

The Address—Mr. Drew

committee would enable the broadest information such as would be extremely valuable to the house, to parliament and to the people of Canada.

Nor is it in defence expenditures alone that it is possible to effect economies. The standing committee on finance of the Senate of Canada presented a report on June 23 last in which there are positive recommendations for a reduction in expenditure. And before we are told again that there is no evidence that any saving can be effected, may I suggest that any member who has that thought in mind might re-read the report of the standing committee on finance of the Senate of Canada, and see what is contained in that report.

As this report is available to the members of the House of Commons, I shall do no more than to refer to the fact that the committee made a positive finding that the practices in regard to the handling of public expenditure for buildings, rental and similar requirements of the different departments of government could "have no other effect than duplication and, overlapping and the inevitable general increasing in costs that is bound to result from this practice". At a time when such enormous sums are being spent for such vital purposes, there is the double need of a measure of supervision of both defence and non-defence expenditures for which there is no provision at this time. It is because of the impartiality of the Senate committee's report, to which I have referred, that I have suggested the name of Senator Crerar.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not think that the names of members of the other place should be brought into debate in this house.

Mr. Knowles: Let them rest in peace.

Mr. Drew: I now refer to the statement in the speech from the throne with respect to television.

Mr. Pouliot: Why not suggest Arthur Meighen?

Mr. Drew: I cannot imagine a better appointee, and I think it would be an excellent demonstration of the impartiality of the government if it were to follow the same course as did the government of the United States and appoint the leader of another party, who has served in the highest office on another occasion, to this very high task.

Mr. Cruickshank: We will give you a job some day.

Mr. Drew: I now wish to speak about television, which is mentioned in the speech from the throne.

Mr. Cruickshank: You do well there.

[Mr. Drew.]

Mr. Fleming: Here comes the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann).

Mr. Drew: The subject is one which it will be possible to discuss in detail when the bill comes before the house to interpret in statutory form the statement in the speech from the throne. However, I think it is appropriate at this point to mention two aspects of the announcement. On different occasions, when it has been urged that the government should take action with regard to some aspects of broadcasting or television, we have been told that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was an independent commission and that the government would not think of deciding how it should conduct its affairs. Nevertheless the speech from the throne explains that the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) did indicate on an earlier occasion in Montreal that there were to be new television outlets and that it is as a result of that statement that we are now to be presented with legislation to carry forward that announcement. That does raise a question in our minds because, if the statement in the speech from the throne is correct, the answer that has been given on earlier occasions hardly seems to be consistent with the relationship expressed on this occasion.

The other point I would mention is that we now have an announcement that television stations are to be established in Winnipeg, Vancouver and Halifax. That still leaves a very large part of Canada without the opportunity for television and in somewhat vague terms it is stated that the applications of private television stations will be considered in those areas. The words used in the speech from the throne seem to leave no other interpretation than that there are to be no licences granted for private television stations in those cities which now have C.B.C. stations or those which are to have them. That means that we are to be denied the advantages of competitive stations which would greatly improve television broadcasting in this country, and it also suggests that the C.B.C. proposes to retain a monopoly in television in those areas which they regard as the most advantageous from the commercial point of view.

This is strangely inconsistent with the decision made just two weeks ago by the government of the United Kingdom which still retains a monopoly over broadcasting such as we have never had in Canada but which has decided that there is a difference between ordinary broadcasting and television and as a result is going to permit competitive private television stations to operate in the British Isles. I wish to recall to hon. members the explanation given just before we