

Canadian Policy on Broadcasting

Bill No. C-163.

—accordingly sets out in clear language a broadcasting policy for Canada which includes, for the first time, a mandate for the national broadcasting service operated by the C.B.C.

from. Their origin is beyond the comprehension of private members and individual members of the House of Commons. They just appear out of the everywhere.

I have in my hand an extract from "A Parliamentary Dictionary," by L. A. Abraham, formerly principal clerk of committees of the House of Commons in England, and he defines white paper by stating that—

—government publications of all kinds, presented to parliament, are known as white papers... The term is associated chiefly with such command papers (i.e. papers presented by the Queen's command to parliament) as are not of sufficient size to need a blue cover.

I also have in my hand the definition of white paper from "An Encyclopaedia of Parliament" by Norman Wilding and Philip Laundry published in 1961, as follows:

A colloquial term for a government report, statement of policy, or similar document—

• (3:40 p.m.)

I draw to your attention these two definitions of a white paper. According to these writers it is a statement of government policy, and as Mr. Laundry says, it is "a colloquial term for government report, statement of policy." If a white paper is a statement of government policy, can you imagine a committee of this house, which committee is loaded with supporters of the cabinet, bringing in any condemnatory report regarding a white paper? This white paper, which is dated 1966, was referred to the standing committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts, of which I am a member. I took part in practically all the discussions. We were asked to analyse the white paper. An interesting thing in respect of this white paper is that it starts out on page 1, paragraph one, about line 10, by speaking of Canadian radio, and says that this strong mandate did not arise from any narrow nationalism that sought to shut out the rest of the world, and so on. This is the strong mandate the C.B.C. has had in the past.

Having sat here for five years, having been interested in the radio business for a great many years and having heard the C.B.C. refer to its great, strong and powerful mandate in the past, I find it very interesting now that the Secretary of State, when introducing the bill for second reading, as reported at page 3747 of *Hansard* in the left hand column, stated:

The bill—

Well, there has been an awful lot of high class lying done up to November 1, 1967, if for the first time a mandate has been established for the C.B.C., because they have been speaking eternally of a mandate which did not exist in the past. When I make reference to the Secretary of State I should like to emphasize that I have absolutely no feelings with regard to the lady, except those of admiration and respect. She is a friend of mine and I hope will long continue to be a friend. There have been some references to some recent remarks which she made regarding the radio world. It is very, very nice that this Secretary of State has as such a great precedent for what she did, what was done by the gentleman who formerly was minister of national defence. You may remember that a certain Admiral Landymore had some discussions which were not entirely too pleasant with respect to himself and the head of his department, the then minister of national defence. The then minister of national defence and Admiral Landymore parted company over words used at that time.

I am 100 per cent behind the minister of national defence of those days, the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Hellyer) in respect of what occurred, for the simple reason that I believe in the civilian power. I believe the army, the navy and the air force are under the Minister of National Defence and are responsible to him. When I state that I support the former minister of national defence in his stand at that time, I must add that I regret very very much that he practically destroyed the value of committee work by his remark to the effect that government employed witnesses who appear before parliamentary committees must give evidence according to the line that the minister of the department has adopted, and must not express their own thoughts. With that he destroyed absolutely the value of evidence given by other employees of the government before parliamentary committees.

As the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Fairweather) will remember, the president of the C.B.C. appeared before the committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts. When he was being introduced to members of the committee I asked the chairman to ask the president of the C.B.C. if what he was about to tell us had been cleared with the