

*Supply—C.B.C.*

teragency committee. Such a committee will serve several useful purposes, without reducing or weakening the independence of the institutions. It will enable them to meet at regular intervals to discuss their common goals and problems, to try to improve the co-ordination of their activities, to prevent duplication and fill the gaps that may exist.

In addition, the time may have come to establish the relationship between parliament and those agencies on a more proper and continuing basis. It may have become desirable to establish a standing committee of parliament on cultural matters. All agencies responsible to parliament could be asked in succession to appear before the committee to report on their current activities and on their plans. These meetings could be most useful, I am sure, both for parliament and for the agencies themselves.

I should like now to make a rather brief progress report on each individual agency and, to begin with, broadcasting, the B.B.G. and the C.B.C. As I have said on earlier occasions, and I think it should be repeated here, there are several problems and questions involving both public and private broadcasting in Canada which must be solved and answered as soon as possible. One of the major problems is the lack of clarity and the shortcomings of the Broadcasting Act of 1958. Unfortunately the Broadcasting Act did not solve what Albert A. Shea in his book "Broadcasting the Canadian Way" called "the one basic issue... to which all others are related: what are the aims and purposes of broadcasting in Canada and how can broadcasting best be organized to achieve these objectives?"

Dr. Andrew Stewart, chairman of the board of broadcast governors, has publicly told of the board's distress at this lack of clarity in the act and the resulting confusion and conflict in its other provisions. Hence, confusion exists about the aims and roles of public and private broadcasting in Canada, about the relations between the C.B.C. and private broadcasting, about the powers of the C.B.C. and the B.B.G., and about the extension of television broadcasting.

On the question of the board's authority, for instance, certain clauses of part I of the Broadcasting Act can be interpreted to mean that the B.B.G. has complete jurisdiction over all Canadian broadcasting, but other clauses in part II can be construed to mean that the C.B.C. is independent of the B.B.G. in certain instances. By its vagueness, then, the act has set up potential conflicts between the C.B.C. and the B.B.G., both organizations apparently

[Mr. Lamontagne.]

operating from different, necessarily self-defined premises. The Grey cup issue was a notable example of this confused and difficult situation.

Similarly, Dr. Stewart—quite rightly I think—has alluded to the fuzziness of the act about the extension of television service in Canada. This, too, has caused certain disagreements because the C.B.C. apparently feels that it should decide, with the concurrence of the governor in council, what stations it can establish, while the B.B.G. is not at all certain that this is a correct interpretation of the act.

Should the C.B.C. have first call on all television station applications? Should it have its own stations across the country or should it depend partly upon affiliates? In other words, should the C.B.C. in future work towards a B.B.C. type system of station ownership, or should the C.B.C. system be different to fit a different Canadian situation? More generally, should there be statutory conditions under which television stations can be established by public or private broadcasters? These questions must have answers and the answers obviously depend upon what kind of Canadian broadcasting system is desired—single, dual or mixed.

Apart from these general questions and problems raised by the uncertainty of the Broadcasting Act, there are related subjects pertaining specifically to the C.B.C. The structural organization of the corporation is one of them. The Glassco commission made some general comments about the structural organization of the C.B.C. and if the Glassco inferences are well founded, important changes must be made in the corporation. At the moment the C.B.C. itself has a small "Glassco committee" studying the corporation's structures. Undoubtedly it would be useful to make serious appraisal of the findings of that study.

The government also feels that there should be a serious look at the whole C.B.C. financing picture, both short term and long term.

Included in a study of C.B.C. financing, of course, is the subject of advertising and its ramifications in terms of Canadian broadcasting, public and private.

Also involved in C.B.C. financing are the costs of C.B.C. consolidation projects like those contemplated for Montreal and Toronto. In turn, these consolidation projects may influence the future development of Canadian private producers and technical facilities whose general role vis-à-vis the C.B.C. merits serious study and consideration. The