

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Speaker, in closing—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am afraid the hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Stanbury: Mr. Speaker, I am willing to yield some of my time to the hon. member, for him to express his complaints and interest, if there is unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Unfortunately that is not in order in these proceedings. I think it would set a dangerous precedent.

Mr. Robert Stanbury (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am sure nothing the hon. member would say could be dangerous to this house. The hon. member, who is concerned with preserving the interests of his constituents, thinks those interests may have been threatened by what he considers a biased presentation on a public affairs program. I need not remind the hon. member that programming on the C.B.C. is completely a matter for the corporation and is in no way under the control of the government. In the past the C.B.C., by its programs, has brought to the attention of the Canadian public certain problems which are of acute interest to all Canadians. The preservation of our natural resources interests us all, as does the pollution of our atmosphere, streams, rivers and lakes.

I am informed by the corporation that an effort was made in this case to describe both sides of the question in the program referred to by the hon. member. I understand it was explained that the logging operations were conducted at a reasonable distance from the highway crossing Algonquin Park. That precautions were taken not to damage or divert streams, and that in some cases the felling of trees was of considerable benefit to surrounding trees. I also understand that the producers of the program did not intend it to be an in depth study of the question but rather they hoped to make a reasonable presentation of the problem of our diminishing forest resources.

I am aware, however, that the hon. member takes a different view of that presentation. He has expressed a contrary opinion and has made suggestions which, I can assure him, will come to the attention of the corporation and be given careful consideration.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

BROADCASTING—INQUIRY AS TO REQUEST FOR TAPES OF NEWS BROADCASTS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last as reported at page 3527 of *Hansard* I asked the following question:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Did any member of the task force on government information services, set up by the right hon. gentleman, request the Canadian Radio-Television Commission to ask Canadian radio stations to provide tapes of their news broadcasts to the commission?

The Prime Minister replied:

Not that I know of, Mr. Speaker, but I will gladly inquire.

• (10:20 p.m.)

The next day, on Friday, after setting forth the question, he said as reported at page 3592: "The answer is, no, Mr. Speaker."

Later that afternoon as the result of further information I acquired, I telephoned the Prime Minister's office to suggest that the answer be looked into. Still later, about two o'clock on Friday afternoon, I received actual confirmation as to the type of letter which was being sent to various broadcasters across Canada. From notes I took down, the first paragraph of the letter was to this effect:

The special task force on government information is undertaking a study of newscasts from a representative group of radio stations and has asked the C.R.T.C. to assist by suggesting appropriate sample stations and by contacting the stations to ask for recordings or preferably the scripts of all newscasts broadcast within a specified time period.

I have a motion on the order paper, No. 53, for the production of the letter concerned, and a number of questions wrapped up in one comprehensive question which is also on the order paper.

Today, at the earliest opportunity to answer me, since I was not here yesterday when motions were called, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) acknowledged that the request had in fact been made, and his answer will be found in today's *Hansard*.

I draw three conclusions from this. First, I think the advisors of the Prime Minister should be called into question. They should not put into the mouth of the right hon. gentleman wrong information to give to the House of Commons. I believe this has placed him in an awkward spot. I do not for a moment suggest that he intended to fall into it. He had simply been given wrong information by people in the public service. Second, it is obvious that top management of either