

Government Orders

reform put forward by others. What did we expect? It has done nothing new since it came to power one year ago.

Fortunately, in the near future—and I will not mention dates, that would only stir things up—the people of Quebec will be asked to choose between an unlikely cultural existence as part of Canada and a cultural existence as a sovereign state. The federalists will point to venerable institutions like Radio-Canada as proof of the cultural viability of the Canadian federation.

When we know that the endangered culture in Canada is the French culture, we cannot believe that this very federal and very federalist imbalance will ensure its survival in the Canadian context. No wonder that in a 1980 survey conducted by the Fédération des jeunes Canadiens français, the reply of young French-speaking Canadians when asked in which language they listened to television, radio, video games and videocassettes was “mostly in English”. Perhaps it would not be so, had the federal government not treated them as second-rate citizens culturally.

If Quebec is to survive culturally, it must repatriate all culture-related powers and monies. I should point out in that regard that all the governments in Quebec have been asking for just that for 30 years and that for the past 30 years, this has been denied to everyone of them by the federal government.

Basically, at the next referendum, Quebec will have a choice between two alternatives: cultural death within the Canadian federation and development as a French speaking sovereign state in North America.

That is why I would like to introduce a motion at this time. Seconded by the hon. member for Québec, I move:

That the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word “That” and substituting the following: “Bill C-53, An Act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other Acts, be not now read a second time but that the Order be discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject-matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.”

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I will take your proposal under advisement and advise you in a moment as to its admissibility. I would suggest that you continue with your remarks in the meantime.

• (1300)

Mrs. Tremblay: Madam Speaker, the main thing about our motion to defer second reading, to not read this bill a second time but to refer it instead to the committee, is that it is absolutely essential in our view that all the overlapping in the cultural area be reviewed and really reported on to this House. This bill, which had probably been drafted by the previous government, meets Ms. Campbell's wishes. It must be amended to avoid all sources of conflict, all overlapping, all unnecessary expenditure of Canadian taxpayers' money, and particularly to

ensure that the Quebec community can see its uniqueness reflected in this bill.

Understandably, Madam Speaker, it is impossible for a Quebecer to feel at ease as part of the Canadian Heritage.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Your motion is admissible, hon. member.

Before giving the floor to someone else, I would like to remind the House that sometimes, with motions, we forget that it is not our practice to name individual members of this House. We can refer to them by their titles or ridings but not by name. I did not rise but that was done several times and I would ask all hon. members to be more careful.

Mrs. Tremblay: When I named the Prime Minister, I was referring to him when he was a lawyer. I could not say “Prime Minister” as he was just a lawyer at the time—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I will check the “blues” but I think you are mistaken. If I am wrong, I will get back to you, but I would first like to see the blues for that part of the debate.

[English]

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

Before I begin my speech I would like to state for the record that in order for a reasonable and conscientious debate to take place, as we are hoping to do with this bill, it would be greatly appreciated rather than receiving an amendment 20 minutes before rising to speak in the House that we be given an adequate response time. This has happened continuously throughout this session of Parliament and I do object most strenuously.

The bill is intended to establish legislatively some of the changes to government that the member for Sherbrooke and his Conservatives bequeathed to us in Parliament. In reality it is nothing more than moving the tables and chairs of a bloated bureaucracy. There is no downsizing, no cost savings. It is the status quo once more, the consistent refrain of a Liberal government that has become one of review, study, consult, discuss. Quite frankly it is do nothing mumbo-jumbo.

I am going to address a number of issues today explaining why my colleagues and I will oppose the bill. Further I will address those changes that should be made to the bill which would allow my Reform colleagues and I to support it. Having just heard the Bloc amendment, in principle I can say we will support it because it will move the bill to committee for further extensive examination.

With respect to the bill itself we oppose it for a number of reasons. First, it will legislatively entrench multiculturalism spending, national enforced bilingualism and the funding of