

Interim Supply

corporation should be considered in light of what it is doing and the direction it is moving. The board of broadcast governors should examine this corporation very closely. In earlier years Canada required a national network system. Does Canada still require such a system? Is there a need for a government subsidized body in this field of communications? Most areas of Canada are now being served by the C.B.C., as well as by private radio and television networks, many of which are affiliated with the C.B.C. Perhaps we no longer need this crown corporation.

Mr. Chairman, most of the questions I have posed this evening should be considered and answered. One other question that has been of some concern to me relates to the 55 per cent Canadian content regulation. What does that regulation mean? Does it mean that 55 per cent of the actors must be Canadian? Does it mean that 55 per cent of the actors must be of Canadian origin? Does it mean that the film must be produced by Canadian photographers? I suggest if this regulation is carefully examined one will discover that it means the film must be produced by a crew which is at least 55 per cent Canadian, and that is all. Is compliance with this regulation going to mean that Canadians will have a greater part in the television industry? I suggest the obvious answer is, not necessarily.

Has the C.B.C. gone along with, accepted or rejected the recommendations of the Glassco commission? Not exactly. The Auditor General made some comments a year ago with regard to the financing of the C.B.C. He found it a bit odd, to say the least. I think that was the gist of his remarks when the public accounts committee was studying the financing of the C.B.C. These are questions that I think should be examined by a broadcasting committee.

The whole question of Canadianism is causing a great deal of trouble across Canada today. Is it the C.B.C.'s responsibility to project their image of Canadianism across Canada? Are they the ones who should interpret what they think Canada should be or should evolve into in the years ahead? Should they portray this image to the Canadian public, whether or not they are right in their projection or in their vision? In other words, is it their job as a corporate entity directly responsible to parliament to interpret Canadianism in the years ahead? This is what they seem to think at times.

Questions have been asked in broadcasting committees in the past with regard to whether or not certain expenditures should be made,

[Mr. Horner (Acadia).]

and from time to time we have had examples of amounts such as \$120,000 or \$150,000 being spent on various programs which, to say the least, did not receive wide approval across Canada and which did in fact cause a great deal of apprehension in many homes. Is this the kind of business in which the people of Canada want the C.B.C. to be engaged? In other words, is it the C.B.C.'s job to enter into competition with Hollywood? I do not think so. Even the socialist government of the 40's and 50's in Saskatchewan did not go to that extent. They got into many businesses but they did not try to compete with Hollywood in such a risky business as the production of acceptable films. They did not try anything as risky as that. They stuck to shoe leather, bricks, boxes and many other things that one could mention.

We find the C.B.C. now engaged in the business of the production of films in competition with Hollywood and other private enterprises. I think this whole question should be examined in the light of the future policy of this corporate structure, which is now spending over \$100 million a year, with nobody holding the pursestrings. Where is it going to end? The member of our party who spoke just before me mentioned the vast interlake area of Manitoba which is receiving no television service. Is the C.B.C. making a worth-while effort to go into those areas where there is no television reception? Is the C.B.C. making a worth-while effort so far as radio is concerned, or have they forgotten about their obligations in the field of radio? These are some of the questions that I think should be examined by a broadcasting committee. Many members have urged the setting up of a broadcasting committee during this debate and I certainly agree with that suggestion.

Some member interjected a while ago that this was a private matter. When I first became a member of the house I know that television reception in my own constituency of Acadia was practically nil. But then ambitious, enterprising, private television stations moved in, long before the C.B.C. In fact, the C.B.C. has been rather reluctant to move into the east central part of Alberta, a vast area which was not able to enjoy television reception for a number of years until the growth of private television stations.

I say this in a somewhat derogatory sense so far as the C.B.C. is concerned, because surely they must feel it is their duty to make radio and television services available across Canada for all Canadians. I know they have