

1958. If the same drama were broadcast today, it would probably pass unnoticed.

The same applies to this program. Maybe in five years from now, no one will even pay any attention. Naturally, the role of a Crown corporation is not to aggravate the opinion of Canadians. And were I personally convinced that the CBC was not conscious of such a role, I would be the first to intervene in the House, and when the CBC appeared before the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, I would have joined my colleagues and expressed my opposition as well to the way in which the CBC has so far carried out its mandate.

Finally, I feel that guidelines such as those being now applied for the production of documents seem valid to me. The government has defined in very precise and explicit fashion its notice of motion on the production of documents, which should now open the doors wider to publicity on all decisions and information likely to help the government take its own decisions. On the whole, I feel that if we are to amend its guidelines, that ought to be done by the committee, and not simply by asking for the production of letters on a program which, all things considered, remains of very slight importance amidst all that is heard and published in Canada.

[English]

**Mr. Gus MacFarlane (Hamilton Mountain):** Madam Speaker, I want to assure the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) that although I graduated from McGill and know Patrick Watson very well I have not been invited to "Some Honourable Members" either, so he is probably in very good company. I would also draw attention to the fact that on such a problem of social conscience I notice no member from the NDP has seen fit to attend at this hour, so I imagine they are not interested in the topic.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** They are out watching the CBC.

**Mr. MacFarlane:** I would like to stress the fact that I do not believe that it would be a sensible matter to table, or even request the tabling of, letters from the general public. I think we all realize that correspondence received from the public has its own benefit and its own nature of truth in it, and since, like the programs, it would be "in the eye of the beholder", we would only be making our own judgments of those letters.

I will have something to say about the program a little later on, but I think that the "eye of the beholder" has to be looked at pretty closely. I wonder what we would think if we looked down through the list of films some of us have seen. For example, I do not know whether any hon. members have seen the Scottish film called "The Brothers". If so, they would have seen the two brothers go out to the island, swim across the loch, and on the island one of the brothers catches his hand in a crevice, and then in the scene in the film he takes a knife and cuts his hand off and the blood rolls into the water. Nobody seemed to think that this was undue violence; it was part of the story and was accepted as such.

I wonder what we would think of "Volpone" when it was on the stage of Her Majesty's, as it was called, in Montreal, perhaps re-presented at O'Keefe's, with Donald

### CBC Programming

Wolfit playing in it, and we see the scene where he comes across the stage, much like a wolf moving toward the fair maiden he is about to rape. I wonder whether we would say that this should not be seen by all those wealthy people who could buy tickets, and by the few students who could sneak in.

What would we really think if we took a look at some of Shakespeare's writings, and when he writes of Gloucester "Put out his eyes, out of their bloody sockets!". I wonder just how horrible this is.

● (1740)

I wonder what we would think of it all when we think of sex and remember that there she lay, the fair Lucretia, two alabaster castles in white, where the breath came and went and the currents moved slowly. Is this terribly sexual, or is this beautiful writing? It is in "the eye of the beholder" to a great extent.

If we want to come back to our young people, and I caution you about being certain when you talk about young people that you have some experiences with them, we should not always see them as adults. One Sunday in Ottawa if you happen to be attending a speaking engagement here and not in your riding, you should go out and see what the young people, the little people do. They are at Kung Fu or they are at a Sunday afternoon movie.

What is this Kung Fu? I really do not like Kung Fu films. I was probably fairly agile in my day. I think I can still do a pretty good Russian dance and throw a few pretty good drop kicks, but I am not really too interested in that. But you had better go and see these things. What do you see there? Do you see them performing these actions which people say are just exhibits of violence? Suddenly do you find all the children very, very silent, and then suddenly the bad guy does something and they say "boo", just like we did for Ken Maynard, when we shouted "hurrah" for Tom Mix, and booed the bad guy? There is no difference. These are great morality plays. We should take a look at that aspect of it and see what is actually happening.

I know I used to have fights on Fifth Avenue in Verdun and I never used to win. The other guy was Tom Mix and I used to play Ken Maynard, and the one guy wore black, and the one guy wore white. This is ridiculous. I do not think it is fair for us to presume that all this evil is happening, and everything we see on TV and all the violence are affecting young people in this way.

I remember sitting up at night at 11 o'clock when I was seven years old, turning on the radio, and "Here comes the Shadow; who knows what evil lurks in the minds of men?" My mother said I was going to have dreams. It was a good experience. It was exciting drama. I do not see any reason why we should be too concerned about the wonderful generation that is following. I do not think they will be easily hoodwinked. They will not be hoodwinked any more because of the fact that many of them are now interested enough, and the records show it, in returning to their churches. They have not been frightened by all of the hypocrisy that existed. They have gone back to their churches, and some of them have brought better music and ideas into the services of churches of all denominations.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Agreed, but let us have the—