

Canadian Policy on Broadcasting

space. Had we access to the treasury we might find it desirable to own the building; since we have not, we are willing to go along as we are. Many professional and businessmen are quite satisfied to work in office space that is reserved for them in buildings owned by others. It is not necessary for them to own the buildings in which they work. House-keeping facilities must be provided efficiently, but they do not need to be operated by the business or professional firms which use them.

● (9:50 p.m.)

The same principle surely applies to the C.B.C. All our experience in Canada indicates that housekeeping operations connected with the functioning of broadcasting stations could be provided much more efficiently and economically by private operators rather than by organizations such as the C.B.C. which rely on subsidies from the public treasury.

The Fowler report gives many examples of the inefficiency of the C.B.C. when carrying out these housekeeping operations. Referring to the proposed new C.B.C. building in Montreal, the report says at page 205:

Work measurement tests indicate that for both administrative and operational or production processes there is a need for the development and implementation of precise standards, from which one could reasonably anticipate staff savings of up to 20 per cent of the present totals in these classes of employment. C.B.C. management does not agree with this estimate. However, obstinate disbelief in the validity of work measurement techniques is an anachronism today; we must therefore assume that future growth could be modified by savings from increased efficiency in the future, and it could well be that the planned staff increase in Montreal need not be anticipated in the building program.

Speaking of the proposed new buildings both in Montreal and Toronto, the report said, at page 209:

We must emphasize that our analysis clearly confirms the need for immediate relief, both in Montreal and Toronto. We are equally sure that existing C.B.C. plans for rectifying this situation are not well founded. In our view, they take insufficient account of new and prospective developments and trends, both in programming and electronics, and are consequently too extravagant and inflexible. We are satisfied that they should be reviewed *ab initio*, and redesigned in accordance with the principles we have advanced above.

At page 263, in the same vein, the Fowler report has this to say, speaking of the changes which might come about as the result of the possible use of satellites, laser

[Mr. Wahn.]

beams and other technological improvements in communications:

For broadcasting policy, the bearings are obvious. In developing the Canadian national broadcasting system, great care must be taken not to hinder tomorrow's advance by vast investments in facilities and equipment that belong to yesterday's technology. There must be elbow room to take advantage of each scientific discovery as it becomes available for practical purposes. New and better ways of producing and transmitting broadcast programs must not be balked by costly but outdated buildings that will remain only as durable monuments to lack of foresight. We have all seen such monuments in our travels, some of them not far from home.

At page 298, speaking of C.B.C. administration, the report says:

Some 1,500 to 1,600 C.B.C. personnel have clerical and supervisory duties, with annual salaries totalling \$7,500,000. The study indicates a potential saving of \$900,000 to \$1,200,000 or 12 per cent to 16 per cent.

I believe it is a fundamental mistake to assume that these inefficiencies can be changed for long merely by bringing about a change in management. I say this although I very seldom disagree with my hon. friend from Verdun (Mr. Mackasey). The simple fact is, our experience has shown that over a long period of time housekeeping operations of this type are not carried out efficiently by any government, any public corporation or any commission which relies largely upon public subsidies.

The private operation of such facilities has built-in safeguards against operational inefficiency and waste of money, and we should take advantage of this principle. Accordingly when the bill before us goes to committee I hope the minister will be prepared to accept amendments along the lines I have suggested.

To continue to deal with the subject of efficiency, let me draw attention to the fact that the present bill contemplates the head office of the corporation remaining in Ottawa. The Fowler report clearly documented the inefficiency of keeping a large head office staff in Ottawa, remote from the two large operational centres in Toronto and Montreal, and recommended that the head office be removed to one of the operating centres, preferably Montreal.

It is surely entirely clear to all that there is no point whatever in continuing to maintain at great expense a large head office staff at the Ottawa headquarters on Bronson avenue. I suggest that the formal, statutory head office should remain in Ottawa at the office of