

southern Alberta admirably for many years, and that to-day that radio station serves the people admirably, that the people of all over southern Alberta, so far as I know, are strongly attached to the station and would prefer to hear it rather than to listen to the C.B.C. programmes, makes it a serious matter for the C.B.C. to take any action whatsoever which will result in the impairment of that splendid radio station.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): We have an amendment before the committee. I am not sure whether it has been moved. It was moved by the hon. member for St. Paul's:

That vote 965 for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation be reduced to one dollar.

Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): No. I am conscious that no one would willingly take on this task at this time. I know the committee is tired and all that sort of thing.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Take plenty of time.

An hon. MEMBER: It is going to snow.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): The reason I am taking the time of the committee on this matter is very simple. I believe that, while nominally passing merely this item, what we are really doing is what the minister really indicated a moment or two ago. We are really settling an important question which is going to be irrevocably settled.

I want to say one thing, first, because of something that happened earlier in the day. I am far from criticizing the C.B.C. I wish to say this in particular—I do not think the hon. member for Waterloo South intended to suggest that the C.B.C. had dealt unfairly with our meeting. Sometimes he and I are a little prejudiced against the Liberals, and it may be that he suggested that the prejudice carried over. I wanted to say that in the presence of the officials of the C.B.C.

I now come back to what I intended to say. A bill came before the house which was discussed. There were only two speeches made on the other side about it. One was dead against it. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre to-day suggested that most of the things in the bill were better left over for consideration later, with which I fully agree. Yet we are asked to take action here which, I submit, will really make the other points largely meaningless, because of the action which we are asked to take here. I submit this in spite of what the minister said about their wanting to encourage private radio. The important thing is not what people say but what they do. I believe that it has been

[Mr. Blackmore.]

established in this committee to my satisfaction—and no satisfactory answer has been given—that this action will have the effect of destroying or at any rate so crippling as virtually to destroy these companies in question.

I want to go back to what the minister said about what was said previously in the house by a previous leader of this party. I am not afraid of it; I do not want to run away from it. Conditions often change. I submit that never in the history of the world have conditions changed as much as in the last fifteen years. I submit, further, that if you take the words of Viscount Bennett they make it perfectly clear what he was talking about was not the situation we have now, because he was talking about "leaving the air to private enterprise." That is what he was complaining about. But nobody to-day is suggesting that. What we are suggesting is that this house should take time before it irrevocably closes the door on a policy which was so well established on other occasions, notably in regard to the railways. In the railways we have two enterprises: the great public enterprise and the great private enterprise. I would think what they have done is a pretty good way to combine public and private enterprise.

Let me say again that I believe there are hon. gentlemen opposite who feel as I do, not including the minister because he plainly and clearly said what was to be his policy. He said he was for state control, and I assume he means right across the board. It is fit and proper for the minister to say that. That makes it perfectly clear that what we are doing is not passing an item; we are deciding a principle finally and irrevocably. I believe that there are hon. gentlemen opposite who feel as I do. They do not want this thing irrevocably decided. I think I am safe in challenging them and asking them to rise in their places and say they believe that. I think I can pretty nearly dare most of them except the minister. His statement was plainly and honestly given, for which I respect him.

I wish to recall the situation which we have before us. It is not disputed that if we take this action it will result in the emasculation and virtual destruction of these stations. There are usually two reasons for mulcting or destroying or hampering private enterprise. One is that it is in danger of becoming a monopoly. That suggestion was made to-day—I forget by whom—and it seemed to me at the time that we might be saved from that kind of argument when we are having a serious discussion. The question is not whether private enterprise can create a monopoly; the real question is whether it can stay in the picture at all. The second