

C.B.C.—is money collected from the public. At least \$80 million of public money is used to support the C.B.C.

What is the answer? We are all concerned about censorship. We are all interested in the preservation of freedom of speech, but I am convinced that no one in this chamber, and extremely few Canadians throughout the land, have any interest whatsoever in the proliferation and perpetuation of this kind of license.

Honourable senators, is there an answer? I suggest there must be an answer. An old maxim which has governed our affairs for many years is that there shall be no taxation without representation. The public is being taxed to provide the money for these programs. Is the public not then entitled to be represented in the determination of the broad policy of the kind of program that is offered to them and their children, as well as to their friends?

I suggest that this is not in any way a question of censorship of the whole broad spectrum of presentation of ideas to the public in a literary form, newspaper form, or pictorial form. I suggest this is an area in which the Canadian people are themselves assuming the responsibility of perpetrating a degree of license that no other television system anywhere else in the world tolerates.

This is us, honourable senators; it is our money, it is our decision whether or not to allow this to continue. I suggest there should be a protest made from this chamber to those who are in positions of responsibility in the C.B.C. We should say to them, "Now, stop!" There is no sense in arguing about the hierarchy, the chain of command in the C.B.C. This argument has gone on and on and has appeared in the front pages of the press. The people responsible for the previous program which offended many Canadians are gone, and they have been superseded by another group which, in my judgment—if it is worth anything—is worse.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Why are they not prosecuted by the police?

**Hon. Mr. Grosart:** I have no responsibility, Senator Roebuck, and I do not think it is a matter of breach of the law. Maybe they are not breaking the law.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Oh, they are.

**Honn. Mr. Grosart:** I do not know. Perhaps under our law it is allowed in a public medium to discuss publicly the kind of matters that were discussed in this program, questions with tongue in cheek about the most intimate

relationships, and not the kind of relationships between men and women, or men and men, or women and women, that anybody would be proud of.

Is it a matter for the police? I think not. I think it is a matter for the whole Canadian community. If Canadians generally do not care, are not aroused, if they want this to go on, I for one do not protest; but I do not believe the Canadian people want this kind of thing to be repeated.

In my position at this moment, it is difficult to say how a formal protest might be made from this chamber. I would like to leave that for the consideration of the Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Connolly, Ottawa West). He has spoken strongly on the subject. If there is a way in which this chamber can go on record within the rules tonight as calling for action to prevent a repetition of that C.B.C. program last night, then I would hope that somehow he will find that way.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

On motion of Hon. Mr. White, debate adjourned.

## DIVORCE

### RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of Resolutions numbered 831 to 890 inclusive, which were presented on November 16.

**Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck,** Chairman of the Standing Committee on Divorce, moved the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolution 831, for the relief of Joan Brais Corbeil.

Resolution 832, for the relief of Joyce Elaine Harrison Baril.

Resolution 833, for the relief of Mabel Florence Long Abbott.

Resolution 834, for the relief of Margit (Margot) Gleisberg Simon.

Resolution 835, for the relief of James Robert Perry.

Resolution 836, for the relief of George Davis Forde.

Resolution 837, for the relief of Terry Grace Alberta Lewis Hanson.

Resolution 838, for the relief of Estella (Estelle) Agnes Prevost Brooks.

Resolution 839, for the relief of Helen Frances Holmes Blackmore.

Resolution 840, for the relief of Esther Colette Marie Rose Elizabeth Giroux Le-