

*Radio and Television*

people have to be around a sound stage at a C.B.C. station. I presume they have a job to do. The same comment applies to the technicians involved. They may have something to do with the quality of the program, but I have particular reference to where the same type of program is involved. Somehow or other the C.B.C. always seems to have rather more people about. Perhaps the technical production is superior; I do not know, but I make that observation in passing.

I feel the position of our radio and television coverage in this country is such that we should encourage competition between the national system and private interests. The hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill) suggested that we did not want to get into a situation in this regard like we have with the C.P.R. and the C.N.R., but I think the fact that there is a privately owned radio system and a publicly owned one—

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I am sure the hon. member does not want to misrepresent what I said, which was that we had not created a system such as the one with respect to the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific.

**Mr. Lambert:** I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker. I felt from the reference of the hon. member that he was suggesting that the fact that there exist two different types of competitors was something that should not be encouraged. I would like to say that I would have thought the best competition for the C.N.R. is the C.P.R. It acts as a spur to provide a better service to the public, and the same applies with respect to the C.P.R.

I believe the same might be said of this field of radio and television. Competition within the framework of technical control by a board set up to regulate the allocation of wave lengths and the general technical development of radio and television in my opinion would be beneficial. This competition, of course, would have to be confined in other aspects from the point of view of morality, et cetera, but we could then encourage private radio and television and the C.B.C. on the same footing, but not the condition which has existed for rather too long of the one group acting as judge, jury and prosecutor. It may be that the greatest discretion was used, but there was always the suspicion that because the framework permitted it there were occasions when there was some discrimination. From what I have heard from private radio and television interests, those occasions were somewhat frequent.

And now may I make a suggestion with regard to the future of radio and television—certainly television—it would be this: I have spoken on a number of occasions in this house about the value of bilingualism, but I will address myself now particularly to the

English speaking members of this house; I do not think I have to convince the French speaking members about the value of my proposal. We have today French speaking television stations and English speaking stations. In a few centres in Canada we have bilingual stations, but if I am fully conversant with the regulations, such stations can exist only where there is not already an English speaking or a French speaking station. In other words, we cannot have an English station and a bilingual station in the same area.

I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all members that if we are to develop as a nation we must encourage the learning of the other language to the fullest extent possible and take steps to see that our people, particularly our children, become bilingual. We have seen such a development taking place in many areas, in our schools and so forth, and noted that though there had been previously a great antipathy toward learning a second language, that attitude has been changing. Knowledge of a second language is certainly of great advantage in this house, and I feel that where there is a field for a second television station and where there is a demand because of the existence of a minority of the second language group, be it French or English, we should provide a bilingual station on the basis of 70-30 or 60-40 or even 50-50. I suggest that the limitation which exists today be dispensed with.

I know that here in Canada the quality of the development of our domestic actors on the French network of the C.B.C. is of a higher calibre on the whole than that which exists on the English network. Simply because there are no fill-ins they have had to get out and produce. In the same way I think we should give encouragement throughout the rest of the country and that we should give encouragement to the full development and use of both the English and French languages from one end of this country to the other. That is by way of constructive suggestion.

I feel we can say to hon. members in the opposition that this government is fully aware of the problems which they have been eloquent in pointing out. It has been spoken about in the debate on the speech from the throne, and I suggest that if we bide our time we will see something that will be satisfactory.

**Hon. George C. Nowlan (Minister of National Revenue):** We have had an interesting debate starting yesterday afternoon and running into today and I think I will be expected to say something about the matters which have been raised, although frankly there has been very little here of a controversial nature. I appreciate the fact that the debate has been kept on a high level