

Canadian Policy on Broadcasting

say there are other areas in the bill which leave me in a state of anxiety.

My criticisms and comments of December 21 did not express my point of view completely. For example, I am not happy about the provision which authorizes a five-year capital budget for the corporation, though I believe a period longer than one year would be valuable. I realize that the new officers would have to operate under severe restrictions if they were obliged to return year after year for approval of their capital budget, and I believe they deserve more than one year of leeway in this regard. Nevertheless I am not happy about the five year provision and it seems to me an acceptable compromise could be worked out that would be satisfactory both to the officials of the corporation and to those of us here who must try to exercise control over the affairs of the C.B.C. My feeling is that we should agree on a three year rather than a five year period.

Again, I am disturbed about the clause calling for fines up to \$100,000 should broadcasters violate certain provisions of the bill. In my opinion this is unnecessarily harsh and, by implication, discriminatory inasmuch as it implies that broadcasters in the private sector make sufficient money to enable them to withstand penalties of this kind. This, I submit, is both untrue and unfair.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that I have reached the limit of the time allotted to me. I look forward to the clause by clause examination of this measure and hope that constructive amendments will be accepted by the government. In conclusion, I wish Dr. Davidson and Mr. Picard every success in the discharge of their new responsibilities.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, last year my Christmas present to the Secretary of State who is piloting this legislation through the house was a promise not to speak in order that the bill could pass quickly. Unfortunately it did not, so my Christmas present this year will come early. I shall make a speech but I promise to make it a reasonably short one.

• (4:10 p.m.)

First, I should like to join with my hon. friend from Winnipeg South, a former broadcaster, as I am, in expressing good wishes to Dr. Davidson and Mr. Picard on their appointments to head the C.B.C. I would like to offer only one or two caveats about the danger of appointments of this kind where neither of the parties has had direct experience in the broadcasting field. It seems to me

that the problems of the C.B.C. arise primarily in Toronto and Montreal, the originating points for the two language networks in this country. Yet these gentlemen who are being brought in are being posted to Ottawa. Therefore they have the formidable task of not only learning about the broadcasting industry but also of dealing with problems in the C.B.C. arising 100 miles away in the one case and in the other several hundred miles away from their seat of operations. I know both gentlemen will prove in time to be excellent people in these positions. But I am concerned about whether shock treatment is not needed now to help the C.B.C. and whether the public can afford on the job training for people who have great potential but have had no direct experience in this industry.

Sir, it should be a great season for television and radio. Canadian minds will be diverted to other matters than the settling-in problems of Dr. Davidson and Mr. Picard. We should have new programs this year. One will be "The Perils of Paul," an educational, light-hearted series on the constitution and, more particularly, one man's jousting with the doctrine of cabinet solidarity. Another program I can see coming up is "The Perils of the Other Paul," subtitled the story of a man who goes through life proving that what matters is not what a fellow has in his head but what is on his head a case of dye and do. Then there could be "Mitch's Marauders," the story of a gang which takes money from rich and poor alike, leaving everybody poor. I would not like to leave out a Canadian version of "Green Acres," the story of a man trying to prove that his kind of corn can grow in the cities and, finally, "Mission Impossible," which will turn out to be the case for most of the Liberal party leadership aspirants.

With regard to the broadcasting bill I want to make three points and I shall do so briefly because later they will be the subject of amendments. I would like to indicate to the minister what some of us in the official opposition would like to see by way of change in this legislation. The first point deals with clause 2(h) which states:

(b) where any conflict arises between the objectives of the national broadcasting service and the interests of the private element of the Canadian broadcasting system, the objectives of the national broadcasting service must prevail;

My quarrel with that is that it could be a guide to the Canadian radio and television commission and to the cabinet when the issuance of licences is dealt with. If the C.B.C.