

Government Orders

government of Quebec to maintain its own institutions and jurisdictions.

I can see that the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine did not understand a thing I said. We do not want to hear about how many millions were invested; we want to decide, by ourselves, how to spend that money.

I think I have answered the questions put by the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine.

Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, I was just saying that 40 per cent of the National Film Board's productions in Montreal are French productions. So, if I understand the opposition's logic, if Quebec were to separate tomorrow, funding would fall to 22 to 25 per cent. Quebec would be the loser in this situation and that is what the opposition does not seem to understand.

• (1550)

Where will the people on the other side get the money to organize trips and trade shows? Let us not forget that a lot of money comes from federal grants. I was just talking about the Monument national, Les Grands Ballets Canadiens, Radio-Canada and Telefilm Canada. The Canadian government has never questioned the work of our artists from Quebec.

As I was saying earlier, the hon. member does not want to admit to this 40 per cent, to the fact that Quebec receives more than its share of funding for its cultural institutions. She cannot give me an example of a film like Mr. Falardeau's *Octobre*, a film about the FLQ that was funded by Telefilm Canada and by the National Film Board. I challenge you to give me an example from another country. Do you know of any film about the Corsicans or the Bretons that was funded by the government of France?

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec): I can see that the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine still has not understood the meaning of my intervention. The federal government invested in the movie *Octobre* because that is where the money is. If Quebec had had the money, then Quebec would have been asked to fund this type of production.

I am sorry, but I have to say that this bill will just aggravate the problems related to Quebec's cultural identity.

I am also aware that these funds come from the money we give the federal government to manage our country, which means that Quebec pays for these federal grants. We would like to see how we could manage our own programs. Of course, it would look bad if the federal government did not give anything to our producers and artists from Quebec. Nevertheless, it is an historic event. We could have a debate about the October Crisis here in

this House, show you the movie, show you how some Quebecers were treated and how Mr. Trudeau sent in the army. This crisis—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. This debate generates a lot of passion, which is good, but the Chair would appreciate it if hon. members showed more respect to those who express their views.

Mrs. Gagnon: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the purpose of this bill is to promote, with our own money, a single vision which melts Quebec's culture into a multiculturalism program which presents problems for Quebec and which will also present problems for English Canada.

In fact, there is no consensus regarding this multiculturalism program. We should have a debate on the objectives of such a program. We want newcomers to adopt Quebec's culture, to learn French and to respect our institutions and customs. Indeed, it is one thing to know these institutions and customs but quite another to respect them.

This is what we mean when we say that we want to manage our own programs. We want to have control over the programs and the money used to promote the distinct character of our society. We speak French and we want to promote our own culture.

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege to speak on Bill C-53, An Act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage. I believe the best way to use the time at our disposal is to review the programs and responsibilities which fall under the jurisdiction of this new department.

First, I want to point out that the Department of Canadian Heritage has actually been in existence for over a year. Since its inception, which goes back to the general government reorganization of June 1993, officials of that department have discreetly but confidently succeeded in strengthening the links between the various and excellent programs which fall under its scope. This "growth stage" has been exciting and enriching. The fact is that it is not over yet.

• (1555)

There is still a lot of interesting work and progress to accomplish before the Department of Canadian Heritage is fully recognized and plays its important role among other federal departments. Obviously, the tabling of this bill was a major step in that direction, as will its second reading.

[English]

I have just alluded to the range of programs within Canadian Heritage. I want to elaborate upon the department's composition and the scope of its activities. Before I begin let me add a caveat. Because of time constraints, my review of Canadian Heritage program areas cannot be all-inclusive. Nonetheless I am confident that the members present will find this description illuminating.