

Government Orders

volunteer activities on which a lot of these organizations are based.

Our organization in Prince Albert was cut from \$32,000 to \$26,000, a very significant cut. The citizens' instruction and language training program was cut completely. It taught English as a second language on a part-time basis which made it accessible to mothers, people in the labour force and so on. It was a very valuable program. This year \$4.1 million was cut from the heritage languages program. Although we now have a heritage languages institute being proposed and a race relations foundation, we see a consolidation of what might be termed bureaucratic institutions, empires if you will, centralized institutions in any event, and a significant cut in activities that give meaning to multiculturalism at the local level. In Ottawa, and perhaps in Edmonton and one or two other locations, we see an increase in activity but in thousands of other communities we see a cut.

When the opposition made constructive proposals in committee, those proposals were ignored. The people who came to the committee, the Ethnocultural Council and so on, to try to give more meaning to this whole exercise were ignored.

This leads me to ask some fundamental questions about where the election promises and the rhetoric are going. Is this government in fact serious about multiculturalism or not?

I believe that this represents a definite lack of vision when it comes to four basic points. One is the demographic challenge that we face in this country. We need more immigrants, as we have been told by many experts, to maintain our economic well-being, our standard of living and so on. Our population is aging and we need more people. We need to participate in the global village. We need to counter racism. We need to give meaning to the constitutional make-up of the country.

Instead, we get a very shrivelled and inadequate version of what people originally expected from this particular bill. Therefore, I urge the government to take seriously this amendment to give some definition to this, to give some meaning to multiculturalism in this country, and basically to put its money where its mouth is.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 251)

YEAS

Members

Althouse	Angus
Assad	Bélair
Bellemare	Berger
Bevilacqua	Black
Boudria	Brewin
Butland	Callbeck
Campbell (South West Nova)	Comuzzi
de Jong	Ferguson
Fisher	Fontana
Foster	Funk
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gardiner	Harvard
Harvey (Edmonton East)	Heap
Hunter	Jordan
Kaplan	Karpoff
Keyes	Kristiansen
Laporte	LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	MacAulay
MacLellan	MacWilliam
Manley	Marleau
McGuire	Mills
Nault	Pagtakhan
Parker	Pickard
Proud	Riis
Robichaud	Simmons
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)	Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Speller	Stupich
Taylor	Vanclief
Walker	Whittaker—58