

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

this by special tax incentives for sponsors of Canadian programs or by way of tax penalty if programs of non-Canadian origin are sponsored I do not know, but there is room for something along this line so as to encourage sponsors to back Canadian programs. I am sure that if the programs are good and the Canadian people watch them, advertisers will be quite ready to do this sort of thing.

I have mentioned this subject particularly because I think there is a growing cynicism among the people who comment and write about television that Canadians do not want Canadian programs. I am convinced that if we produce good programs Canadians will want to watch them. In this regard our situation is not unique. Popular United States programs such as the *Bonanza* are shown in Britain, France, Italy and Japan, and there is nothing wrong with that.

**An hon. Member:** Don't forget *The Beverly Hillbillies*.

**Mr. Prittie:** Yes. *The Beverly Hillbillies* and *Hogan's Heroes* too. Other countries produce a significant number of programs that their own people like and I am suggesting that we must do the same thing in this country.

There are one or two other points I should like to make about the bill. The minister has said that consideration is being given to a five-year budget for the C.B.C. This provision is not included in this legislation but will be brought in later. I was interested to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Fairweather) the other night, who expressed for the first time some doubts on this move, though he was quite agreeable to it when the matter was discussed in the committee. However, if hon. members do have some fear that this will remove somewhat the necessary parliamentary supervision of the broadcasting system, I would remind them that two opportunities are provided to exercise control. First of all, the Auditor General examines crown corporations and makes a report which is considered by the public accounts committee each year. He can if he wishes examine the accounts of the C.B.C. and, knowing parliamentarians, I point out that members can discuss almost any aspect of the C.B.C. under that heading.

I would also remind the house that the broadcasting committee made this recommendation concerning the C.B.C. and the regula-

tory authorities, as found on page 8 of the committee report on the white paper:

As creatures of parliament, both the B.B.C. and the C.B.C. should continue to report to parliament annually and the members of each board should be available to this committee for a review of their reports when their estimates are under consideration.

The next point is also important.

A major parliamentary inquiry into broadcasting should not be necessary more than once every five years.

So there is still ample opportunity for a parliamentary review of the work of the Canadian radio commission and of the C.B.C. each year even if the C.B.C. is granted a budget for a period of five years.

• (12:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Baldwin:** May I ask the hon. member a question? With regard to the Auditor General's report and the public accounts committee, I think the hon. member has raised a legitimate proposal, but does he not realize that when the public accounts committee deals with the report of the Auditor General it is always at least one year late? In other words, not until next year will the public accounts committee have the opportunity to deal with this year's C.B.C. spending habits. That applies to any other crown corporation, for that matter. On that basis, the opportunities of the public accounts committee are strictly limited. They will continue to be limited unless arrangements can be made or legislation enacted under which the expenditures of the current year also may be examined.

**Mr. Prittie:** I will not argue with the hon. member on that point. He knows more than I do about the operation of the public accounts committee. What he says is true. We have just finished examining the spending estimates for the current fiscal year and it is more than half over. I suggest that if the annual reports of the Canadian radio commission and the C.B.C. were referred immediately to the standing committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts when they are tabled in the house, hon. members would be given an earlier opportunity to question the directors of these two bodies.

In the last little while the C.B.C. has come in for a good deal of criticism from a number of sources. We hear charges of mismanagement and bureaucracy. These may or may not be true. I am not a management analyst and I do not know whether they are. But I