

advertising. Do you agree that under the present policy, Parliament is compelling the CBC to cover a fifth of its budget through advertising?

Mr. Pelletier: Parliament certainly doesn't compel it specifically.

Mr. Fortier: I haven't found it anywhere, but we were interested.

Mr. Pelletier: Certainly not specifically. If the CBC sets its annual budget at \$200,000,000 and Parliament votes it \$160,000,000 or \$166,000,000, of course, the CBC has to look for what it needs to make up the difference at the commercial end, but I wouldn't know whether if the Corporation decided to reduce its services, and give up advertising, I can't say it would be a wise decision and that you wouldn't hear even bigger debates than what you have heard until now. That, I think, would be a decision that the Corporation might make.

Mr. Fortier: Surely you agree that such a decision could be imposed on it by Parliament?

Mr. Pelletier: Yes.

Mr. Fortier: But can't you see that?

Mr. Pelletier: It means that Parliament couldn't say: "Go hunt for \$40,000,000", because Parliament doesn't know that the Corporation could hunt up \$40,000,000.

Mr. Fortier: I understand. But Parliament could say "through advertising on the CBC radio network stations"?

Mr. Pelletier: Yes. Only Parliament could say that.

Mr. Fortier: From your present point of view, that is undesirable, is that right?

Mr. Pelletier: I think that not only is it undesirable, but it is impossible until there is a relaxation of budget restrictions.

Mr. Fortier: The Broadcasting Act, in section 2, imposes what the legislators called Broadcasting Policy for Canada and in subsection (g) we read:

Mr. Pelletier: What section is that?

Mr. Fortier: Section 2, subsection (g): "That the national broadcasting service should" (that's the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) "contribute to the development of national unity" and "provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity." Why was this obligation imposed only on the national broadcasting service instead of on the whole Canadian broadcasting system?

Mr. Pelletier: That's a question I've asked myself. And I'm not sure I've found the answer. I think it's implicit that we could argue that the same thing should apply for the stations in the private sector.

Mr. Fortier: That's what Mr. Juneau told us.

Mr. Pelletier: Although that isn't specified here. But what I'm thinking and what I can tell you is to "provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity" was meant to show that "to contribute to the development of national unity" was not just a business of propaganda. That means (and you have to read both parts of the sentence together) that at the time the Act was voted on in Parliament, an extremely difficult semantic argument arose because "exprimer constamment la réalité canadienne" doesn't seem easy to translate, and in any case it wasn't translated.

Mr. Fortier: Provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity?"

Mr. Pelletier: It's not an adequate translation and for my part, in this case I much prefer the French, because it reflects the honesty of information and the complete information side which should be the philosophy of the CBC and of all broadcasting for that matter.

Mr. Fortier: If there were a way of doing that constitutionally, would you advocate such an obligation for the written press also?

Mr. Pelletier: I think the written press should have that obligation. I don't know whether there is any legal way of legislating responsibilities like that because when you pass laws, you have to be able to check. That's where my old newspaperman's instincts are awakened, and I would wonder who is going to check the written press. But I think that such an obligation does exist in any social philosophy, and certainly in the social philosophy that is the Canadian consensus. And I think that newspapers that think they are exempt from such responsibilities are betraying their mandate.

Mr. Fortier: Section 22 of the Act provides that:

"(1) No broadcasting licence shall be issued, amended or renewed pursuant to this part,

(a) in contravention of any direction to the Commission issued by the Governor in Council "

that is by you, by the Cabinet.

I have often asked myself this question: "Why is there no mention of refusal of a broad-