

we have changed any policy; this method was taken of securing the money with a view to expediting the work of the session, and we thought it would probably take a good deal less time than if the bill were discussed in every detail.

I think we should proceed to pass this item and get on with the rest of the business of the house. I should like, if opportunity permitted, to review what has been done by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, but I feel that we are on eminently safe ground and that we have the support of the great majority of the people of this country in carrying out the policies of a great nationally owned, controlled and operated radio system.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I appreciate very much the answers the minister has given. They are straightforward, and they give the point of view which obviously is actuating the minister and the C.B.C. The one great inconsistency lies in this fact. When I asked the minister if he favoured the development of private radio stations he said, yes.

Mr. McCANN: Yes, so I do.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Then he immediately sanctioned a policy which will result in the serious impairment, if not the ultimate destruction of CFCN.

An hon. MEMBER: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is something which needs explaining. I will leave it to those who read *Hansard* and to the members of the committee to judge. The mere fact that statements were made in forecasts by the leader of the Conservatives back in 1932 which would seem to justify the policy that C.B.C. is following does not, in my judgment, establish the soundness of that policy.

There are one or two matters to which I wish to refer. I asked the minister if C.B.C. had forced CFCN to sell \$158,473.44 worth of time for \$28,680.72. The minister said, "The answer is, no". May I read from the minutes of the hearings of the radio committee, at page 566, where Mr. Love is giving evidence for CFCN. At the end of the third paragraph, about one-fifth of the way from the bottom of the page, he says:

In addition non-obligatory sustaining programmes carried by our station for the C.B.C., day and night, last year, if computed at our lowest rate, would amount to \$61,800. Add to this the value of the commercial time used by the network for their commercials of \$57,361.44 and it makes a grand total of \$158,473.44. We received from the C.B.C. a total of \$28,680.72, one-half of the commercial sponsors' money received by them.

That was the basis of my question. I leave it to the committee.

Now, as to the question whether the CFCN station will lose by the change-over, the minister expresses the opinion that it would not. That is certainly not what the manager of CFCN himself thinks about the matter, because he points out what the members of the committee will readily understand. CFCN is situated in Calgary. South of Calgary is the city of Lethbridge and a great number of small towns and Medicine Hat. CFCN has been serving these communities for many years. If CFCN is to screen its broadcasts in such a way as to protect Mexico and Philadelphia it has to screen out, according to my information, all these communities south of Calgary, which means that a large percentage of these towns will be lost. If I am correctly informed, that means that it would be less remunerative for CFCN to sell its advertising, because the rate at which people pay for advertising depends upon the listening audience. It may be argued that CFCN will not lose heavily financially by the change-over. I cannot say. The minister thinks it will not. The minister said that CFCN was offered a channel other than 1060. So far as I have gone into the records of the radio investigation, no mention was made of any other channel than 1060. If there were any other channel which has not the disadvantages which accrue to 1060 I would be reassured.

I have one or two other points. I could read a considerable section of the report of the committee, but I do not think I had better do that. In my judgment, the one important point that we have to determine is whether or not private radio stations are to be given the right to develop and make their contribution to this nation's thinking, its education and development, or whether they are to be submerged and reduced to relative colourlessness and ineffectiveness by the overriding C.B.C. If more stations like Watrous are to be established in every portion of Canada, then I would venture the supposition that in about fifteen years private radio stations will simply disappear. In other words, the move is one which will ultimately result in the strangulation of private radio stations, not necessarily because the C.B.C. will deliberately destroy them, but it will simply come in and take their business and allow them to die. That is quite evident from the answers which have been given to my questions.

I am not satisfied with the situation. Something better should be offered to the private radio stations. The fact that station CFCN was a pioneer, that it served the people of