

Canadian Policy on Broadcasting

cabinet and the minister had to use as a basis to alter the structures of the C.B.C. and set up those of the commission created by this bill:

1. The public should be offered a wide and varied choice of programs.

2. All programming should be of high quality.

Here, as a digression, I ask the C.B.C. officials to keep an eye on their programs, particularly on those directed to the young. Most of them have children and know that until eight o'clock at night children watch television. Therefore why show before eight o'clock at night films which aim only at warping the conscience and the morals of our young people?

● (8:40 p.m.)

And as the head of a family, I must object to certain programs broadcast by the C.B.C. between six and eight o'clock at a time when children watch the C.B.C. programs before going to bed. In several cases, I say that the C.B.C. has presented programs whose purpose is to pervert the conscience and the morals of the listeners whereas the C.B.C. should be an instrument of culture, information, an instrument which would raise the morals of our youth. That is why I claim that as far as programming is concerned, the C.B.C. should be more careful in showing films between six o'clock—

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): If Duplessis was here—

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): Does the minister wish to put a question?

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): If Duplessis was still alive he would talk of the poets.

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, if it is desired to go into this area I am quite ready to discuss it. Ten years, I think, have gone by since Hon. Mr. Duplessis passed on and he still haunts the conscience of our friends opposite. It shows that he was a strong man in Quebec.

Thirdly, the third basic principle is the following:

Broadcasting has national responsibilities and must awaken Canadians to Canadian realities.

Here evidently, I think that it deals with what I said earlier. I think that the C.B.C. programming must in the first place take into account the ideology, the philosophy of the community to be served as a whole. I do not wish to mean by that—

Mr. Duquet: Would the hon. member—

27053—250

Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix): Let me finish, you may ask your question later, because the time allowed to me is drawing to a close. I do not mean by that we should kick out the people who do not think as the majority of the people served, but an opportunity should at least be given to those who share the ideas of the majority to use the facilities of the C.B.C. to state their opinions and their views. I think that certain equalities must be maintained in the programming field, especially as far as information programs are concerned.

I would not want only separatist people within C.B.C., and if there are people who hold different views, they should have an equal opportunity to be heard on C.B.C. I think this is a question of fairness that the C.B.C. management should consider when preparing public affairs programs on political, sociological or economic issues. An effort at balance should be made, and panel guests should be not only representatives of minority opinion within our society, but also people who speak for the majority of us.

That is what I would expect from the C.B.C. management.

Now, in respect to the fourth basic principle—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time as expired.

[English]

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, having reviewed some of the comments hon. members opposite have made over the last period of years about the C.B.C., I find it difficult to believe that all of a sudden they have become great champions of the C.B.C. and its programming. I suspect somehow that it is not that they disagree with what the minister has said, but rather the way in which she has said it. I find it very difficult to comprehend how all this criticism could be valid when the minister is not responsible for the C.B.C. In the case of either the Department of Public Works or the Department of National Defence, for instance, I can understand that if the minister of either of these departments, made some critical remarks about his department we would consider such remarks to be uncalled for because that department would be under his control. That is, we would take the position that a minister should not criticize his or her department if that minister is in a position to fire the deputies or senior civil servants. In this case, however, I wonder what hon. members