

than it was in earlier years. It is even more interesting to note that if we narrow the expenditures down to what might be called the cost of running the Government of Canada, we find that the federal Government has done rather well over the years. I am referring to the figures given in the report concerning expenditures by the federal Government on goods and services. Goods and services, of course, include the salaries paid by the federal Government, and the cost of goods of various kinds. The percentage of the gross national product that the Government required in this area from 1952 to 1968, which is the last year for which we have full figures, runs from 10.4 to 6.6 per cent. This indicates, of course, that the main reason for the rise in total expenditures is demand on the federal Government for purposes other than the administration of the Government of Canada.

There are two specific matters dealt with in the report upon which I should like to make a qualifying comment. One is that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation which, as the report points out, was an agency of Government which this year was asked to appear before the committee. In its report the committee expressed concern at the mounting demands of the CBC for both capital and operating expenditures from the federal purse. I agree that that is a subject of alarm. However, it is not a matter that can be dealt with merely on the grounds that somebody does not like the C.B.C.'s programs or objects to the very high cost of the C.B.C. I have an open mind on the subject, but I believe there is necessity for a complete re-examination of the function of the C.B.C. in respect to the social and other demands for a national broadcasting service in Canada. I say that because I am in the most thorough agreement with the reasons given for the establishment of the C.B.C. when it was first constituted, but times have changed and times will change even more rapidly in the next few years.

I assume, of course, that the C.B.C. is considering and is concerned with this situation. I would say to honourable senators that all the indications are that the capital demands, and I think the operating demands of the C.B.C. on the public purse in the next five or ten years, will escalate at a rate which will make what it has done up to now seem very easy going for the taxpayers. Whether this escalation is necessary or desirable, I do not know. I do know that such comparisons we have had at times, that the CTV—the private television network—can produce a program

for such and such a cost and that it costs the C.B.C. much more is very seldom valid. Certainly it is not a valid criticism of the C.B.C. to say that the private television network offers a service to Canadians comparable to the C.B.C. without costing the taxpayer any money, because the truth of the matter is that the C.B.C. is required by statute to undertake many non-paying services which, in the main, are the reason for its very large deficit.

I shall not go into the details, because I believe that there should be a re-examination of the whole structure with the C.B.C. given an opportunity to outline these specific extra requirements which it has. It might very well wish to be rid of some of them. If it was a straight basis of competition with CTV, I am sure the C.B.C. would be glad to be rid of the requirement that it provide two complete networks, French and English. The CTV is not required to do that, because it provides service where it can make a profit. The C.B.C. does not have that choice. I would like to see the statement which is made in our report qualified by an appreciation of the fact that there are at least two sides to this very important story—and for all I know there may be three or four sides.

The other specific matter on which I would venture some qualification is the comment in paragraph 13 regarding Family Allowances. The committee gave this very careful consideration, and I would merely bring this to the attention of honourable senators as my own view, that we are now starting a very useful debate on the whole question of universality in welfare payments. I think it is a debate that is long overdue and the report indicates that. Specific reference is made in the report to Family Allowances which, of course, is only one of many charges on the public purse in this area that might come under re-examination. They would certainly come under re-examination if the whole question of universality was being looked into. From my own point of view I would not wish the impression to be left that the committee itself singled out Family Allowances as the leading case in this field, and the report makes it quite clear that this is not so. I merely draw attention to the fact that in the report the committee quotes three experts who came before us and in quite vivid terms cast doubts on the validity of continuing Family Allowances and other programs, as they are presently constituted.

There is a comment in paragraph 14 of the report of the committee regarding debt ceil-