

people get is a service for which they should pay a charge. Let us take, for example, the Board of Grain Commissioners. A charge is made for inspecting and weighing every bushel of grain that passes from the farmer to the market in Canada or elsewhere. Why is that charge made? It is because the inspecting and weighing of grain is a legitimate service that the farmer gets. In days when, I am bound to say, we did not dispense money quite so freely as we do now, this was felt to be a fair and legitimate charge. I think this principle is fair and sound. It is argued that you cannot collect all the fees. Well, there may be difficulty in collecting from some people, but the arm of the law can be very long. What is needed is a strict enforcement of the law and the awarding of sufficiently stiff penalties to make people realize that it is unsafe to have a radio without a licence.

Honourable senators, periodically the business of the C.B.C. comes under review by a committee of the other place. That, as far as it goes, is all to the good, but the tendency before some parliamentary committees is to try to score an advantage against someone else. I sometimes think that some of the committees set up by parliament are not as objective in their approach to the problems placed before them as they should be.

Before I resume my seat, let me say that it is rather unfortunate that we should have to deal with this matter in such hurried fashion.

**Hon. Mr. Burchill:** I was much interested in what the honourable senator from Churchill (Hon. Mr. Crerar) said about the great power that is being placed in the hands of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I wonder if he could tell us how this differs from the policy with regard to the British Broadcasting Corporation.

**Hon. Mr. Crerar:** I do not know that it differs very greatly. I was in Great Britain for a couple of months this summer, and I often listened to their programs. I am bound to say that they usually appeared to me to be of a higher quality than the programs we have here; but this very matter of monopoly has received a good deal of criticism in the British press.

**Hon. J. G. Fogo:** Honourable senators, we have listened to some excellent speeches on the broad aspects of this legislation, but I am going to address myself to one narrow feature which has been mentioned at least once in this chamber, for I think an inaccurate impression may have been created. Earlier in the day, when the honourable leader (Hon. Mr. Haig) chose the members of the Senate as an example of what might

be termed "impartiality" in his remarks about alleged partiality on the part of the C.B.C., I was tempted to rise on a question of privilege. On second thought, however, I decided that I ought to address myself directly to the point.

I think the suggestion was made that the C.B.C. has been used as an agency of government for political propaganda. I have been in a peculiarly intimate position with reference to political broadcasting for some twenty years, commencing at a time when there was no such thing as the Canadian Broadcasting Company or Corporation, and neither before the institution of the C.B.C. nor since has there been any evidence, within my knowledge, of partiality on the part of the board or the governors or the management in the presentation of what may be termed political material; nor have I seen any evidence that this government or its predecessor used this agency as a means of promoting its political ends. If that suggestion was made it ought not to go uncorrected.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** May I interject here to say that I never said that. I said propaganda, but not political propaganda.

**Hon. Mr. Fogo:** I certainly misunderstood the honourable leader opposite.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** I never suggested that on the part of any government. I said propaganda, but not political propaganda. I was kicking about these university cranks.

**Hon. Mr. Fogo:** Perhaps the connection misled me because reference was made to the person or body which appointed honourable senators, who are expected to be impartial because they are appointed for life. I think the suggestion was made that if we were appointed for only ten years we might be in fear of the end of our tenure and be tempted to become partial.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Let me correct my honourable friend. I said that that was possible. That is all.

**Hon. Mr. Fogo:** At least it was suggested, and I thought it appropriate to make a remark or two on the subject.

I have had occasion to complain to the C.B.C. a number of times when I thought it was according to many privileges to parties other than the one with which I happen to be connected, but I learned later that the other parties were making equally strong complaints about the privileges accorded by the C.B.C. to my party. I was bound to conclude in the end that the C.B.C. was holding a balance, for everybody felt that he was not getting an advantage but that the other fellow was. So it is apparent that at least a middle course was being followed.