to do it. Even though they think it is wrong or bad, they still have to do it.

Then the Bill indicates that the directors will not be held responsible in cases like that. Then who is responsible? The Cabinet, which means nobody is responsible. When there are 25 people responsible for something, what is everybody's business is nobody's business. In other words, no one is responsible.

That is not the worst of it. While the Bill gives Cabinet authority to make directives, it denies that authority when it comes to certain corporations such as the CBC. The programs can be as bad as the corporation likes, but Cabinet cannot give the CBC any directives, nor can it give the Canadian Film Development Corporation or the National Arts Centre Corporation any directives. In other words, these corporations become the government, responsible to no one. They do what they like. Even the Cabinet cannot make recommendations.

I used to think it very odd when the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox) would write to me indicating that he had no authority to give directives to the CRTC in connection with *Playboy* or pornography. The Minister of the Crown responsible for that corporation cannot give a directive. Cabinet can give a directive, but even it cannot direct the CBC, the Canadian Film Development Corporation or the National Arts Centre Corporation. Who runs it? It runs itself. It is like the government of the country. It becomes the government. Why any government would want legislation like this is beyond me.

• (1120)

Let us look at one or two examples. A few weeks ago an item was issued by the National Film Board on a great Canadian war hero, Billy Bishop. This film smeared the courage of not only Billy Bishop, but others like him. Men who gave their lives so that we can be free in this country are smeared in that film. What does the Minister say? He says he has no authority. In a letter to me, the Minister said that we pride ourselves on having freedom of speech. Freedom of speech to smear men like Billy Bishop? What a cheap and sleazy attack.

The Minister says that each agency is accountable to Parliament for its action. When does Parliament have an opportunity? After the fact, never before. We are placing into legislation that a board set up by government cannot be controlled by government. It cannot even receive a directive from the government. Read the Bill. I wonder how many Members have read it. I read it going on home on the plane at Easter. It is so bad that I felt like throwing the Bill and everyone connected with it out of the airplane. That is just one example.

Another example is the CRTC. I attended a CRTC hearing in Edmonton. The board chastised a company because it dared to show American films in the Banff-Canmore area. Those same films are shown almost everywhere else in Canada. I told the directors that every one of them had access to those films, but not the rank and file in Banff-Canmore. The CRTC threatened to cancel the licence of that company because it dared show a film it was not authorized to show.

If American films can be shown in Toronto, Montreal and Calgary, why can they not be shown to those in the rural areas? If you have a lot of money, Mr. Speaker, you can see anything. If you have an extra $2,500, you can buy a TV saucer. Where would the rank and file in this country find $2,500 to buy a saucer to put in the front yard, if indeed they have a front yard? You do not need a licence for a saucer. You can watch any program you want, American or otherwise; it is entirely up to you.

The Minister is doing nothing about this even though it is ruining some of our cable companies. Everyone who purchases a saucer is a potential customer of a cable company. The cable company has to pay taxes. It has to beg the CRTC for a licence. It must get down on its hands and knees because it dares to show a program in Banff and Canmore which the board said it could not show even though the board members watch the same films in Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa. Isn't that a fine how do you do? The Minister says there is no authority to change this situation. This is the kind of Act that is being set up in this country. I will move on even though we could spend the whole day on this one clause.

• (1125)

There is another contradiction in the Bill. Clause 104(1) provides that no Crown corporation may carry on any business or activity that is not consistent with the objects or purposes for which it was incorporated. That sounds fine. A Crown corporation should not do anything that Parliament has not given it the authority to do. However, there is an exception to this. Clause 104(2) indicates that if a Crown corporation is already doing something illegal, it may continue to do it. That makes we wonder how many of these corporations are already carrying out programs for which they have no parliamentary authorization. Some of them must be doing it or there would not be a clause in this Bill authorizing it. This clause indicates that it is all right for a Crown corporation to break the law if it had broken the law before but other Crown corporations cannot break the law in future unless another exception is later added to the Bill.

That makes me think of sin. These days, even some of the churches are supporting sins about which they used to decry. A King of England had to abdicate because he married a divorcée. Now the same church to which he belonged is authorizing divorces right and left. Divorce has suddenly become right. If enough people do it, it is fine. The Government says: "Enough corporations are breaking the law so they can keep right on doing it because they did it before but no new corporations can do it". What kind of a moral attitude is this kind of legislation building in the country?

Some Crown corporations must now be doing things not consistent with their objectives. What are these illegal activities that are being carried out? I would like to know. How many corporations are guilty? Perhaps I should ask how many of these corporations are not guilty of doing this very thing that is now being authorized by legislation. I say shame to any government that would do that.