

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

too strenuous government control of programming. In their brief they pointed out the following:

Parliament may want certain things from programming, or the broadcasters may, or any other group, but those things will not follow unless the programming attracts audience.

This is why any policies relative to the programming field should, in the light of our experience, be extremely flexible and very broad and general.

One of the problems we have met in the past, Mr. Speaker—and I think this thought is also shared by the minister—is that the management of the C.B.C. think that everyone should listen to a program that is educational, something that is of a very high artistic standard. However, they always program the type of art that those particular people in management believe to be art. I know from my own experience that certain types of art that have been praised by the experts to me do not represent art at all.

The minister says that she is going to put certain restrictions on programming. After detailing a few incidental controls that the B.B.G. or Canadian radio commission will have on radio programming, as reported at page 3747 of *Hansard* for November 1, the minister said:

Beyond these reasonable limitations, broadcasters must be allowed the right to freedom of expression; that is to say, censorship and pre-editing of programs are not only undesirable but impractical.

Then as reported at the top of the next page the minister goes on:

None the less this privilege of free speech carries with it a heavy responsibility and must be exercised with due regard to the public interest. It will therefore be a function of the commission to observe and assess the degree of responsibility shown by each broadcaster in exercising his privilege of free expression and to take this factor into account—

That is, the commission will take this factor into account.

—when the renewal of his licence is under review.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue the present situation, which means there is no clear definition of the range and type of programming that can be produced and broadcast by a television station. It is not until after the fact that the commission decides whether or not a certain type of program is acceptable.

There have been cases when a station was closed down and its licence taken away because a member of the governing body decided that a certain program was not a

proper program to be transmitted. The complaint has been that there were no guide lines laid down governing the type of program that was required. Therefore I hope the minister will give to the broadcasters of this country some very clear indication in this respect, some guide lines along which they can work without fear of attracting the wrath of the C.R.C.

In an editorial in the *Tillsonburg News*—and again I am afraid I do not have the date—the situation of programming was summed up in this way:

We think most people buy a radio or television set for the entertainment they expect it will provide. We doubt many buy with the thought of being educated or "getting culture." What's wrong with being entertained?

There are too many vague generalizations by the committee. It sounds like they think everything the private stations do is lousy. This is nonsense. Many of the private stations do an excellent job. The committee says: "The private stations have responsibilities as holders of valuable rights from the state. They cannot merely go on providing a useful service to their local communities and letting the cash registers tick on."

According to this editorial, the committee has found it disgraceful that a broadcaster should let the cash registers tick on, that it is a sin for Canadian broadcasters to make a profit. This editorial continues:

Pray, what is the matter with providing a valuable service to the local community? Are we only to hear and do what the "state" feels we should hear and do?

The editorial ends with this sentence:

In fact it makes us darn mad that what some people think what is good for Ottawa or Montreal or Toronto is good for the whole country.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we will find it impossible to defeat this bill, but while we are considering it in committee surely to goodness we should be able to brighten up Canadian broadcasting to the point where it is acceptable to the people of Canada. We should not restrict the importation of foreign material. Our object should be to improve the calibre of Canadian broadcasting to the point where the Canadian people would be proud to listen to it and watch it. They should be proud of Canadian productions. If we do this, Mr. Speaker, and if this is the end for which we strive, then we will not have to worry about programs that are imported from other countries.

**Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, one of the first phrases used in