

There is much else I should have liked to say, but since other hon. members want the floor, I shall be content with the few remarks I have just made.

[English]

Mr. Chas L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) for choosing this topic for today's debate, even though his motion is drafted in such highly partisan terms—

An hon. Member: Like the minister's speech.

Mr. Caccia:—that it does not add very much to an unbiased, lucid and objective approach to the topic of his choice. It strikes me as being significant that today's debate has taken place so far in English and French, not in Ojibway, not in Italian, not in Polish, not in Ukrainian, not in Greek, and not in Portuguese. This has a certain significance. If the hon. member had spoken in Ukrainian in making his opening remarks, if the Minister of State (Mr. Haidasz) had replied in Polish and had been followed by the next member speaking Jewish and then by me speaking Italian, perhaps we would have been achieving real multiculturalism. The fact remains that we are addressing each other in this debate today either in English or in French, and this is something that strikes me as being a fact of life in this country, a reality with which we are all coming to grips and from which we probably draw different conclusions but which nevertheless could also be a subject for a deeper analysis.

Apart from this observation, let me say that this debate raises several other questions. It raises the question of what is the role of the state in determining the cultural policy of the nation. Is it to strengthen and encourage the retention of identities along the road travelled so far which has found its definition in the term "mosaic", or is it that of strengthening and encouraging the integration of individuals in the new society which eventually leads to the so-called melting pot? Is it also to keep in mind considerations of national unity and of common denominators despite differences, this being a third alternative apart from the other two?

Another question that this debate raises in my mind is whether it is good to have a separate policy, a separation between the multicultural policy on one hand and the other cultural policies of the state. Should there be a distinction between the two, whereby you have the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) implementing a policy aimed at Francophones and Anglophones and another policy that takes care of all the others. Is this something to which we would like to address our thoughts? I would like to do that, and also to consider what the consequences are of these approaches in the long run.

Another question that comes to my mind, of course, is one that has been raised by many other speakers, namely, do we believe in hyphenated Canadianism, such as Anglophone-Italo-Canadian, or a Francophone-Greek-Canadian, or an Anglophone-Armenian-Canadian, and so forth? What is the meaning of that and what are the implications of this approach?

These are very intriguing questions, but I should not compliment myself upon the fact that I am asking these

Multiculturalism

questions. Nevertheless, they arise from the motion which is now before us. I do not have the answers, of course, but I think there is more to this subject than is revealed by the terms of the motion put to us in a highly partisan way by the hon. member for Athabasca. This is a very important and serious matter which cannot be measured in terms of the cash value of cultures. It is for this reason that when the idea of creating a council and its composition were announced by the Minister of State I thought it was a tremendous thing. I believed that a body had been launched which perhaps could provide some of the answers to these questions which cannot be resolved in the course of an afternoon's debate. For instance, some of the questions which should be put for guidance and deliberation are: Which direction is the state to take within the Canadian experience, and if there is a balance to be achieved between identity and integration, what kind of balance should it be? What is the role of the federal government, of provincial governments, and of municipal governments?

The hon. member for Athabasca raised a number of points in his remarks, some of which were purely under provincial jurisdiction, such as, for instance, the teaching of other languages in high schools. Different standards and different patterns are applied in the various provinces. Another question is: What is the role of volunteer agencies. The next one is related to the point which I just raised, namely, should multiculturalism remain a separate component of Canada's cultural policy? Another area for investigation which intrigues me very much is: What do the second, third and fourth generation Canadians expect from multiculturalism, and what does it mean to youth, to the ones who will probably be implementing some of the ideas that are being forged now? When you have individual approaches, there are all sorts of replies to such questions and some of them are so much in conflict with each other that it is rather difficult to reach a conclusion regarding what the expectations are. Obviously, the expectations of the first generation Canadian who has voluntarily become Canadian during his lifetime are quite different from the expectations of second, third or fourth generation Canadians.

● (1700)

The perception of the country and the ambitions are varied as a result of the experience of each generation. This is why I say it is rather sad when cultural programs are measured in terms of dollars and cents or, even worse, when they are compared with expenditures for implementing the Official Languages Act, as was done some weeks ago by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). That question was raised by him in this House, and comparing the two struck me as being a kind of cheap politics. Really, this is not the way we should approach these two questions.

Obviously, bilingualism is a policy that is highly supported and is received with great enthusiasm by all cultural groups in this country, because through the bilingual policy we see a vehicle to a recognition of a multicultural society. Therefore, the comparison of one with the other is a most unfair approach. Actually one program complements the other. The bilingual policy is followed by the multicultural concept. There is historic evidence for this