

Canadian Policy on Broadcasting

column, first paragraph, the minister had this to say:

This means that the standards to be applied by the commission cannot be measured only by broadcasting time. Both the quality and the nature of Canadian content will have to be taken into account as well, so that the best possible use can be made of the abundant resources of Canadian talent which in the present unsatisfactory situation is all too often fleeing to New York, Hollywood or London. There is also no particular reason, so far as I can see, why the provisions with respect to Canadian content should not also be applied to commercial messages. The B.B.C. so far has not exercised its statutory authority under the present act for this purpose, but I would expect that the new commission will give this close and careful attention.

This part of the minister's statement is an obvious reference to the excellent report presented to members of parliament by the Association of Canadian Television and Radio Artists entitled "A Program For Better Broadcasting."

The fears of ACTRA are reflected in a letter to me from one of my constituents, Mr. Joseph Schull, of Cité des Deux Montagnes. Mr. Schull is a member of that association and a writer well known for his evocations of the drama in Canadian life. Without quoting the ACTRA report of Mr. Schull's letter of September 25, in order not to abuse the house's time and patience may I be allowed to paraphrase or summarize their viewpoints, which most members and the Secretary of State have already had an opportunity to study, and to offer my comments.

The report deplores the fact that more and more American programs are invading our Canadian network. Mr. Schull points out that "a Canadian national consciousness is not being fostered by this material; it is being dulled and deadened". He points to a C.B.C. press release on this season's programs on the English network which showed that there were to be less Canadian programs and more from the United States. The Canadian programs included ten in the series *Hatch's Mill* which were shot last year but not released until now, ten new *Wojeck* programs and none of the series *Quentin Durgens, M.P.*, although ten are being made for release in the fall of 1968.

A full list of United States programs would take too long to recite, so I will give only some of them: *The Danny Thomas Show*, *High Chaparral*, *Everywhere A Chick-chick*, *The Mothers-in-Law*, *Dundee and the Culhane*, *He and She*, *Gentle Ben*, *Moby Dick*, *Shazzam*, *Dragnet 1967*, *Mission Impossible*, *Walt Disney Presents*, *Green Acres*,

[Mr. Régimbal.]

The Ed Sullivan Show, *Bonanza*, *Search for Tomorrow*, *The Guiding Light*, *As the World Turns*, *The Edge of Night*, *Hogan's Heroes*, *The Man from U.N.C.L.E.*, *Get Smart*, *Bugs Bunny*, *The Beverly Hillbillies*.

Both Mr. Schull and the ACTRA report point out, among other things, that American sponsors are getting a good deal in cornering great segments of our prime radio and television time, that we as Canadians could tighten up on our allocation of prime time without losing the big advertisers, and that special allotments of time and money should be made available by the C.B.C. to encourage, foster and promote Canadian talent. They suggest a sliding rule of tax deductible expenses according to the degree of Canadian content in programs and commercials, and other incentives. All of these observations are well made and deserve our close attention, and I trust that the minister will take them into account.

I believe, however—and I am sure members of ACTRA would agree—that money and time and proper concern are not the only solutions to our ills. I believe they are willing to look at this whole situation very objectively and realize the very great effort which they themselves must put forth in the fostering of their own worth-while cause and the improvement of their outlook and of their craft.

As far as money is concerned, centennial year was the occasion of more grants and allotments than ever before. But outside of the very many valuable documentaries which were produced, do we find a proportionate increase in valuable cultural production? Did we get better plays for it? What happened, for instance, to the Canada centennial play? Is money the only answer?

So far as prime broadcast time is concerned, do we have the machinery and the facilities and the bodies to fill these item slots with entertaining, artistic Canadian products? Or can we hope to compensate for United States film-making facilities with a \$10 million film development board? Will provision of a budget devoted to the development of new Canadian material be the end of our problem?

I have no doubt whatsoever that Canadian producers, actors, designers and technicians need not take second place to anyone in the world. As a matter of fact, wherever they go their talent matches the best in the world, only more so because they bring to their new