

questioned in the House of Commons, if the House was sitting.

I have only one or two other things I would like to mention. I think with subclause (e) of clause 2 we are moving into the constitutional field and that it should be eliminated entirely. That is this clause:

all Canadians are entitled to broadcasting service in English and French as public funds become available

I think this is a constitutional matter and should be dealt with when the Constitution as such is revised. I think it is also redundant because in subclause (g) (iii) we have the statement that the national broadcasting service should be in English and French. We have already got this contained here and I do not think we should be getting into the constitutional aspect of our Canadian life by introducing such a clause as subclause (e). The final thing I would like to mention in connection with this particular part, then I am finished, is subclause (g) (iv):

contribute to the development of national unity

I refuse to admit that this is a situation that exists. I believe the word "harmony" would be a much better word and much more fitting. I do not think that we are ununited in Canada at all. I think that there are differences of opinion from various regions, from various ethnic groups and language groups. I think there are many things that have to be ironed out but that the word "harmony" would express much more clearly what the intent of the Bill is.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Miss LaMarsh, would you like to answer any of these comments at this time?

Miss LaMarsh: I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that it is appropriate for me to answer comments. If I am asked any questions, I will be glad to try to answer them. I am certainly making notes of all the comments that are made.

The Chairman: Is there any specific question you wanted the Minister to answer on those points?

Mr. Leboe: Not at this point, no. Thank you very much.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I just want to comment on the Minister's opening state-

ment. If I heard her correctly, I believe she said that debates in the House of Commons are distressing the country because of the condemnation of the CBC. Mr. Chairman, I think this is sheer effrontery on the part of the Minister. I do not believe that the debate caused distress in the country. It is a reflection on the manner and conduct of the members in the House who have the duty to reflect the views and the uneasiness of the people in this country as they see difficulties in the CBC and what is going on. Perhaps some members in the House cannot understand some of the difficulties there, but certainly it is obvious that throughout the country people have uneasiness and worry about this. It is the duty of members of Parliament, as custodians of the taxpayer's dollar, to bring these difficulties out in the open and to make such comment on them as they in their duty feel necessary; and to suggest that it is this duty to speak frankly about the difficulties of the government agency that is causing distress in the country, rather than the difficulties themselves, and is, I suggest, an unworthy view of what happened in the House of Commons.

● (10:10 a.m.)

I thought the Minister must have her tongue in her cheek when she said that in our discussions of this problem we must be careful not to throw the baby out with the bath water, because I certainly do not think the Minister is asking this Committee to believe that anyone, in their remarks in the House of Commons, could have approached the manner in which the Minister comported herself in her own comments on the management of the CBC.

Perhaps we can see a method to this morning. There has been a new statement by the Directors that the Minister pretends to ignore, but for her, after her own conduct, to suggest to this Committee, under the guise of giving it a lecture, that we must be careful, creates just a little suspicion about whether the Minister is really serious in appearing this morning, on her opening remarks.

Mr. Jamieson: I have a number questions for the Minister on the comments she made.

Miss LaMarsh, is my interpretation correct that this Bill essentially preserves what has traditionally been called the "single system?"

Miss LaMarsh: Yes.

Mr. Jamieson: Apart from the power that is given to the CRC, there is no indication in