To try and answer whether this legislation does anything about this, as we know, Mr. Committee was fairly unanimous that some-McCleave, never before has the goal, the purpose of the institution, been spelled out, and many of the more or less expert critics have said that this was one of the real problems. Indeed, the President of the CBC and the Chairman of the BBG have, themselves, indicated before this time that they thought it was a problem because they had to divine, as it were, Parliament's intention; they had to describe it themselves. Now the whole purpose, particularly of subsection (g), is to say what the Corporation should do. The whole purpose of this special clause 2 is to show what we want broadcasting to do in Canada. I do not know that there is anything more than that that anyone can do, but this is something we have never tried before. Since Parliament represents the people and Parliament is the boss, then I think Parliament should say in advance what it is it wants and then it is up to those who are working within the institution to see whether they are prepared to work towards the same goals. Now, if I am wrong in this—I think it is absolutely fundamental—I think I, the government, and certainly the CBC, should be set straight about it.

Mr. McCleave: Well, I do not quarrel with the Minister's letter except that I think she was too gentle. She could have summed it up in one line and said, "Dear Mr. Sylvestre, please go to hell"-and perhaps have left out the "please"!

• (4:00 p.m.)

The Chairman: Mr. Goyer?

Mr. Jamieson: If I may put a supplementary; Miss LaMarsh, could you enlighten the Committee on why the drafters of the legislation were not more specific about the mandate of the CBC?

Miss LaMarsh: Not more specific?

Mr. Jamieson: I think it is fair to say that the Committee felt that there should be a fairly clear-cut indication of what the CBC was to do. You have general comments such as attaining a high standard and you make this specific reference to national unity, but it is left there. Is there any reason for this?

Miss LaMarsh: No. We thought we were covering it. If you have some suggestions I would be very happy to hear them, Mr. Jamieson.

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Chairman, I think our thing should be put into the act to define the so-called CBC mandate more specifically. Beyond the reference to national unity there is not a great deal. However, perhaps we can deal with that when we consider the sections.

The Chairman: Mr. Goyer?

(Translation)

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Chairman, (please excuse me while I adjust my listening aid). I am among those who think that the ministers should not intervene directly in the business of Crown corporations. I am also among those who think that ministers cannot remain indifferent towards those sacred cows called Crown companies.

And I am in great sympathy with the minister who, indeed, must work under very difficult conditions without any directives from Parliament in trying to get into touch with CBC, that Crown agency which is most prone to criticism from all members of Parliament.

But in any case, I think that we are putting the cart before the horse in taking one Minister to task and discussing the relationship between ministers and Crown corporations about which they have to give an account to the House.

I think it is time we should appoint a royal commission of inquiry on this question, in order to define up to what point the Minister's prerogatives go with regard to the Crown corporation and up to what point they can intervene in giving directives and seeing to the implementation of these directives, in co-ordinating policies, and so forth.

And I think it is unfortunate that we have not before now studied this question on the whole, and have waited for the Secretary of State to attempt a definition of the fields of action in this difficult case which the CBC is.

And I would like to know if the Minister intends to intervene even further in the business of CBC and other Crown corporations which come under the Secretary of State. In the CBC, for instance, there are many films being made—almost feature length films when there is a Crown agency called the National Film Board whose main responsibility it is to make such films.

Is the Minister responsible for the co-ordination of policies of these various agencies of