

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

I covet for Canada excellence in communications based on the principle that our air-waves are, as this bill declares, public property. The view that there should be in the presentation of public affairs balance and completeness is, I regret, not shared by everybody. In fact there are well known personalities who express quite the opposite view. May I refer to an article which appeared in the *Toronto Star Weekly* of November 26, 1966. In that article Mr. Patrick Watson wrote:

The C.B.C. now describes its public opinion responsibility as some kind of fantastic juggling act designed to produce balance among extremes whatever their value.

He added:

A better job to undertake would surely be to destroy or confuse, or upset public opinion.

The hon. lady in her important policy speech declared:

The C.B.C. has, of course, a very special responsibility to maintain objectivity as a corollary to freedom from censorship and pre-editing of programs.

Again I refer to the views of Mr. Laurier Lapiere. In an article which appeared in the spring, 1966, issue of *Actra* he indicated that he would have the immense resources of talent and energy which the C.B.C. possesses put to the task of questioning Canadians and their leaders on his oft-repeated theme, "our endorsement of the United States role in this dreadful affair, Viet Nam", and also of providing an analysis of what he described, from his party's viewpoint, as "the bankruptcy of Canadian political leadership." He proposes that the facilities of the C.B.C. be mobilized to convert public opinion throughout the nation to the views which he regards as socially desirable.

Farmer Tissington, who has been in the press gallery for a number of years and is a friend of many of us, speaking over the air in a report from Ottawa on May 27, 1966, described the trend in television programming which "has alarmed and dismayed many Canadians." He went on to say:

The C.B.C. is, after all, a publicly owned and tax supported medium and yet it has been used increasingly to espouse moral, religious, social and political beliefs which are surely almost wholly at odds with those of a great majority of Canadians.

The minister declared in her speech:

But this privilege of free speech carries with it a heavy responsibility and must be exercised with due regard to the public interest.

Let us not overlook the importance of prime time and what can be done with prime

time in nation to nation broadcasting. There have been, we know, in different western countries persistent attempts to subvert our society. Let us never forget that Guy Burgess, a committed spy who delivered his country's most intimate secrets to Russia while serving in the foreign office and later as assistant private secretary to the foreign secretary, Mr. Hector McNeil, started out his career with three years' service in the B.B.C. The program feature he handled was called *This Week In Westminster*. It was the inspiration for a later British program called *That Was The Week That Was*.

Our C.B.C. Seven Days format was largely a follow-up of *That Was The Week That Was*. I have wondered, and I have heard this question asked in England, whether Burgess did more damage to his country by acting as an espionage agent or as a broadcaster. *Time and Tide* of October 3, 1963, called this program sinister. This article says:

It is now sinister. To turn Catholics against the Jews is no service to the Jews or to the country. The young men let loose in "*That Was The Week That Was*" will find it easy to sow in shallow minds distrust of British institutions whether royalty, religion or morality. Does Mr. Carleton Greene realize the power he is letting irresponsibles use? If he does not, someone should tell him.

The problem continues to be serious in England. I have been interested in the development of that sad situation and read the *London Sunday Express* of September 17, 1967, in which there is very serious criticism of the television and radio programs in Britain, which appear to many people intended to undermine that country. The article states:

• (2:40 p.m.)

The fact that news bulletins and current affairs programs have a left-wing bias is hardly disputed... Day after day by omission, slant, innuendo or even a tone of voice, news is far from objectively presented.

I would commend this full-page article on the British situation to anybody who is interested. In the earlier part of my remarks I referred to what we know to be one of the major problems in Canada, the English-French problem and its television development. This is only illustrative of many other subjects in respect of which we have been subjected to quite unbalanced treatment with regard to public affairs, both domestic and international. I have been disturbed when listening to the news from Washington, which is delivered daily by Mr. James F. Minifie. Upon making detailed comparisons afterwards to ascertain the extent to which these reports harmonized with reports