

Supply—C.B.C.

but we may be overly pessimistic about that. There are some people who continually change their sets for newer and better ones. But I believe it is quite correct that the revenues from the excise tax are going to dwindle in the years to come. Is parliament supposed to vote money out of its revenues all the time, at a time when we would like to raise the old age pensions and family allowances, at a time when we are committed to \$200 million to start off with for a national health program? At the rate this corporation is going it will not be long before the amount is going to be tremendous. I am not in favour of the old plan of assessing the taxpayers of Canada the \$15 that was suggested by the C.B.C. to the Fowler commission. I am not in favour of this parliament subsidizing the C.B.C. to the extent it has in the past. In my opinion the only one alternative is for the C.B.C. to pay its own way or else get out of the business and let private enterprise do it.

I have gone over this report rather carefully and I cannot see too much in it that private enterprise could not have accomplished. For instance, the C.B.C. developed between 40 and 45 hours a week of program service for national distribution through C.B.C. and private stations. Of these 40 or 45 hours that were provided for the private stations, 55 per cent was produced in Canada and the other 45 per cent was piped in from the United States. In so far as the French language programs are concerned, of course, the percentage is higher because obviously the programs for French viewers have to be produced in Canada. I am not disagreeing with the idea of bringing United States programs into this country since they are obviously the programs the viewers wish to see. However, I cannot see where it is necessary to use the C.B.C. to bring these other programs in from the United States when the same thing could be handled by private enterprise.

Last year \$10,600,000 was paid out for T.V. and radio talent. As I said before, this is admirable because it gives Canadian talent and Canadian artists a chance. However, this \$10,600,000 does not include the cost of announcers, producers, program research editors, scenery, news writers, film editors, camera men or commentators. The report lists the various programs under various headings such as drama, opera, variety and so on. I am wondering whether these are all the programs the people wish to see. I am convinced a great deal of the money we are spending now should be spent in providing more top notch programs.

I find that one and one-half pages of the report are devoted to audience research.

[Mr. Reinke.]

Those one and one-half pages of audience research do not give one ounce of information about the result of that research of audiences. I do not know whether "Tabloid" has a good listening audience; I do not know whether "Scope" or "Folio" has a good listening audience; and I am wondering whether or not the people are listening to those programs that the C.B.C. is putting on, particularly in areas where they are competing with United States programs or overlapping private stations. We cannot force people to listen to programs they do not wish to hear. We cannot tell them that it is a good program to watch and that they should watch it. A little of that thinking is all right but we cannot take it too far.

Today we have this huge corporation with 5,000 employees. Last year the staff of the C.B.C. increased, according to this report, by 1,000 personnel, and this huge corporation is operating a monopoly in our largest cities. I believe that if we gave private enterprise a chance they could pay their own way and give the people a great deal of what they want at the same time. This country was built on private enterprise. Anyone who owns his own home or his own car is a private enterpriser.

Does the C.B.C. operate like private enterprise? I would say not. Let me give another example. I read in the report that 80 producers were sent to televise and comment on the boy scout jamboree held at Niagara Falls last year. Eighty producers, commentators and technicians were assigned to cover the boy scout jamboree held at Niagara Falls! The report also tells us that many months were devoted to the planning of the conference. I am not belittling to any extent the importance of that meeting but to me it sounds rather fantastic that the corporation should send that many people to cover it. The report also shows that we sent technical advisers to private stations to teach them how to operate and how to deal with the technicalities of television. Why can these private stations not send their technicians to the C.B.C.? Why should we, using the taxpayer's money, send our technicians out to the private stations?

Then, we come to the news. I am quite sure the news broadcasts have a large listening audience. I would think it is quite natural that some of the listeners might think that a state-owned news service would be rather partial to the government; but I have found, in my investigations at any rate, that the opposite is true; that the C.B.C., and possibly rightly so, are so anxious that they should not be criticized for favouring the government that they are bending over