

National unity also means money behind infrastructure and money behind rebroadcasters. You, Mr. Speaker, come from an area and a lot of your colleagues are from areas where you need to have that kind of reinforcement of the voice across those wires so that they can reach the farthest reaches of this land. We heard from the English-speaking people of Sherbrooke where they cannot get a proper CBC voice because we need improvement of that service.

We heard in parliamentary committee of areas in this country—they are few—where they feel the loss of the Canadian voice as heard through the national broadcaster. How did that voice get there? We had a responsibility when we put CBC into place to put the kind of infrastructure that would lead to national unity so that we could build this sense of consciousness and national identity. There is something very nefarious when this government removes the national unity clause.

Recently, the Prime Minister highlighted the importance of national unity by saying: "Everything that we have accomplished as a country can be traced back to our sense of national purpose, to our national unity." If the Prime Minister believes this and says this with all this emotion and feeling, why has that not been carried through? Why has he allowed, at the table of the cabinet, the removal of national unity along with other very important aspects of this bill?

I think the lack of any ministers to sit in this House while the bill was being debated, the lack of any single, solitary person to sit behind the minister as he spoke and the lack of any voice from across this floor to support the government's bill in steering the debate of the findings after second reading in the legislative committee is indicative that either they were so busy with their GST and so busy with the Constitution that they paid absolutely no attention to the contents of this bill when it came to the cabinet for ratification, or they just do not care.

With respect to the two separate CBC standing committees, the government plan to create these two committees, one for English-language programs and the second for French-language programs, will only isolate Canadians from Canadians and create an atmosphere of two Canadas at the CBC.

### *Government Orders*

The Liberal Party believes that dividing the CBC based upon language runs counter not only to the goal of national unity, national interest, national understanding or exchange but to the interest of all Canadians in both official languages which the CBC has always served.

I will not go into the detail of budgeting and the division of the budget, but certainly the sectors on both sides have gained rather than lost in that expression of voice.

The two separate standing committees for the CBC is not a new concept. It has its roots in a recommendation of the 1965 parliamentary committee on broadcasting. However, the Liberal government in 1967 rejected that recommendation.

I would like to remind this House that the Conservative government accepted that as that bill passed unanimously through the House. The Hon. Judy LaMarsh on November 1, 1967 explained why to the House of Commons this was not an acceptable procedure.

She said: "A statutory requirement that the board should split itself up into two would, in the opinion of the government, be undesirable. If the CBC is to be an instrument for the continuing expression of Canadian identity, it must have a clear identity of its own that is neither English nor French but is Canadian."

That is what we have lost, that whole mentality that it is Canadian, the role and function of the heart and soul of this bill, the CBC.

I would like to finish my remarks with the following observations. I really am quite sad. My heart is heavy because I believe that we have missed a wonderful opportunity. A most important cultural instrument in law has been lost. It will impact on our own artists, singers, dancers, writers, actors and our actresses.

It will be a negative, long term impact on this country, and that is what is so sad. There is no vision of this country by the government at this time.

Let me reassure the minister that when I said my heart was sad, it is in due measure to what he has done with this bill: Meechified it, balkanized it and ignored the importance of Canadian programming. I find that in contradiction to many of the things which he does in other areas.