

Senator CONNOLLY (*Ottawa West*): The Government might have difficulty getting the right type of man for this position.

Hon. Mr. NOWLAN: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Supposing the Government wished to appoint Mr. Jones as President of the C.B.C., and he is a very desirable man. Mr. Jones says, "I will come, but I must have a contract for five years at a salary of X dollars." Can the Government give him a contract for five years if his appointment is simply during pleasure? Would not a five-year contract be inconsistent with an appointment during pleasure under this legislation?

Senator BRUNT: It would have to be made subject to pleasure.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. Would not that be difficult?

Hon. Mr. NOWLAN: It would be difficult. I suppose if the Government wants to get rid of somebody there are ways and means of doing it, regardless of what is provided for. There is distinctive precedent for this in the first chairman.

Senator LAMBERT: Are there not two sides to this matter? There is the point of view of the minister and the Government, and the point of view of the chairman of the C.B.C.? For instance, we have a chairman of the central Bank of Canada, and if he does not agree with the Minister of Finance he is free to resign. It is not a case of being fired. Would not a similar condition prevail in connection with C.B.C., if there is a difference in point of view?

The CHAIRMAN: Is the Chairman of the Bank of Canada appointed during pleasure?

Senator MACDONALD: He is not appointed during pleasure.

Senator CONNOLLY (*Ottawa West*): The Chairman raised the further point: you have two conditions in the appointment, and one may be inconsistent with the other. Perhaps the minister should discuss that.

Senator WALL: Mr. Chairman, I hate to press this, but what does "good behaviour" means? I think that definition is crucial.

The CHAIRMAN: You will find, Senator Wall, that is covered in subsection 4 of section 22 that a man holding office during good behaviour can only be removed by the Governor General on an address of the Senate and the House of Commons. So, it is the Senate and House of Commons who have to determine what is good behaviour.

Senator BRUNT: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to get away from this section, but the minister is going to have to leave us shortly, and section 14 is one that should be commented on by him. Could we move over to that section now?

Senator MACDONALD: I think we appreciate the attitude the minister has taken: he has left this more or less with us.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, could you give us your views on section 14 in the light of the facts that came out after you left us yesterday morning, with respect to the non-Canadian holdings of some very important broadcasting companies?

Hon. Mr. NOWLAN: As I said, Mr. Chairman, I have had only a very casual discussion with the officials, and I am not familiar with the whole background of your discussion yesterday morning. I understand your discussion dealt principally with the fact that certain stations are in existence today which might not be able to qualify under this section.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. To take the particular case we were discussing, the Canadian Marconi Company; it has for the past 30 years or more owned a broadcasting station in Montreal, and has applied for a television permit. That company is controlled through another Canadian company by an English