

*Motions for Papers*

is not in the public interest. Such information is not divulged to parliament”.

The mover's argument could be summed up as follows: the C.B.C. will continue to ask for money but will not give us any information. And he stressed a statement made by Mr. Alphonse Ouimet, president of the C.B.C., about the von Thadden incident:

This action does not mean that the corporation will abrogate—

I am quoting Mr. Ouimet—

—its responsibility in terms of the principle of the right of the Canadian public to information.

That statement seems at first to be inconsistent with the usual policy of the C.B.C.

In short, the hon. member is questioning the impartiality of Messrs. Saywell and Ricker.

He has pointed out with sincerity, I think, why he disagrees with them, when those gentlemen criticize the tendency to centralization, that is the centralization of our press, but why does he disagree with them, when they praise the C.B.C.? And in order to control the situation, he asks that the said papers be tabled in the house.

The member for Timiskaming supported the member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), insisting on the fact that the hon. Secretary of State should have a greater authority over the C.B.C. which would allow her to report more adequately to hon. members or to parliament.

Also, the member for Oxford felt that certain government organizations, among which the C.B.C., had avoided the control of parliament, although their funds were provided by taxpayers, that it seems nobody has any authority over them, that they are responsible to themselves only and that they are neither responsible to the public nor to the house.

Moreover, when the hon. member for Oxford concluded his speech a while ago, he drew a parallel between the means of information for reporters at large and for members of parliament.

It appears, however, that the subject matter of the present debate on the policies of the C.B.C., as concerns information given to members or to parliament, has always been within the purview of the internal policy of the corporation.

Generally speaking, every personal and confidential paper must remain so, whether it be at the level of governments, public corporations, private companies or private individuals.

If the necessary papers really exist in the records of the C.B.C., but if they are of a confidential nature, we understand that we would not have access to them.

Furthermore, since the C.B.C. is a public corporation and, therefore, under the same system, as I understand it, as any other crown agency, such as the Canadian National Railways for instance, it is appropriate that it should pattern itself, in some respects, on the behaviour of private companies in general, and especially private radio and television companies, so that unfair competition may be avoided.

Besides, complex problems might arise if, in some cases, a person who takes part in a television program—a television star, for instance, who will be paid, let us say \$1,000 for a show—realized that another who, in his opinion, is not more qualified—which can be a moot point between people of the trade—gets two or three times more money than he does.

It seems that, under existing legislation, when a question of bias within the C.B.C. or any other aspect of internal policy is involved, the minister, who is only the spokesman for the corporation in parliament, must leave any other authority to the governors of the corporation.

It has been said that, since the corporation is, for a major part, financed by the taxpayers, parliament should obtain all the necessary information to control the activities of the corporation.

In fact, this national radio and television service is financed by parliamentary appropriation and by business revenues. For instance, for the year ended March 31, 1965, business revenues accounted for about 27.5 per cent of the corporation's income, while the appropriation voted by parliament in 1964-1965 for our national broadcasting service amounted to about \$85,900,000.

Therefore, this means that hon. members have every reason to make sure that the public, in short the taxpayers, are fully protected.

The administration of radio and television seems a very complex question, at least as far as I am concerned.

Ever since I came to this house, I have found that the standing committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts, was most active. On the other hand, a white paper on broadcasting was brought out by the hon. Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh) as regards the passing of new legislation I believe, and