

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

had in Washington with Senator Mansfield of Montana.

I went down to see Senator Mansfield to find out one or two things from him. I wanted to know, for instance, whether it was correct that at some point in the proceedings the Americans were prepared to drop the Libby project from the treaty. Senator Mansfield made no bones about it. He said: I told them on more than one occasion that I was quite prepared to drop my demands for the Libby dam if that was the price we had to pay for the treaty. This, in spite of the fact that the Libby dam was, as he said, extremely important to him politically as the senator from Montana, the state in which the dam would be situated. It indicated something else to me. It indicated that the Americans are much more in need of this treaty than Canada is, and to have gone into the bargaining room under the impression that the Americans had to be coaxed to come here was a piece of infantile nonsense and a complete misreading of the situation facing the United States today both with regard to their water requirements and with regard to their requirements in the field of flood control. I am convinced that had we been represented by more resolute and, perhaps, better equipped negotiators it might have been possible to have returned with a treaty which would protect the rights of Canada much more effectively than this document does. May I call it ten o'clock?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I wonder if I could suggest to the hon. gentleman who is making a very interesting speech, although he would not expect me to say that I agreed with it, that he continue his remarks until they are completed? Perhaps we could allow the hon. member to go on until half past ten?

An hon. Member: No, they are on a filibuster.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): No, I am not going on tonight, thank you.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: May I ask if we are continuing with the Columbia river debate tomorrow, and what is the prospect for Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. MacNaught: Tomorrow we will go on with the Columbia treaty question, and if it is finished we will take up the second reading of the measure to amend the National Housing

Act. If that should be finished tomorrow we would then take up the second reading of the measure to amend the Export Credits Insurance Act. But if it is not finished until Monday, the second reading of the act to amend the National Housing Act will be followed by consideration of the measure to amend the Farm Credit Act.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

(Subject matter of questions debated under adjournment motion.)

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved:

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—LEGAL ACTION RESPECTING PROGRAM "TWENTY YEARS LATER"

[Translation]

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, on May 21 last I directed the following question to the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne) who is responsible for the C.B.C.:

Does the minister intend to recommend that the government take legal action against the C.B.C. following the program "20 ans Express" presented on Saturday, May 9, which was an insult to religion and which questioned the value of religious teaching in Quebec?

Mr. Speaker, following that broadcast, I received several letters of protest—

An hon. Member: How many?

Mr. Pigeon:—including that of Mr. René M. Coderre of Joliette, who wrote an article in the May 13, 1964 issue of *L'Action Populaire*, from which I wish to quote a few extracts:

A recent program on CBFT (20 Ans Express, on Saturday, May 9) left us aghast.

Leading questions to the people interviewed gave the audience the impression that religion is on the way out in Quebec; the young would be about to lose their faith because their convictions are based on prohibitions and occasions of sin. Reportedly, religious teaching after grade school would be worthless. It would consist of a more subtle indoctrination carried out by teachers who place themselves at the level of their students and who hypocritically pretend to be on the side of our youth to instil them with the principles of a lost cause.

Mr. Coderre continues as follows:

Have we, Roman Catholic French Canadians, no pride; no company or political party would tolerate such a program without taking legal action against the responsible parties. And this is our public broadcasting, subsidized with our money, which