

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

He added this warning:

Chaos can only increase—and the only ones to gain from the situation are those who wish the destruction of democracy and the confederation.

Some time ago the then prime minister of Quebec, Hon. John Lesage, planned to make a trip to western Canada. This, I believe, was a little embarrassing to some federal politicians because there was a federal election brewing at that time and reactions to such a visit could cause difficulty in many constituencies. I took the trouble to read very fully what Hon. John Lesage in fact said whenever he was in the west. I read this carefully in the western press. I was amazed at the difference between what appeared on national television and the reports which appeared in the daily press. They were not the same reports at all. This bothered me. Actually, by press reports Mr. Lesage got an excellent reception everywhere he spoke. I should like to go back a short period in order to show that there appears to be a pattern in this regard. A feature article by J. B. Lamb appeared in the *Toronto Star* of April 3, 1964. Mr. Lamb said:

There is a very real need for some measure to be instituted which would bring the viewpoint of Canada's national broadcasting service closer to that of the people it purports to serve and represent—all kinds of programming is in effect unconsciously slanted to the left.

These are strong words coming from the *Toronto Star*. The lead article continues:

Perhaps the most eloquent testimonial to the slanting of programming by the C.B.C. was Roger Lemelin's recent admission that Quebec separatists had been able to infiltrate the C.B.C. and had "succeeded in making the term private enterprise almost a dirty word of C.B.C. transmissions." Mr. Lemelin chuckled over the success of his friends in using C.B.C., a federal instrument, as the "unwitting vehicle for separatist sentiment".

I should like to remind hon. members that the date of that article is April 3, 1964. Now coming up to date, I have a letter which I received from the head of the department of communication arts of Loyola College dated October 21 last which takes strong exception to Mr. Patrick Watson's treatment of the Quebec Liberal convention on the production of *The Way It Is* on Sunday, October 15. I suppose one might have reasonably supposed that the almost unanimous rejection by Quebec Liberals of the separatist Levesque would have been received with sympathy on a Canadian network.

How did Mr. Watson handle this most important news item? I should like to quote [Mr. Matheson.]

from the letter of Rev. Dr. John E. O'Brien. He said:

—what emerged finally was a most sympathetic treatment of Rene Levesque, a rebuke to the Quebec Liberal party for supposedly packing the convention, and the statement reiterated several times that with Levesque's departure the party in all probability had lost its dynamism.

In his letter to me he went on:

Does not freedom of speech demand that there be no censorship by exclusion? In my opinion the public has been shortchanged consistently for the past few years through the informal censorship exercised by production teams who have been writing their own ticket—and policy be damned.

And that from the reverend gentleman, who incidentally holds his Ph.D. in the field of communications.

I should like to refer to an article by Frank Howard entitled "A Very Political Press" which appeared in the *Globe* magazine in which he discusses the annual convention of the *Rassemblement pour l'Indépendance Nationale* and says that it showed clearly the extent to which Quebec's separatists influence the news media. He said:

There were at least half a dozen delegates to the R.I.N. convention in Trois-Rivières earlier this month who hold key positions in the French language media. Most of these came from Radio-Canada (the C.B.C.) but a few daily newspapers were also represented on the convention floor.

This, of course, does not take into account those who were official delegates.

It is not only the French language side but also the English language side of the C.B.C. which is involved in this. The English language network had more working representatives at the R.I.N. convention than the French network. I ask the question, what is this in aid of? Bruce West in the *Globe* of October 20, 1967, calls it the "numbers game" and shows a picture of Levesque at the mike. He says rather innocently:

I am sure that there are many who would agree with me when I say that to my unstatistical eyes and ears the C.B.C.'s emphasis upon French Canadian hopes and aspirations and demands and charges has far outweighed that devoted to the principle that Canada should remain one strong and undivided nation.

He said:

—one might be justified in asking the ridiculous question of how many times Quebec's Rene Levesque appeared on the C.B.C.'s national network as compared, say, with any politician of similar rank in Ontario?

I have taken a little trouble to work that out. I can assure you that there is absolutely