

When I first came into contact with radio broadcasting in this sense it was not a public project, but a private project, and the system, if I may call it that, of free time for political broadcasting had not been introduced. That came later, and I believe from my observation that it has been a good system, and that it gives representatives of various political groups, recognized as such in this country, an opportunity to present their views in an orderly fashion and to reach many people who would not be reached either by the printed word or by orators on the platform. From what I have seen of the administration of this free time political broadcasting, it is my view that the C.B.C. officials and management have been eminently fair at all times to all parties, and I think that all who have been in the picture would agree with me.

One other statement to which I might make reference was that no check is kept on what is said over the radio. I think there is pretty nearly as much check on what is said over the radio as there is on what a man says on the street or what he prints in his paper. The check is in the law—the criminal law, the civil law and perhaps, in certain instances, the law of good taste. So in that respect there is the same check on radio that there is on all the other media of publicity. To catch up with an audience who hear any particular broadcast may be a little more difficult than to catch up with people who have read something in a newspaper. A letter to the editor of a paper may be printed and reach a certain number of people, and if it contains a reflection on you that is not libelous but that you wish to correct you may be able to get the paper to publish at a later date a retraction or a letter from you; but what assurance have you that the people who read the first letter will read yours? There would be much the same kind of difficulty in trying to correct a statement that has been broadcast.

The complaints that have been made from time to time, particularly by so-called private stations, have not been that there are no checks, but rather that the C.B.C. had exercised certain checks on them. I do not think these checks have been felt to be very harsh or drastic. In any event, every radio station, privately or publicly owned, is still responsible for what it broadcasts, and if it puts out anything contrary to the law there is a remedy just the same as there is in the case of any other medium.

The question of dual control has been debated for at least four or five years in this house, in the other house, in the newspapers, over the air, by special committees of the other house and finally by the Massey Commission. And, perhaps surprisingly enough—

for dual control is superficially attractive—all these committees and bodies, after hearing evidence and studying the whole matter, have come to the conclusion that the system initiated in 1932 ought to be continued.

**Hon. Mr. Lambert:** In 1935.

**Hon. Mr. Fogo:** The original Act was passed in 1932. The administrative body was given a different name then, but the basic system is substantially the same now as at the beginning.

I am not sufficiently well informed to know all the reasons for this conclusion, but I believe there are reasons, and that if this bill goes to committee they can be stated there. We are free to take our choice between the British system, on the one hand, and the American system on the other, and decide which offers the better model for this country. In Britain, as I understand it, radio is completely under government control and is administered by the British Broadcasting Corporation. There are no private stations at all. In the United States the broadcasting is done entirely by private concerns, on a commercial basis. In Canada we have a combination of these two systems, part of our broadcasting being done by the C.B.C. and the remainder by privately owned stations.

Despite the complaints that one hears from time to time, I have not noticed that any of the private stations have been suffering financially from the regulations of the C.B.C. In fact, they are doing rather well. I think that if we probed into the matter we would find that a very substantial part of their revenue is derived from the C.B.C., and through the agency of programs and advertising procured for them by the C.B.C.

**Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck:** Honourable senators, I shall make but a few remarks. I am urged to take that course of action by the experience of my friend from Churchill (Hon. Mr. Crerar). He began by saying that his remarks would be short, whereupon he was greeted with a round of applause, and the only other applause accorded to him was when he sat down. Yet, he is one of the most attractive speakers on the floor of this house. So, honourable senators, I shall take the lesson that was accorded to me in those rounds of applause and endeavour to be brief.

Let me say at the outset that this is a very important measure, and one which should be studied with care in this house and in committee, although it is doubtful whether that will be done under the present circumstances.

The bill proposes some broad amendments to the Act. It provides that a grant of \$30 million be paid to the C.B.C. over five years. Also it provides for a longer tenure of office