

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

its size. Certainly any voting taxpayer who hears, on the one hand, that he must pay 5 per cent extra in taxes and, on the other, that the corporation spent \$319,000 in making "Waiting For Caroline", will tear his hair out.

Though certain films that are produced for "Festival" may be very good, I do not think the government should be involved with them. I do not think we should compete with Hollywood. The government has tried to promote a private film industry in Canada—

**Mr. Dinsdale:** It has not been set up yet.

**Mr. Horner (Acadia):** I know that, but I do not think that we should compete with Hollywood. We should not use taxpayers' dollars for a risky enterprise like the film business. Nor should we compete with Hollywood. Certainly the government must enact broadcasting legislation, but I think that the government should get out of broadcasting. If the C.B.C. is a going concern we should put it up for sale. Let someone buy this Canadian corporation about which everyone is talking. I do not care who buys it. I do care about the taxpayers and the way their money is spent. The government should not be involved in a risky, gambling type of enterprise such as the film business. As I said, we should not compete with Hollywood and the government should not attempt to brainwash the public.

The purpose of this legislation, we are told, is to safeguard, enrich and strengthen Canada. How can you safeguard, enrich and strengthen Canada without brainwashing people? It cannot be done otherwise. We are also told that those with conflicting views will be allowed to express those views on C.B.C. networks. Sometimes, I have the impression that only one side of a picture has been presented on certain programs. The other side has been ignored. Both sides of an argument ought to be fairly presented.

The bill is to contribute to the development of national unity. How can any piece of legislation or any council that is set up contribute to the development of national unity? How is that possible without somebody trying to brainwash the people? That just does not make sense. Since we live in a free society, and I think we do, when a private entrepreneur is given the right to use the airwaves his right ought to be regulated by the government. That is only fair since in some instances he is being allowed a monopoly use of certain airwaves. As I say,

[Mr. Horner (Acadia).]

we should not be in the broadcasting business because it is risky and requires a great deal of capital.

• (3:50 p.m.)

The setting up of a council will remove the corporation even farther from parliamentary control. The cry in parliament for many years has been that nobody has any control over the corporation. Yet this bill will remove it still farther from control by the people's representatives. The provision for capital expenditure to be on a five-year basis is another feature which will lead to the further weakening of control. All we can hope for is that those appointed to the council will be fair-minded men who will remain so forever and a day, because this is our only hope that any solution will come out of this legislation at all.

The bill provides every escape route feasible for C.B.C. management as a way out should any complaints reach them. The minister told us that the corporation would be answerable to the council and that complaints directed to the council will be brought to the attention of the C.B.C. in accordance with the objectives set out for the corporation in the bill. In that regard the corporation is required to promote, somehow or other, a sense of Canadian identity. In doing so, of course, it has to project conflicting views. So we are giving the corporation in effect a blank cheque covering anything they may wish to disseminate.

This giant has grown so big that instead of trying to limit its size we are washing our hands of it and handing it over to someone else to run. In my opinion we are going about handling this mammoth giant, which each year is gobbling up more money and creating disharmony rather than unity in Canada, in the wrong way. It will continue to do so after this legislation is passed.

[Translation]

**Mr. Grégoire:** Mr. Chairman, before the vote on my amendment could I ask the minister who brought in the measure if she could tell us, still in accordance with my amendment, who are the owners or the shareholders of the Quebec private television stations belonging to that same company? Could the minister provide an answer in this connection?

[English]

**Miss LaMarsh:** On May 4, 1966, there was tabled in the house pursuant to an order