

Mr. DURANLEAU: Nothing wrong was done. The minister had the power to do it and he thought he should do it in all fairness. As I told the committee, there were only two licences in the metropolis of Canada when other cities smaller than Montreal had as many as five, more channels than even the province of Quebec has at the present time. I think my hon. friends from the province of Quebec are unfair to their province when they object to the granting of a licence to this paper in Montreal.

Mr. HANBURY: That is just a smoke screen.

Mr. DURANLEAU: This is a Conservative paper, but do my hon. friends want every paper in the country to be Liberal? I think the electors of the country are entitled to read both sides of the story and are entitled to hear over the radio every angle of politics. My hon. friend asked whether the minister had control over the speeches made from La Patrie station. My hon. friend knows that even though the minister has the power to grant a licence, these stations are under the control of the radio commission. I remember the premier of Quebec objected some time ago to certain speeches made over this station, but I contend that the people at the head of this particular movement were within the law and had the right to propound their own ideas on politics. I ask my hon. friend to read the speeches which were broadcast last Saturday evening, I think by one of the leaders of the labour clubs of Montreal. Mr. Desrosieres made a speech last Saturday evening over this station in which he outlined the work they were doing. I invite my hon. friend to read that speech in La Patrie.

Mr. HANBURY: Is it good?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I think he will find it is absolutely within the law.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Do you agree with it?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I do not say that I agree with all the ideas propounded, but I do not think there is anything to be objected to. I hold that these gentlemen have the right to voice their views provided their statements are not against public order. They have the right to make speeches, and particularly the one made last Saturday evening. My attention had been called to the speeches made the week previous and I listened in last Saturday as well as reading the speech in La Patrie. If my hon. friend will look over this speech I think he will find it is absolutely in order.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, my disappointment is so great that I can hardly find words to give it voice. We have great respect for the Minister of Marine, but I was under the impression that he was a real fighter, a man who would stand up for his convictions. He leaves his native land for the land of the toreador, for the land of The Kid from Spain, to represent this country at an international radio conference. When a minister is away he still has in large degree the responsibility of his department. There may be an acting minister, but an acting minister is rather a dummy; he is there to look after the routine work. I have heard the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) say that no decision would be made before the return of a full minister—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. POULIOT:—of a department, even though the department was in charge of an acting minister. I am afraid that because of what the acting minister has done, the minister must be considered as a fooled minister. I am very sorry about this. There is also a constitutional point to be considered. After the full minister had been told of what had happened, he should have offered to resign from the cabinet because an important step had been taken and an important decision arrived at without authorization from him. This decision was made and what he should have done was to go to the Prime Minister and tell him that he had to choose between either the full or the acting minister, that one of them must resign. But the minister did not do this, and I cannot understand why. But as everything is all right, according to the hon. gentleman, as he wishes to hide nothing from us, will he be good enough to tell us how it is that La Patrie got that licence? May I tell him that I said nothing against La Patrie. They have their views. I respect even the views of the Minister of Marine; I respect the views of everybody. I do not complain of the fact that the licence was granted to La Patrie; I complain of the way in which it was given. Will the minister be kind enough not to say that I object to the licence being given to La Patrie? Would he tell us the inside story of the matter? Who recommended that the licence be granted? Was it Senator Webster, who travels around the world while people pay so dearly for coal in Montreal and other parts of Canada? Is it that powerful man who had that done in the absence of the minister? Was it done by the substitute of the minister while the latter was absent? Will the minister be kind enough to tell us that?