

Interim Supply

gesting is that private industry can probably do it better than government. Then the Fowler report says that Canadians are willing, within reason, to pay for it. I wonder if we are still within reason in paying for it. I do not think that at the present time the majority of Canadians who are aware of the situation would favour a public broadcasting system. When one considers the history of this corporation, what has happened in the past, why we had it in the first place, and how it has developed throughout the years, he realizes that the time has now come for us to seriously consider its basic policy. This has been the policy of every government. The former government had the same policy toward the corporation, and the government before that had this policy, which is based on the assumption that Canadians want it and need it, and that it was an economic necessity to have a public broadcasting network in Canada.

I am suggesting that the necessity is no longer there from an economic point of view; that the majority of Canadian people who understand the situation no longer feel that we need to have a public broadcasting system; that we could save ourselves a great deal of emotional agony; that we could probably improve the broadcasting fare for Canadians if we were to suggest to the C.B.C. that they should reorganize their entire operation so they would be responsible solely for the technical side of broadcasting. This would include, for example, the remote areas, film boards, educational television advancement and international programs. If that were done I think we would get down to basics and save this country millions of dollars. For example, \$100 million right off the bat would be saved and there would be a continuing \$100 million a year.

Mr. Moreau: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member but I fail to understand his point. He seems to be advocating essentially that we turn over the broadcasting field to private industry; at least that is what I understood. In view of the general support he is getting from the members on his side of the house, such as the hon. member for Bow River and the hon. member for Ontario, may I ask whether this is an official party position?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): No, it is not. The hon. member should appreciate that over here we are allowed to express our views from our own experiences.

[Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson).]

Mr. Woolliams: I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member is putting words in my mouth. I have not made a speech on the C.B.C. If the hon. member for York-Scarborough, one of the trained seals of the Liberal party, wants to make a speech let him make one.

Mr. Noble: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few observations on C.B.C. television activities. It is my belief that the Canadian people are grateful to the C.B.C. for the excellent service they provide across the nation. Personally I admire the board of directors of the C.B.C. for the contribution they have made and continue to make. On their shoulders rests a great responsibility. Decisions made by them can and do have a tremendous influence on many people.

Some people resent the fact that the corporation is a power unto itself and that censorship from any outside source is frowned upon by that body. Many people feel that its work should be open to inquiry, subject to public scrutiny and answerable to public opinion. On the other hand, its progress could be impeded and its services damaged with too much supervision and too many inquiries.

It is understood by everyone that the C.B.C. should be non-partisan and free from political interference. Occasions have arisen when such suspicions were perhaps justified. Such circumstances should not be tolerated and regulations to assure this should be strictly adhered to; but I do think the Canadian people should have an effective liaison through which they might voice their disapproval of extremes that should be protested against and corrected without delay.

Several days ago I objected to certain C.B.C. television programs by way of questions in this house to the Secretary of State. No other course was available to me by which my constituents would know that I had made this appeal. Nevertheless the reply I received brought people everywhere to the full realization of how helpless are the government and the people of the nation to protest effectively a very undesirable program, a feature of our own crown corporation.

My disapproval was directed at the play "Feast of Lupercal" on the program "Festival" of October 7, and again at the same program one week later when two related plays were presented, "Mrs. Dally has a Lover" and "Today is Independence Day". Each play appeared to be an effort to outdo the previous one in vulgar language and in portrayals of