

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

live national broadcasting service. It is precisely in this area that most of the recent criticism of the corporation has arisen. Perhaps the most important feature of the C.B.C.'s mandate in the new bill is the obligation to contribute to the development of national unity and, as I said before, its employees have an overriding responsibility to be objective and balanced in its presentation of news and commentaries on public affairs. But I do not believe that this can be achieved by legislation or by sporadic interference from this chamber or from outside. The responsibility for this, particularly under the new bill where this is clearly set out in its obligation to contribute to the development of national unity, lies fairly and squarely on the C.B.C. board and management, and that is where it is going to remain. The only other course is to turn to censorship, which I think is repugnant to all of us, or to total pre-editing, which is absolutely impossible.

The late Mr. Adlai Stevenson once said:

Freedom demands infinitely more care and attention than any other system. It puts consent and personal initiative in the place of command and obedience. How are we to defend freedom if, for the tyranny of external control, we substitute the clattering, clattering tyranny of internal aimlessness and fuss?

Now I should like to deal very briefly with the internal organization of the corporation. Organization in itself is not an end but a means. Nor is it just a matter of boxes and lines drawn on a chart; it is a framework for personal relationships. In other words, good organization means competent managers and clear communications, neither of which can be secured by prescriptive legislation. I cannot imagine anything more likely to destroy the creative value of the C.B.C. than the rigidities and frustrations that would result from an organization structure prescribed by law.

With one exception to which I shall refer in a moment, the bill therefore has nothing to say about the internal organization of the corporation. It does not, for example, incorporate the recommendation of the standing committee that there should be a senior executive responsible for programming and production in the English and French networks, even though this recommendation subsequently was accepted in principle by the present C.B.C. board. Our view is that it is precisely with that body, the C.B.C. board, that decisions should be left involving the internal organization of the corporation. I am

certain that this will be one of the major subjects of consideration by the new board to be appointed under this legislation. Its members will have available to them the recommendations of the standing committee, as well as those put forward by such groups as the Glassco commission and also the president's study group prepared within the corporation itself, although we do not know much about it, and the Fowler committee. It will be for the board, in line with its responsibilities under this bill, to decide which of these recommendations are most appropriate for the kind of corporation required to carry out their own policy decisions. They are in a far better position to do this than members of parliament.

• (4:10 p.m.)

The standing committee also supported the formation of two groups within the board of directors of the corporation, each one to concern itself more particularly with the English or French network. Under the bill the corporation will have full power to establish standing or special committees of the board and to delegate responsibility and authority to them. But a statutory requirement that the board should split itself up into two would, in the opinion of the government, be undesirable. If the C.B.C. is to be an instrument for the development of national unity and the continuing expression of Canadian identity, it must have a clear identity of its own that is neither English nor French but Canadian.

The one matter of organization about which the bill is explicit is the relationship between the two most senior officers of the C.B.C. The standing committee recommended that they should be known as the chairman and general manager respectively, but it has been represented to the government that these titles would have a restrictive effect on the titles available for senior officers of the corporation at a lower level.

It has also been represented to us, notably by the press and by the present president of the C.B.C., that in dealing with other North American corporations it is desirable that the senior officers of the C.B.C. should have titles recognizable by those corporations. It is therefore proposed in the bill before us that they should be known as the president and the executive vice president. The president is designated as the chief executive officer of the corporation, which means that he must take full responsibility for every aspect of the C.B.C.'s activities. The responsibilities of the executive vice president are defined as