. Beside the aboriginal peoples were the French and the English, the two founding language peoples of the country from the European civilization. On top was the multicultural nature of Canada.

After much debate, many changes, and many constitutional fights, we did get a Constitution that reflected what I would call the modern nature of Canada. We have much to do with respect to the aboriginal peoples; we are incomplete. Aboriginal self-government is one area. Better aboriginal broadcasting is another area. Much has been done in terms of French and English educational rights. Of course, our multicultural people are on top of that as a recognition of the new part of the country. For example, in my present riding of Vancouver—Kingsway a majority of people do not speak English as their first language. As a matter of fact, 35 per cent to 40 per cent of the people are Asian Canadians. They have particular needs in the broadcasting system.

This amendment seeks to give a recognition in broadcasting policy, and put very simply, that we have to pay attention to the multicultural nature of Canada. Shortly, my colleague, the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp) will speak as the multicultural critic in much greater depth and with better knowledge than I have.

In committee we made real progress on the human rights section, Clause 3(1)(c)(iii). The Minister put forward a good amendment, and then made it even better by accepting my subamendment dealing with equal rights. I appreciate that. It has been greeted with satisfaction by many multicultural and women's groups, and others.

In addition, we greatly improved the alternative section to alleviate the fears of many that the alternative service would relieve other broadcasters from multicultural responsibilities. Sometimes the language of this broadcasting policy is so complicated that people do not understand what you are talking about. There is provision in this Bill for an alternate television service. Concern was expressed that that would be where things are stuck and ghettoized. Multiculturalism is stuck in there, some science shows, and the intellectual shows. We did not want to do that. We were very open to the notion, and I believe everyone was, of an alternate service. We did want to ensure that that was not a ghettoized service. For example, we wanted to ensure that the CBC would not forget its mandate to produce Canadian programs and programs to which Canadian women have equality and access to that reflect their interest. That is in the Bill. The same with multiculturalism.

We would like amendments to recognize the multicultural nature of Canada as a new Canadian reality to be reflected in the broadcast system, but we do not want to hive it off to one little ghettoized part of the system. That is why we wanted it included in the general part of the system. Far be it from me to speak for the Hon. Member for York East who is older and

Broadcasting Act

much more experienced than I am. He has a lot more experience in municipal politics, and he is from the huge City of Toronto which believes it has a monopoly on all knowledge. Far be it from me, a little lawyer from Vancouver, to take away from what the Hon. Member for York East would say. However, had he proposed the amendment, I think he would probably have said: "Let's recognize the multicultural and multilingual aspect of Canada".

I would like to end my speech in Chinese. During the last election campaign I would go around door to door and say: *Chi chi wy do*, that is, vote for me in Chinese. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you understood that. Now that I am running in another riding I am speaking English and French more often.

We should recognize that there is a multilingual nature to this country and that there is a multicultural nature to this country. This is not to take away from the fact that the two founding language groups of this country are French and English. I do not want it to be confused that by recognizing the multilingual heritage we take away from the basic languages. French and English have a different status in this country than the other languages or cultures. However, that does not mean that they cannot be recognized and made part of the Canadian mosaic. That is what I think the Hon. Member would have said. If he does not like what I have said, he could come back to the House and say something different.

• (1750)

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): I am sorry that the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) has not been able to stay with us and to carry on the support for his particular amendments. The amendments of the Member for York East are of interest. They reflect the ongoing concern that we have had. In both Motions Nos. 72 and 77 he is directing his concerns to the multi-ethnic character of Canada. He is talking about the need for the visible minorities and the ethnic groups to be represented on the board of directors of the CBC in the one case and in the CRTC and its establishment in the other case.

I would like to suggest that Mr. Redway reflects an ongoing concern that I and members of our committee have had—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It is the Hon. Member for York East. Now that I have told you what riding he is in, I would appreciate it if you would address him as the Hon. Member for York East. Thank you.

Mrs. Finestone: I would be happy to address him as the Hon. Member for York East and also as Mr. Redway and, I am sure, as a good Member of the House of Commons.

What I was trying to get to, with respect to the principle and the philosophy behind the thought being expressed by this Hon. Member, was the fact that we wanted the multicultural aspect of Canada to be represented in every aspect of our society. It is not, I think, in the placing of amendments of this nature on the Order Paper or in a Bill. It is in the fullness of