

*Motions for Papers*

a special committee of the house tabled a report on that white paper on March 21 last.

I noticed that the hon. member for York-Humber sat on those two committees. Knowing how outspoken he is, I suppose that he must have put forward, at times, some good reasons for granting the minister more control over the C.B.C.

In the present situation, I think I understand why the hon. member failed to obtain the required papers, if they are available at the C.B.C.

However, following the thorough studies I mentioned earlier, I do not doubt that the present government will make sure that the public interest and the interest of our fellow-citizens are always protected and will avail itself—I mean the government—of every opportunity to amend or improve the legislation to that effect for the specific purpose of always safeguarding the public interest.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

● (6:20 p.m.)

[English]

**Mr. Cowan:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member who has just addressed the house whether he does not consider a cheque to be a document.

[Translation]

**Mr. LeBlanc:** Mr. Speaker, I feel that cheques—I have always considered cheques as papers.

[English]

**Mr. Andrew Chatwood (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, the motion of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) for the production of correspondence, telegrams or other documents relating to payments by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to Professors John T. Saywell and John C. Ricker is very interesting in that it concerns the rights of so many people. It concerns the rights of the individual member of parliament, the rights of parliament as a whole, the rights of the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh), the rights of the C.B.C., the rights of Professors Saywell and Ricker, and the rights of other people who work for the C.B.C. and who from time to time appear on television or are heard on radio. In this debate we must decide whether or not it is right and proper that these documents should be produced at this time. I am assuming that what the hon. member for York-Humber is seeking to obtain is information as to the

[Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski).]

amounts paid to Professors Saywell and Ricker, thereby making this information available to the public as a whole.

The hon. member for York-Humber, in speaking on his motion, quoted from the book "Nation and Province" which was, I believe, circulated at one time among the schools of Ontario and in which, he said, sharp attacks were made on the printed word. In the course of my speech I should like to quote from other books written by Professors Saywell and Ricker. In two of these books these gentlemen collaborated with other authors. In this way I hope to give some indication of the type of people these gentlemen are, which will give us some background with which to consider whether or not the payments made to them by the C.B.C. should be made public. The first is a book entitled "Canada, A Modern Study" by Ramsay Cook in collaboration with John T. Saywell and John C. Ricker. This book is basically a history of Canada. I quote from it briefly.

The successful defence of British North America in the war of 1812 brightened the future prospects of the British North American colonies. Moreover, the war once more confirmed the direction that the economic and commercial development of the area would follow. The Treaty of Versailles in 1783 had cut Canada off from the rich lands of the Ohio valley. While furtrading posts had been retained in the area south of the Great Lakes for more than ten years after that, the merchants of Montreal were beginning to look more carefully at the lands north of the lakes. Then Jay's Treaty in 1794 and, more emphatically still, the hostilities of 1812-14 made it clear that the United States had no intention of allowing British and Canadian traders to ply their trade south of the lakes. It was to the west and north that the merchants of Canada, who were mostly based in Montreal, now had to look.

On page 41, speaking of the Liberal ministry which Laurier formed in 1896, the author writes:

Macdonald had laid the framework for the Canadian nation. Laurier knew that to complete the structure he would have to heal the sectional and racial conflicts that had divided and weakened the country. His main aim was always to bind French and English speaking Canadians together in a common nationality, by following a path that was neither narrowly English nor French, Roman Catholic nor Protestant, but broad enough to win the acceptance of all groups. As he told a friend:

"My object is to consolidate Confederation and to bring our people, long estranged from each other, gradually to become a nation. This is the supreme issue. Everything else is subordinate to that idea."

Sometimes the way in which the C.B.C. appears to spend its money puzzles me at least a little. I do not think it would be