

It must be wonderful to be a director of one of these Crown corporations. Clause 112(1)(c) provides that the director of a Crown corporation may issue a document for which he or she had no authority and the document is still valid and genuine. If a director were to issue a document for which he or she had no authority, it is still valid and genuine unless someone can look into that director's brain and determine whether he or she knew that it was wrong to do so. That is not evidence. Again, the Bill authorizes illegal operations.

Even worse, Clause 112(4) gives a Crown corporation blanket permission to do things it has no power to do. That action becomes valid. Clause 112(4) reads:

No action of a Crown corporation, including a transfer of property, is invalid by reason only that the corporation was without the capacity or power to so act.

What is our country coming to? Clause 116 of the Bill is equally ridiculous. This clause does not give the power to appoint or reappoint directors, chairmen or chief executive officers if they do not meet the requirements of any Act. I would think that a chief executive officer would have to meet the requirements of an Act. However, this does not apply to *ex officio* directors, chairmen or chief executive officers. They can be appointed even if they do not meet the requirements. In other words, top officials do not need to meet the qualifications set out by Parliament. I suppose the only qualification they must meet is to be cronies or members of the Liberal Party.

Clause 125(1) is another dandy clause. It reads:

(1) Every director and every officer of a Crown corporation in exercising his powers and performing his duties shall

- (a) act honestly and . . .
- (b) exercise the care, diligence—

And so on. Is that not splendid? However, Clause 125(2) indicates that a director or officer is not liable for breach of his duties under subsection (1). In other words, he can be dishonest and does not need to be diligent. He need not be accountable for his dishonesty or carelessness as long as he did not know that he was doing wrong.

I believe this Bill is a shameful piece of legislation. It needs to be overhauled completely. Any government that authorizes the things which I have pointed out should not only resign but should be kicked out and kicked out fast.

● (1130)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): There follows a ten-minute period for questions and/or comments. The Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River?

Mr. Sargeant: Selkirk-Interlake, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Benjamin: Close!

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Saskatchewan West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) made some scandalous statements in my constituency last week, I will have the House know!

I would like to ask the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) a question. In his speech he sounded as if he was advocating that the Cabinet exercise some kind of control over

Financial Administration Act

the CBC, the CFDC and the National Arts Centre. I wonder if he could tell us if this is indeed the case. Does he believe that those bodies should not enjoy complete independence from Cabinet? If he does believe that, how does that square with the statements in this House of a week and a half ago made by the former Prime Minister of this country, the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), when he was criticizing the Government, and rightly so, for not giving this new peace research institute complete independence from government?

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, what I was advocating was that there should be a Minister responsible and that the board of directors should be responsible. It should not be shoved up to the Cabinet where nobody is responsible.

Second, I certainly believe there should be no political interference, but a government that appoints a board should have some authority over that board. They do not need to censor it, but surely if it starts abusing women or children through pornography that is disgraceful and completely contrary to the thinking of the people of the country, then the government should say: "We do not want that type of thing". If the Hon. Member for the NDP thinks that type of thing should go on, he is not reflecting the thinking of the people he represents.

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Speaker, could the Hon. Member give the House examples of when any of those three bodies—in particular, the CBC, CFDC and the National Arts Centre—have abused women and children in this country? Also, could he answer my second question about how that squares with the comments of the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead about the need for complete independence of another government body?

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member does not have examples of the things that have gone on at CBC and done by the CRTC, I do not know where he has been hiding the last few years. I saw a program a few years ago called "This Hour has Seven Days" that was complete lies. It was carried out in Alberta, and it was complete lies. That type of thing should not be permitted to go on. Independence and political interference are two entirely different things. Certainly any body that is appointed by a government should be responsible to that government. Do not tell me that the Minister does not talk to the chairman of the board of the CBC. I know he does.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, as one who has humbly practised the journalism profession for some time before I came to this new profession, I am a little bit concerned about the tone of the remarks I hear from the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). I hear him saying: "If they speak the truth as I see the truth, then they are fine. But if they speak lies as I declare something that has been carried on the public networks is lies, then we have got to do something about it".

When I hear a Member of Parliament who supposedly is here to protect what is near and dear to this country, who has just witnessed in recent days the passage of a Charter of