

When I first spoke on this bill, I pointed out that this department was a "grab bag" with a hodge-podge of programs, as a result of dividing up responsibilities and bringing together parts of federal departments.

I also stressed the very relative political say of the Minister of Canadian Heritage as compared to the real power of the Minister of Industry who would hold the purse strings.

I ended my remarks by denouncing the fact that the existence of Quebec's culture was completely ignored since the bill was totally silent on it. And finally, I noted the unfair treatment given by management to the French network of the CBC as compared to its English counterpart, mentioning that many regional stations had to shut down.

In this respect, in a brief submitted to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, Mrs. France Dauphin, from the coalition for the defence of the French network of the CBC, raised a number of issues. For example, investment in programs per hour of broadcast time has increased by approximately \$7,000 as far as the English network is concerned, but only marginally in the case of the French network. In just five years, from 1987 to 1992, investment rose from \$30,500 to \$37,500 at the CBC while rising from \$17,500 to \$18,300 at SRC. In other words, a mere five per cent increase for the French network, as compared to a 20 per cent increase for the English network.

I want to go back to an important aspect of this bill, namely the sharing of responsibilities. In our opinion, this legislation reflects a firm desire to make this department a tool of promotion, if not propaganda, for Canadian multiculturalism.

As for the management of this new department, I agree with the comments made by the member for Calgary Southeast to the effect that there is no management strategy or plan. However, I would say that the Liberals are "seemingly" giving the Department of Canadian Heritage very extensive powers, and in that sense we have every reason to question the rather mysterious mandate of this new department.

For example, why maintain this artificial sharing of culture and communications technology? This dichotomy was created by the Conservatives with culture and the management of the cultural industry.

The fact is that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is only left with responsibility for cultural content, while the Minister of Industry is responsible for the means of communication. In other words, he is the one who has real control.

Moreover, the Minister of Industry managed to set up a consultative committee on the electronic highway. This is another example of overlapping, duplication and lack of co-ordination within the federal administration itself. The telecommunications and cable television industries are converging on this new department of Industry and this is a source of concern

Private Members' Business

to us because it may have a bearing on the Canadian content, which falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

The fact is that real power over Canadian culture is in the hands of the Minister of Industry. Moreover, by granting the CRTC exclusive power to set the rules governing telecommunications in Canada, Ottawa downplays Quebec's interests and puts them on a par with those of the industry and consumer groups, which goes totally against Quebec's traditional claims.

Finally, let us not forget that Quebec was excluded from the broadcasting and cable television sector in 1974, and then the telephony sector in June 1993, at the expense of the CRTC which was granted extensive regulatory powers, thus confirming Ottawa's control over the whole telecommunications industry.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CITIZENSHIP ACT

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.) moved that Bill C-249, an act to amend the Citizenship Act (right to citizenship), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

She said: Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to rise in the House today to speak on behalf of my private member's Bill C-249, an act to amend the Citizenship Act concerning the right to citizenship.

The bill amends the Citizenship Act so that a child who is born in Canada after December 31, 1994 will not have Canadian citizenship if at the time of his birth neither of his parents is a citizen or a permanent resident. However such a child will be granted citizenship when one of his parents becomes a citizen or a permanent resident and an application to that effect is made by the authorized person on behalf of the child.

This matter relates to concerns from my own constituency of Port Moody—Coquitlam and was further underlined in discussion as a member of the citizenship and immigration committee. Current events and policy descriptions made me increasingly aware of the weaknesses of and the necessity for change within the immigration system in Canada. Along with many other Canadians I can no longer passively accept the choices made for us by governments whose agenda for establishing policy in this area is dictated not by the realities of our country but too often by political and special interest agendas.