

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

A statement from the standing committee's unanimous report, already quoted by the minister, reads:

A distinctly Canadian broadcasting system is essential to our national identity, unity and vitality in our second century.

My first point, Mr. Speaker, I admit is a delicate one, and perhaps more so at this particular time. I hope all members will approach it in the same rational, realistic and patriotic spirit that I have. My point is illustrated in clause 40 of the bill, although many hundreds of other examples could be given to illustrate the same point. Clause 40 reads:

(1) Except as provided in subsection (3) of section 38, the corporation is, for all purposes of this act, an agent of Her Majesty, and its powers under this act may be exercised only as an agent of Her Majesty.

(2) The corporation may, on behalf of Her Majesty, enter into contracts in the name of Her Majesty or in the name of the corporation.

(3) Property acquired by the corporation is the property of Her Majesty and title thereto may be vested in the name of Her Majesty or in the name of the corporation.

(4) Actions, suits or other legal proceedings in respect of any right or obligation acquired or incurred by the corporation on behalf of Her Majesty, whether in its name or in the name of Her Majesty, may, subject to subsection (3) of section 42, be brought or taken by or against the corporation in the name of the corporation in any court that would have jurisdiction if the corporation were not an agent of Her Majesty.

The words "Her Majesty" are repeated nine times in 18 lines. Not once do the words "Canada" or "parliament" or "government" or "Canadian people" appear in this clause dealing with agencies; yet this is a bill which has the avowed intention of promoting Canadian identity, Canadian unity, Canadian content and Canadian vitality in our second century. I feel very much at ease in speaking on this matter, Mr. Speaker, because I am a monarchist. I am happy to be one because I believe it is the best system under which we can develop our particular diversity. I do not feel archaic in my belief when some of the most prosperous economies and stable democracies in the world today follow the same system. I refer to Great Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, The Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Australia and New Zealand.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I am satisfied to offer allegiance to the Queen of Canada, but I do not feel that I need to be reminded of my allegiance nine times in 18 lines in a bill, or each time I go to the movies, a hockey game or a football

game. Indeed, I need to be reminded no more than I need to be reminded at every opportunity that I am the son of Léo Régimbal and Emma Frappier, or that I adhere to the Catholic faith, or that I reside in Quebec, or that I am a French Canadian, no matter how dear each of these facts is to me or how proud I am of each of them.

In speaking about this to many of my colleagues, I was told that this was strictly a matter of form and quite acceptable as such. This would be a good occasion, to my mind, to verify whether it really is so acceptable to everyone or whether it is not a denial of identity and even a source of impatience. If it is simply a matter of form, I would like to suggest that we re-examine the form, and an appropriate place to do this would be in committee. Therefore I would hope that the minister will find this another valid reason to justify our suggestion that the bill be sent to the standing committee before second reading in order to give members an opportunity to find a better form for our second century of Canadian confederation, without our having to follow the usual procedure of amendments which must be voted for or against. I believe we have attained a sufficient degree of maturity to agree on certain changes without questioning our allegiance to the crown.

I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of my visit to the British pavilion at Expo where, after two hours of deliberate search for a picture of Her Majesty or even a reminder of royalty, there was no trace to be found except in one reproduction of a typical old British home where an elderly woman, sitting in an antique rocking chair with her pot of tea and her pet cat, is watching the coronation ceremonies on her six inch "telly". I am also reminded of that very dramatic moment during the opening ceremonies of our party's national convention when 15,000 people in Maple Leaf Gardens, in full view of four to five million Canadians, listened very respectfully to our guest artist sing "God Save our Queen" and very spontaneously, wholeheartedly and naturally joined her in singing "O Canada". This is the very point I am trying to make, sir.

Second, in seeking what Bill C-163 calls "the continuing expression of Canadian identity", I would like to speak on the question of Canadian content and the use of Canadian talent. In her opening remarks, as recorded on page 3749 of *Hansard*, first