

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

course to news broadcasts, and especially to public affairs programs.

I am concerned about this bill, as we must ensure that this powerful medium of broadcasting is placed in the hands of sound men. They must be provided with sound policy guide lines.

I note that clause 2(c) of Bill C-163 reads:

(c) all persons licensed to carry on broadcasting undertakings have a responsibility for the public effects of the programs they broadcast but the right to freedom of expression, subject only to generally applicable statutes and regulations, is unquestioned;

I also note that clause 39(1), which we shall be discussing later, reads:

The corporation is established for the purpose of providing the national broadcasting service contemplated by section 2 of this act,—

And so on. Here the bill stipulates clearly that clause 2 applies not only to all licensed broadcasters but to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as well.

Here we are dealing with a matter of accountability: Who shall be held accountable for the programs which come out of the television tube or the radio receiver? The bill is quite clear—as it needs to be, and it is vital that no one misunderstands its meaning—that persons who are licensed, and the management of the C.B.C., are to be held accountable. I raise this point because of my experiences during the past two years on the broadcasting committee as well as a result of my own researches.

Those of us on the broadcasting committee last year saw a bitter war raging within the C.B.C. between the producers of "This Hour has Seven Days" and some of their immediate superiors, and the management of the corporation. A small but determined group of producers made a bare faced attempt to destroy the corporation's top management, because top management had had the temerity to suggest that, in the face of public demand and demands made in this house to end serious breaches of good taste and the flagrant slanting of programs, a slanting which was against the best interests of the country, the program be toned down.

Not content with trying to unseat those in authority, these people at public expense instituted a telephone campaign from a hotel room opposite the C.B.C. offices in Toronto, to try to stir up protests on their behalf. One may read the details in the committee's reports. Mr. LaPierre, Mr. Watson and Mr.

Leiterman also engaged in speaking engagements and in radio and television performances to build up their campaign against their so-called tormentors in C.B.C. management. Last year, following this extraordinary performance, I wrote in *Canada Month*:

Only forty people worked on the staff of "7 Days"—8,500 are employed at C.B.C. Yet the producers and performers of this relatively small group were able to resist and test the strength of the entire C.B.C. management while attempting to force the Canadian government and parliament to act on its behalf. Their strength was multiplied dangerously through the astonishing power of T.V. and by a carefully manipulated campaign in the press and on Parliament Hill. Seldom have Canadians seen such an occurrence that so occupied the country's attention and so scarred the image of the massive C.B.C. operation.

Unfortunately, press, radio and television supported the producers at first, but management of C.B.C. was given its right to manage and Mr. Leiterman, Mr. Watson and Mr. LaPierre left for politics and other fields. I note that *Maclean's* magazine pictured Laurier LaPierre on a recent cover as Canada's first socialist prime minister. May I ask this question: Did Mr. LaPierre's left wing politics start immediately after he left the C.B.C. or were Canadians who watched his program treated to a barrage of his thinking and ideas and the special ideas that his friends had? That program was supposed to be an objective but startling look at the world today. I think you know the answer, and I shall provide some specific evidence when we deal with the clauses of the bill.

A meeting of the broadcasting committee was held on June 27, 1966. Only twice had there been a larger attendance. We passed the following paragraph 21, amended to read as follows:

The committee deplores the manner in which public opinion was injected and drawn into the Seven Days crises by the producers. To prevent such incidents from becoming public issues in the future and to contain them within the C.B.C., it is imperative that a grievance procedure be set up in all centres of production. Grievances could thus be dealt with promptly and equitably, thereby preventing the dispute from becoming a matter of public controversy.

● (5:10 p.m.)

On only two occasions in 32 previous meetings of the standing committee had there been a better attendance, and this amendment was carried. The vote indicated majority criticism of the producers.

I was most concerned that at the last and much smaller meeting of the committee prior to the presentation of the report, this paragraph was ruled out by this minority, who refused to believe there was anything wrong