

Estimates

L30, which means—and the hon. member for St. Paul's might shrug along with me—that we would have to vote against the operation of Malton and Dorval. Now, I may not like airports but I must admit they are fairly useful at times and that many Canadians like to use them. To vote against the operation of Malton and Dorval would be absolutely unreasonable, but that is the bind we are in.

I do not know whether there is any device whereby the Minister of Transport could say to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury), "I do not really need this money, so let it go". As a matter of fact, until the Minister of Transport said in response to one of my questions in the House today that there would be no construction at Pickering but there might be some design work going on, many of us had been under the impression that he had said in committee that there would be no planning or design as well as no construction.

Mr. Atkey: Quote some of his remarks.

Mr. Harney: The hon. member asks me to quote some of his remarks. As a matter of fact, I spent the better part of this afternoon looking through the records of the committee to see whether I could find evidence of the Minister of Transport having said that there shall be no planning or design work. If the hon. member for St. Paul's can find the passage where he said that, I would be extremely grateful. What I found is something close to that, but not quite that. There are references to other members saying that the minister had said there would be no design or planning work, but I cannot find the minister saying that. I am in the records of the committee as clearly saying, "Considering that the minister did say there would be no planning or design", and so on, and I went on to ask a question about expropriation. Unfortunately for the case I was trying to make, the minister answered with regard to the case for expropriation. But, as I say, if the hon. member for St. Paul's can help me find the passage I want in this voluminous report, I would appreciate it.

The important point is that the impression was created in the minds of hon. members that no planning or design work would be done. Certainly the people in the Pickering area would have reason to feel more secure about the sincerity of the minister and his department if this small item were removed. Since the government is running the risk of having a fair amount of egg on its face should the decision go against the Pickering airport, it could save itself this amount of yolk by not spending \$4 million on planning something that might not be built.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I regret having to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, of the votes enumerated in the motion of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), two are fairly important of which Vote No. 5 concerning Information Canada—exclusive of Queen's Printer program expenditures—which is being questioned.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows, and specially the government members, that Information Canada is nothing but a publicity agency for government affairs, for the liberal

party. Information Canada is difficult of access; yet, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) agrees to all the expenditures of that agency, and submits them to Parliament asking that we vote for those funds which are listed with those of the Department of Labour. On the other hand, when we ask him to help us finance our offices, to help us serve our voters better, he never has any money. Funds cannot be found to give us the secretaries we need, while at Information Canada people trip over each other the staff is so numerous. That reminds me somewhat of the 12,012 Hydro-Quebec employees whose shoes have steel uppers to protect them from crushing each other's toes.

● (1750)

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are being asked to vote for Information Canada, and I see that the President of the Treasury Board, who is in his seat, is taking note of that. When we ask for additional services, it is not for the fun of it, it is not to enable more people to fill their pockets, but to give our electors the best possible services.

Another item that interests me greatly is Vote 50 of the Department of the Secretary of State - Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, to the amount of \$59,999 for the president's salary. That item should be cancelled. The idea behind this motion is that the people's representatives should be allowed to have some say in how the taxpayers' money is spent. It is not meant to censure the president of the CBC, whose salary we propose should be reduced.

Mr. Speaker, this year the CBC has the audacity, the nerve and the effrontery, as usual to ask Parliament to vote it \$232,797,000. The proposal made to the committee that this amount be reduced by \$1000 was adopted by six votes to five. Mr. Speaker, the CBC—I repeat—is a separatist stronghold, as far as the French network is concerned.

That does not mean that they are all incompetent, no, but I think that the \$232 million budgeted for the CBC should be completely rejected. It would be a good idea to close up shop for at least a year, to do the house-cleaning that is needed, and start again on a solid foundation, to provide better services to the Canadian public.

I see the CBC as a means of uniting Canada, of helping Canadians to know and understand each other better. What one hears least about on the CBC are the problems which Canada is facing.

Everyday the news is broadcast in all the provinces. At night one hears about Viet Nam, Russia, Algeria, France, Africa, about Watergate or Argentina. As for news, out of a total of 20 minutes we get about 2 minutes of Canadian news.

On several occasions, following the question period, I was invited to go to Room 130-S for an interview. There I was questioned and the interview was filmed. Then it was not shown when I listened to the French news at 10:30 p.m. or to the English news at 11 p.m. When you listen to those guys you would swear there were only three political parties in this House: the government, the Progressive Conservatives and the New Democrats. The Creditists do not exist. We have not yet succeeded in making them understand that we do exist.