

for the chairman of the corporation, and there is a somewhat illusory appeal being provided. All these are matters that should be attended to and examined carefully here.

Honourable senators, I am a bit tired of the futile protests that are made in this house about legislation coming to us at the close of the session. It stands to reason that the Commons will run their own business in their own way and will not send us legislation until they are through with it, and that in the course of their work they will pay very little thought indeed to the convenience of this chamber. The remedy is not in scolding the House of Commons; it is in our own hands. Nobody can force this chamber to adjourn or to rise at any particular time. We can take all the time that is necessary, and if we are unable to finish our business before the Christmas season begins, we can come back after Christmas.

The fact is that we do not commence our work until some little time after the House of Commons has been in session. They get the first chance at most legislation, and commence their work earlier than we do. The reasonable thing for us in this chamber to do is to recess in the early stage of the session and then at the close of the session, irrespective of the desires of the other house, take what time we require to complete our work in an orderly and deliberate fashion. Let us stop protesting, for it is fruitless and futile, and let us give the legislation the time it deserves. I am not one who wishes to prolong this session; indeed, I should be very glad to see it close before Christmas. On the other hand, in the review of the legislation to come to us we have a serious duty to perform. Let us take our time and do it properly.

As I have said, the bill now before us has some important features. In our consideration of it we should bear in mind the fact that broadcasting is by nature a monopoly, and in that respect cannot be compared to the publication of a newspaper. Any person can start a newspaper anywhere as long as he has enough money to buy a press and can find people to read his paper. On the contrary, in the field of broadcasting there are only a few channels and once they have been monopolized by certain persons they cannot be used by others. Broadcasting is, as I say, a natural monopoly. It should not be a private monopoly, but a monopoly belonging to the people of Canada. I disagree with the statement that the air is not owned by the public. The air, or the electric channels in it, are the natural property of the whole people. Even if that were not so, our ears are our own and they can be guarded only in a general way by the Government of Canada.

In the end, no one should be allowed a vested interest in these channels; they must be controlled, and they should be owned by the government. I am not very sympathetic to the wails and complaints which we hear so continuously from those who have been given special rights on the air, and who now want to free themselves from control by the C.B.C.

The honourable senator from Cariboo (Hon. Mr. Turgeon) made a suggestion, concurred in most heartily by the senator from Churchill (Hon. Mr. Crerar), that we should have a supervisory board with jurisdiction over both public and private broadcasting. While there is, I think, some virtue in the suggestion, I fear that the establishment of a second board would gain little for us. The question should be inquired into by this house or one of its committees. It seems to me that in the Board of Governors we have just such a board as is now being advocated. That board does not manage the broadcasting operation; that it is given over to the managers or to a president who does some managing. The board itself, like any board of directors, sits back and supervises both public and private broadcasting. It seems to me that this attempt to separate administration from supervision would bring us back to the point where we now find ourselves. The Massey Report suggests that the appointment of a new board may be the cure for our ills. I think there is something to the argument that if the present board is not functioning, a new board—rather than a second one—should be set up.

The member from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Lambert) has said that the operations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation have been inquired into on a number of occasions, with no concrete proposals forthcoming. I am inclined to think that if we engaged in an extensive inquiry now the result might well be the same. The answer may be, not the appointment of a second board, but rather the freeing of the present board from some of its administrative responsibilities, which should be carried more completely by management under the supervision of the board.

May I say a word on the question of right of appeal? It is provided that when a private company is suspended, there is a limited appeal to a judge of the Exchequer Court on questions of law. But what questions of law are there to determine? When a private broadcaster is alleged to have been guilty of the non-observance of some regulation published by the board, and his rights are suspended, what question of law would have to be determined on that appeal? I say it would be a question of fact more than of