

accomplished with the use of the word "shall" as it was changed in the legislative committee.

Unfortunately, it might still not be quite sufficient. Therefore, Motion No. 10 is designed to go beyond that. Motion No. 10 in the name of my colleague, the Member for York West (Mr. Marchi), was accepted by the Speaker rather than my own. It is a motion which states that: "institutions shall, with a view to implementing the policy stated in Clause 3(1)." It places an even greater obligation on the Government of Canada to be sure that the policies to which Parliament is committing the Government and to which the Government itself is committed will be acted upon in the way of various specific proposals.

● (1630)

Motion No. 12 is my proposal for an explicit addition to the Bill designed to put into these obligations that the Government of Canada would accept, an obligation to act upon the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, specifically Section 27. This particular motion would commit the Government of Canada to develop policies and programs that assist ethnocultural communities to make larger contributions to the preservation and enhancement of Canada's multicultural heritage.

I would like to comment on the carrying of Motion No. 30 rather than Motion No. 32, proposed by the Hon. Member for Parkdale—High Park (Mr. Witer) and moved, by agreement, by the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Ostrom). Motion No. 30, moved by myself which was chosen over Motion No. 32, put into the preamble the language of Section 27 of the Charter in a way analogous to what was done in our consideration of the Official Languages Bill, Bill C-72, which was passed last week.

I think putting the language of the Charter into legislation is a useful exercise, so in Motion No. 12 I have endeavoured to commit the Government of Canada at the outset to acting on Section 27 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Motion No. 14 is designed to remove the word "promote" from several of the paragraphs in Clause 3(2) and insert instead the word "implement". Here again is a proposal that has come not only from the Canadian Ethnocultural Council but from the various community organizations. If the Parliament of Canada is really serious about the multicultural policy we first adopted in 1971, we should have an actual obligation on Ministers and all Departments to implement the policy and to look for ways in which the policy could be made more real.

Motion No. 17, moved by the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi), is an alternative to the proposal in Motion No. 8. I endeavoured to take up the concern of the Canadian Ethnocultural Council to recognize explicitly in the Bill the importance of the youth of our country and to ensure that our multicultural policy was carried through with explicit regard to the youth of the country and their needs. One way to do that is to make it one of the principles on which the Government would be committed to act in the first section of Clause 3,

which is where my Motion No. 8 stands. The other way to do that, of course, is to use Motion No. 17, putting it in as one of the obligations of the Government.

I would hope that recognizing the Government rejected my Motion No. 8, although it was initially on a voice vote, the House might have the will to take up Motion No. 17 and make it an obligation. It is, after all, a strong request from the young people who are active in the Canadian Ethnocultural Council to have their needs recognized. I look to the Minister and hope there might be some readiness to take up this particular proposal.

There remains then, only one other motion on which I would like to comment. Motion No. 19 was found to be out of order because it went beyond the scope of the Bill as the Government presented it. I want to note that the motion moved by the Hon. Member for York West takes up the first paragraph of my motion. I take it, then, given the ruling on Motion No. 18, that Motion No. 19 would have been found in order if it had only gone that far, although it would have been an exact duplicate. I endeavoured to go beyond annual plans to provide for review on all those activities oriented to the establishment of a commissioner of multiculturalism which, again, the Government has not taken up.

Motion No. 18 has a very useful proposal that the Departments of Government have an obligation to make plans annually in order to realize the multicultural policy of the country. In the context of my motion being ruled out of order, but Motion No. 18 being in order, I speak in support of that motion as well as in support of the motions on which I have already commented.

These are important motions to strengthen the Bill. Let me leave it at that and look to the comments of others. I trust we will have the support of the House for these motions to ensure that this historic Bill really becomes the kind of legislation it should be.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Madam Speaker, I would like to address my remarks in the time allotted to Motions Nos. 10, 15, 17 and 18. Motion No. 10 which stands in my name is an attempt to make the language and commitment somewhat more specific. We have tried to move this intent at committee and today at report stage because I believe that if there is one ill with the Bill, it is its lack of commitment in terms of very specific, clear and committed language.

With respect to Motion No. 10, what I am endeavouring to do is to tie subsection (2) under the federal institutions to the earlier stated multiculturalism policy for the federal Government. The intention of Motion No. 10 is simply to review and to try to commit the federal Departments in a very specific way to the multiculturalism policy as articulated in subsection (1). Those words tying the federal departmental role to the federal policy is not stated explicitly. Rather than keep it vague and general in terms of having federal Departments expand and enhance multiculturalism, I would like to see the