

Canadian Policy on Broadcasting

any one group seeking to promote its views and its views alone. Rather, it should be the means to provide stimulating and thought-provoking discussion.

It should be a cohesive factor in Canadian life. Earlier I quoted the aim of a national system of radio and television, and in this regard may I say that unity should be the result of a good broadcasting policy on the part of a viable C.B.C. and should not be a means to an end. The C.B.C. should not be used as an instrument to forge unity. Rather, as it helps one region of Canada to understand the others better, as it helps one racial group to understand and appreciate others, it will have done its work well and will have helped immeasurably in forging a united Canada, proud of its different origins and confident despite its diversity.

Presuming that we accept the above premises, certain other consequences become apparent. I have mentioned some of them previously. First, to achieve such lofty aims C.B.C. radio and television must reach every citizen in our country and, as I pointed out before, this is not yet a reality. Consequently the C.B.C. must have sufficient funds in order to provide the kind of service required. It is meaningless to put these words on paper and then not provide the means to give the type of service we hope to see.

The C.B.C. must also have sufficient flexibility and stability in regard to the moneys appropriated to allow meaningful, long-range planning. But it must also be responsible to the people of Canada and the parliament of Canada who provide the money with which it operates. At the same time authority must be permitted to allow good corporate management with the proviso that artistic freedom be given prominence, because only in this way can the C.B.C. mature and its influence increase. As I said before, allowing the C.B.C. to be used as an instrument of propaganda for any pressure group is to be mentioned only to be condemned.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer once more to the amendment I have placed before the house. Once again I ask hon. members on both sides to consider how we in the official opposition view this amendment. Certain allegations have been made by the minister. Counter-charges have been hurled back by the C.B.C. This unseemly situation must not be allowed to continue.

• (5:20 p.m.)

As I have said before, it is the right of every taxpayer in this country to know [Mr. Brand.]

exactly how the money provided to the C.B.C. is being spent by it. If the minister feels that her responsibility is to the management of the C.B.C. only, then I must in all honesty say that I disagree most heartily with this concept. It is the members of this house and the people of Canada who should know what is rotten in the management of the C.B.C. As parliamentarians, before we discuss the bill and before we propose amendments as the minister has invited us to do, we must know what is going on.

In the last few weeks factors have come to light which we did not have an opportunity to discuss in the committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts. In many ways this is a new kettle of fish. We must have an opportunity to hear what these charges are. The Canadian people must know what the charges are. When we have this information we would hope to be able to come up then with a bill that will provide for the Canadian nation the type of guidance and control that all of us would like to see in this vital area of broadcasting which affects every facet of Canadian life.

Mr. Speaker: Before the amendment moved by the hon. member for Saskatoon is placed before the house I should like to say I have had an opportunity to look at it from a procedural standpoint. I would certainly appreciate having the views of hon. members in respect of whether this amendment in its exact form is acceptable from the procedural standpoint.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I am glad you have raised this point because it provides a very useful opportunity, both in respect of this bill and the general practice, to deal with this matter. As Your Honour is aware, I believe there is ample precedent in the customs and practices of this house for the moving of the type of amendment by which the subject matter of a bill may be referred to a committee before second reading. I believe it is perfectly proper to move such a motion.

It is true we have changed what in the past has been the formal wording of such an amendment. At this time, however, when so much is being said about the reform of parliament I think we should be free, when we the members of the house and Your Honour see an opportunity to change the substantive practice of the house, to seek out ways and means by which we can make our motion conform to what is the intent of hon. members. I submit there should not be a continued slavish adherence to a certain type of