

Supply—Secretary of State

in Canada. The C.B.C. will fulfil this function when it informs the Canadian people of what goes on in Canada, on what exists in Canada, and when it stops spending millions of dollars to cover wars, murders and shameful events.

Mr. Chairman, we firmly believe that the C.B.C. can be useful. It must service Canadians and serve them with justice and objectivity, giving them the right to speak and respecting that right, so that the C.B.C. may be avluable and truly represent the Canadian people.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, we all remember that the young lady who is Secretary of State said one day that there was something rotten in the C.B.C. That statement angered certain existentialist commentators. I have the impression, just the same, that among the members of this house, that statement met with the acceptance of most of us who are trying to estimate the work performed by the C.B.C. and that, in the party itself, it was agreed that there was much room for improvement in the C.B.C.

At the time when our government was putting forward the improvements, the amendments or the new organizations which we have approved, we hoped that the C.B.C. would give to the Canadian people something more objective and lasting under the circumstances, because we had all deplored, Mr. Chairman, the kind of infiltration which we have all witnessed. I do not think that it is some kind of partisanship merely reflecting electioneering, which is usually deplored, but even then, those conditions were so obvious that we generally recognized there had been some separatism and socialism infiltration within the C.B.C. and in certain fields for reasons which may seem evident to some, less to others, and perhaps also some people who reject all the principles in which we have believed up to now.

Mr. Chairman, I see that my hon. friend, the member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), disagrees. I do not believe that he is protesting on behalf of that swarm of atheists who would like to bring into question again everything in which we believe, we the representatives of all Canadians, of all faiths or allegiances.

We have seen on the C.B.C. revolutionaries who did not even need the excuse of a more acceptable ideology to be given the right of expressing themselves on the air more often than their turn.

Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago, the leader of the Ralliement Cr ditiste (Mr. Caouette) said that the C.B.C. could respect all currents of thoughts. That was indeed the opinion of the government which established the C.B.C., of the governments which, ever since, have endeavoured to modernize the C.B.C. structures, and of parliament which has voted this year a very substantial budget to the corporation. I too believe that the C.B.C. should respect every opinion.

However, Mr. Chairman, when I watch the C.B.C. programs, I cannot help noticing that the Liberal party is being treated generously, which is only natural since it is the party in power; the same thing would probably be true of the Conservatives if they were in power. They would be treated just as generously, to be sure.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Members of the New Democratic party also appear more often than their turn, but I am not going to blame them. Perhaps, it is because they have members who are—how should I say; I am trying to find a word to which they will not take issue—who are more aggressive than the others and they happen to be on the French and English networks perhaps more often than would warrant their representation in the house. I am not going to complain about that, because every time they appear, they have something constructive to offer.

The same thing applies to members of the Ralliement Cr ditiste, but they enjoy an extraordinary advantage. Since they have no money of their own, thanks to the generosity of philanthropists or charitable people who want to save the race, they have programs on private stations to propagate their doctrine, their revalorization of the financial system.

Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting for two years and a half in this corner of the house, next to the door, on the first row. Therefore, nobody can call me a black-bencher, and I am one of those who are wondering why nobody thought of asking an independent, since we are so few. Until recently, we were four; we are now only three: one Independent Conservative, who persists in sitting next to the Conservatives, which implies that his views are rather conservative, the hon. member for Lapointe, my good friend, behind me, who is a Cr ditiste, a separatist, and an independent, because nobody else wanted him, and myself. We, independents, are of that breed of Christians who are alleged to have to accept anybody with all their failings