

*Radio and Television*

However, I should like to point out to hon. members that despite the despair one may feel over the reaction of the adolescent and pre-adult group, there are some significant groups and national associations in Canada that have taken a much broader and more educated view of the whole matter. I was delighted to see that the Canadian radio league has been reactivated, and was impressed by the people who are organizing and supporting it. I note that a famous Liberal is on the committee, Professor A. R. M. Lower. I think that is good. The committee also includes a man who is almost a paragon as far as the Conservative party is concerned at the present time, the great biographer of the life of Sir John A. Macdonald, Professor Creighton.

If you go over the list you find such names as Dr. E. A. Corbett of the Canadian association of adult education, Dr. Robbins, secretary treasurer of the humanities research council, Father Henri St. Denis of Ottawa. We even have the president of the Saskatchewan wheat pool and the president of the federated women's institutes of Canada, all in this reactivated league which supports the general premises of the Fowler commission and in effect supports both the amendment and the subamendment that have been introduced in this house. That is a sort of balance to the despair that comes over one when he gets what one might say is the impromptu reaction of so many of the younger people in this country.

Television is very much a mixed blessing, and I think we have to keep in mind that our national interest in it is the paramount consideration. Both the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Kootenay West, as well as others, have put it very succinctly. There are two main reasons why we have to keep a national system and why that national system can only be one that has government support. One is the United States inundation that is always threatening us, and the other is the fact that we have not in Canada the markets to support a private enterprise system right across the country; and, of course, the two factors are interrelated.

One of the key problems in connection with the future of the C.B.C. is the question of what kind of regulatory board there should be. Quite obviously the board of governors of the C.B.C. has not operated very well in one particular regard, namely controlling the private broadcasters from the point of view of the C.B.C.'s own regulation. As a matter of fact I know of a C.C.F. telecast that goes on regularly. Every time it goes on it breaks the C.B.C. regulations. Yet the C.B.C. has never bothered to police its own regulations,

and the board of governors have never sufficiently encouraged the management of the C.B.C. to go out and police the regulations.

When you have regulations that are not policed and supported, then they become ridiculous. That is one of the reasons why the C.A.R.T.B., under Mr. Allard, went off on such a wild attack, because at that very time they were running pretty freely, without any checkrein.

Therefore, following from this point, I think the central thing we need to keep in mind with respect to the regulatory board is that it should really regulate. If it does introduce regulations it should put them out in a precise booklet, and if any changes are made those changes should be put on record and the record kept up to date and not have a whole host of separate papers, so that private broadcasters will know where they stand and know that if they do not follow the regulations then they get the axe, or some form of punitive measure will be taken against them. I know of one particular radio station about which dozens of letters have gone in complaining that they break the regulations concerning the number of spot announcements in the morning and noontime periods. All they have received from the C.B.C. is a gentle tap on the wrist, saying in effect, "No, no, boys; some day you are going to get your licence suspended." I hope when the regulatory board is set up it will enforce the regulations.

One of the factors in connection with a regulatory board, as brought out by the Leader of the Opposition, is whether it should be a fairly large board and representative of a group of interests in the country or a small board. Well, I tend to feel that a smaller board would be more effective, because once you begin to try to represent interested groups across the country you get a body that has, let us say, very little unity or homogeneity in terms of following a definite course of action, and it takes a long time when that group is meeting fairly rarely to develop an integrated course of action.

On the other hand, if this regulatory board is going to be the body that has the power to hand out those plum licences in the rich market areas that board is going to be under a great deal of pressure. I hope the Minister of National Revenue will look at the experience of the F.C.C. with regard to the television licence fiasco in such places as Boston and Miami, where the pressures have been so great. We have all observed the scandal going on in the United States at the present time over the pressure put upon federal regulatory boards for favours for certain