

realistic and constructive alternative which would prove much less divisive and less costly than the status quo.

I will deal briefly with the third myth, that having an official multiculturalism secretariat that gives grants and makes lofty pronouncements is not the best means of preserving our multicultural heritage in a harmonious manner. Government should get out of the multicultural business. Let me explain what I mean by the multicultural business.

The Secretary of State for Multiculturalism spent over \$3.8 billion in 1992-93. Much of this budget we would transfer to other more suitable departments and ministries. The \$2.9 billion transferred to the provinces for post-secondary education is a good example of a program that would be protected from cuts under the Reform plan. The \$500 million in student loan guarantees is another good example, as is a federal funding to fight racism and human rights protection.

However, the funding to universities, private individuals and associations promoting cultural development, totalling over \$26 million, could be eliminated. Furthermore, \$47 million in taxpayers' hard earned money could be saved by cutting funding to language-based special interest groups in all parts of the country.

If, as we have argued, the federal government is not the appropriate body for funding and running multiculturalism, then who should be responsible for preserving, conserving, encouraging and paying for our cultural heritage? That is a fair question. The Reform Party supports the principle that individuals and groups are free to preserve their cultural heritage using their own resources and we shall uphold their right to do so.

We would focus federal government activities on enhancing the citizenship of all Canadians, regardless of race, language or culture. We oppose the current concept of hyphenated Canadianism as pursued by this and previous governments.

If you reject the idea that culture can be designed or engineered by the state, then it only stands to reason that the development, preservation and promotion of our multicultural heritage should be left to individuals, private associations, or in some cases lower levels of government.

The focus of the federal government should be the prevention of discrimination on the basis of race, language or culture. How would this approach affect Quebec? I think this is the focus of what we are discussing in this House today. Reformers believe this approach to linguistic and cultural issues may hold the key to Quebecers' aspirations to feeling culturally and linguistically secure. It would allow Canadians in Quebec to promote and preserve their language and culture through their provincial

Supply

government. Therefore, the federal government should transfer its efforts at protecting and promoting language and culture to individuals and lower levels of government.

In the case of Quebec, the provincial government would likely accept the challenge. Other provinces may not choose to do so, but we believe the prerogative should lie with the provinces as to whether they want to promote language and culture within their jurisdiction.

The federal government would maintain and even revitalize its role in preventing discrimination of minorities wherever in Canada they may be. We believe the federal government should provide the glue that helps hold us all together, no matter where we are from, no matter what our cultural heritage, no matter whether we are first generation Canadians or 10th generation Canadians.

By allowing people the freedom to pursue their linguistic and cultural interests independent of federal government interference we would create a more unified country. It is far more productive to stress those things which all Canadian citizens share in common rather than to emphasize differences that threaten to tear us apart. If the government would work to bring Canadians together we would all be a lot happier.

Therefore I strongly support our motion. I believe it is a blueprint to prepare Canada for another 128 successful years as a Confederation of 10 equal provinces, perhaps more if the northern territories are brought into Confederation. It is a country in which we can all feel secure, whether our heritage is Asian or European, whether it be French ancestry, English ancestry or whether it be First Nations, the aboriginal people of Canada. That is the kind of Canada in which I want to live in the future and that is the kind of country I believe most Canadians would be quite excited about, working for and preserving.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It being 5.15 p.m., it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 81(16), to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith all questions necessary to dispose of the supply proceedings now before the House.

[English]

The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.