

Mr. Prittie: Mr. Chairman, I have a procedural question before Mr. Leboe goes ahead. The Minister said she cannot be here all of the time, and I appreciate that. But will she be here while we are discussing in its entirety, clause 2, broadcasting policy, which is rather important?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, at present I think I will not be here next Tuesday, but that is all.

The Chairman: Perhaps we could arrange next Tuesday for the Radio Act amendments to be dealt with in your absence.

• (10:00 a.m.)

Mr. Leboe: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to ask a few questions. I have some grave reservations concerning the broadcasting policy, Part I. In connection with clause (b)...

The Chairman: Mr. Leboe, are you referring to clause 2(b) of the Bill?

Mr. Leboe: Yes, clause 2(b). I was wondering whether I could make some general references to the problems that I see exist, particularly in Part I of the Bill.

The Chairman: I think, at the moment, we should try to limit ourselves to general questioning of the Minister without getting down to the specific clauses because we will be going through them one by one. Perhaps, at this point, we can extend quite a bit of latitude in that so that we can survey the whole field of problems you would like to point out to the Minister.

Mr. Leboe: I will just go over them roughly very quickly. First of all, we have in clause 2(b) the word "preserve". The word "preserve" seems to me to indicate something that is very, very stable and fixed and immovable. You are going to preserve something and, with the help of some of the press that have been interested in broadcasting, I would like to suggest that the words "safeguard and enrich" would be much more preferable in that particular part of that clause. And, further down in clause 2, subclause (c), you will note on the second line of that subsection:

all persons licensed to carry on broadcasting undertakings have a responsibility for the public effects

This seems to me to be of no value at all if we do not put some direction to it. I suggest

that after the word "public" we should have "good and the" in there which would then read: "for the public good and the effects", so as to give some direction and also that the whole matter be set in the framework of the Constitution and Parliament. As the Minister has pointed out in the statement she has just made, Parliament represents the people, and the Corporation is the Corporation of the people and, therefore, clause (b) might read as follows: "so as to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the social fabric of Canada within the political and economic framework as defined by the Constitution, an act of Parliament". This would give some direction and something to hang onto as far as the people are concerned who are going to be responsible for carrying out the work of directing not only the CBC but the broadcasting system as a whole. Further on, I would like to mention that in subclause (d) of clause 2, we have the expression:

and should provide reasonable opportunity for the expression of the conflicting views.

It seems to me that here we would be much better to say: "and should provide opportunity for reasonable expression", because we could get ourselves into a position where, with the word "reasonable", we could find ourselves in many conflicts. Actually, the individuals who are going to participate in any live broadcast are there at the invitation of the CBC or the CTV—the broadcasting system—and therefore, the individuals chosen to be on the broadcast may reflect something quite different from what the people of Canada would appreciate in many cases. We have already had this problem, so prevalent in the broadcasting system as it exists today, and it seems to me that this switch could be made quite easily. Another suggestion I would like to make here is that where it says:

and the programming provided by each broadcaster should be of high standard, using predominantly Canadian resources

after the word "standard" we might add: "and in good taste". I suppose somebody is going to say: "What do you mean by good taste?". Here is where we would then be in line with the suggestion made earlier where the political and economic framework is defined by the Constitution and acts of Parliament would come in because if there was any argument about good taste, it would finally come through to the Minister and be