

Mr. Speaker, we get them in large number everyday. It is clear that if we want to assume fully our responsibility—in spite of everything, we manage as best we can, and the public appreciates it, but it is not enough. I do not see why the member sitting in front of me has access to a research staff while I do not.

Mr. Speaker, it is a question of justice, fairness and ability to do the job. There are not two categories of members in this House and you must make sure that they receive the same treatment. There are not two categories of citizens, and there are not two categories of members. That is why I beseech you to reverse your decision, and if you refuse, you should at least have the decency to explain why.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises an interesting point. I would like to respond from my point of view and especially the view of my constituents in western Canada.

The hon. member says his party wants the same rights and privileges as other members. They have them, do they not? They have a research staff. They have people in their offices. We have three people in our office. They have three people in their office. They have their office budget like we all have. Each MP has that. They have that.

This Parliament has been very liberal—small *l*—toward the Bloc quebecois. That is what my constituents say.

• (1510)

They have places in this House. They have been asking questions. They have been allowed to get in the House after a questionable oath taking ceremony. We have been very liberal.

It is not a party. It does not have 12 people. Those are the rules. They should stop whining. The House has been very liberal to them and I find it shocking when they get up and whine, bitch and complain.

If my constituents were here in the House, they would be a lot harder on them than the rest of us. We have been very liberal toward them. They should stop whining and get to work by using their existing resources.

### *Government Orders*

**Mr. Speaker:** I am going to exercise my prerogative as Speaker and take the point that the hon. member for Shefford has made. I see other members rising, and this could go on all afternoon.

It may well be only an administrative matter, but the hon. member has argued his case with some passion and I am going to consider it carefully.

I am going to return to the House, and I hope my response will at least show that the complaint has been taken seriously, which I know the hon. member wishes me to do. I hope that my response will be consistent with fairness in the House.

This is not a place to continue a debate on oaths or other things.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### BROADCASTING ACT

#### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-40, an act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam)** moved:  
Motion No. 17

That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 39 and 40 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

“(vi) contribute to national unity, shared national consciousness and identity”,

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal)** moved:  
Motion No. 30

That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 5 by adding immediately after line 6 at page 9 the following:

“(a) establishes priorities for the system based upon the national interest;”

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, this is a very crucial amendment to the bill, perhaps to one of the most important parts of it. Let me summarize what it does.

The 1968 Broadcasting Act, the act that we are changing, says that part of the mandate of the CBC is to promote national unity.