

*Broadcasting*

ago and produced a report I think it is important for us to analyse what has happened to our recommendations. I emphasize again that the bodies concerned are not bound to accept these recommendations, but they certainly have the responsibility to indicate what action they have taken or if they have ignored the recommendations, to indicate on what basis they have done so.

On the question of the corporation's whole financial structure I think the committee should be given some indication of whether there has been any attempt made to more efficiently commercialize the corporation and, if so, to what extent this has succeeded. I realize that for years to come the C.B.C. under its present structure, will have to be subsidized to a considerable degree. I have never disputed this fact.

But having said that, and as one who took part in an analysis of the financial structure, and because of the geography of Canada and the importance and necessity of the C.B.C., Canadian taxpayers of course, would have to subsidize much of the programming. My examination was based on this question: Is there any real effort made to recover any portion of the funds which the commercial operator is expected to recover as a private broadcaster? I will expect to receive an answer to this question.

I have one actual example of the C.B.C. taking to heart our recommendation. I refer to the Rose Bowl game. In my own city I raised a complaint that the Rose Bowl game was not televised throughout Canada. I received the highly logical reply that only a few stations had asked for it, that no sponsor could be found for the program and if it were carried it would represent a substantial cost that would have to come from the public treasury. That is an example drawn from my personal experience which indicates that the corporation has become conscious of the need to meet the cost of unsponsored programs, unless there is an overwhelming demand for them as a public service. I believe this is an indication that the committee's report last year has had some influence.

In fact, while this committee was severely criticized by some of the press in Canada it has had many beneficial influences. I agree with those who said that in some respects the committee was conducted rather like a circus. I am not of course speaking of the conduct of the chairman but of the committee members themselves and the behaviour of the committee to which, of course, I contributed. Nevertheless, I think it was an excellent committee in that it did produce satisfactory results in many respects. I think it would be

[Mr. Smith (Calgary South).]

wrong to discredit the work of the committee simply because there were unfortunate events which transpired in one or two of its sittings.

Turning to another aspect of the corporation, I think it should be asked to consider whether in its desire to be competitive, the corporation has perhaps gone to the opposite extreme in lowering its rate structure unduly. I am not sitting in judgment of the corporation at this point but I do think this relationship with private broadcasting should be closely examined.

Let us move on from the corporation to the responsibilities we expect to be met by the private broadcaster in view of the fact that he has this rather exclusive licence to communicate to the public. I think we should ask him whether in some instances he is really running a commercial or advertising vehicle and if he is living up to the principles enunciated by the board of broadcast governors. In our examination of the role of the private broadcaster we should make it clear that we, as representatives of the people, as parliamentarians, demand of him the same standards and integrity in broadcasting that we ask of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

What, then, of the board of broadcast governors? They have now had an opportunity to function for over a year. They have established certain principles governing the conduct of all broadcasting in Canada. I, like many other Canadians, am a little suspicious that perhaps some of the rules are not sufficiently flexible and I wonder if they have attempted to blanket the industry with certain fixed requirements such as the 55 per cent Canadian content regulation and, having applied it, said, "This is something to which all must adhere without regard to the quality of programming." We have the responsibility of making an assessment of the new regulations to see if they are beneficial to the broadcasting industry as such and to ensure that the individual consumer is receiving the standard of broadcasting to which he is entitled.

I return to my earlier point that even after conducting this examination committee members have the individual responsibility to report their considered views to parliament. We are not, however, in the committee stage dictating what must take place following the filing of the report.

I turn now to an area of this field where I have the most difficulty defining for myself where our responsibility lies. When the committee was set up two years ago I said I felt it would be difficult for us to attempt to define what was a good or bad radio or television program. Like most viewers we are laymen in the field even though we had