

Mr. McCANN: Well, I can back myself up after I get through supporting you. The trouble is that the Conservative party show, by their whole attitude toward radio broadcasting, that they have repudiated the policies which were enunciated by a former prime minister and their former leader.

Mr. McLURE: What was your attitude in 1932?

Mr. McCANN: I have heard no announcement from the leader of the Progressive Conservative party with reference to their policy on radio broadcasting, and I suggest to them that they might well haul down their flag and delete from the hyphenated name the word "Progressive", because they are now no longer progressive as far as radio is concerned.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is a good stump speech, anyway.

Mr. McCANN: It is time the hon. member knew something about it.

Mr. MASSEY: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. McCANN: I would ask the hon. member to wait until I get through answering other questions. I am asked:

Did the C.B.C. force CFCN to sell C.B.C. \$158,473.44 worth of time for \$28,680.72?

The answer is, no.

Did the C.B.C. on April 18, 1946, notify CFCN that CFCN must give up CFCN's channel of 1010 kilocycles and that CFCN must take the channel 1060 kilocycles?

There is a double answer to that. They were notified that the 1010 frequency would be required, but they were not told they must take 1060. It was suggested to them that 1060 would be available for them as an alternative to the one they now hold, but the matter of another frequency might be canvassed and probably they would be given use of that. That notice was not sent by C.B.C.; it was sent by the Department of Transport.

Will displacement lose much revenue for CFCN?

No, I do not think it should lose any revenue for them. CFCN will still have the greatest coverage of any private station in the west, and should make money.

The hon. member for Lethbridge states how well they can hear the station at Watrous, Saskatchewan. What we want to do for Alberta is exactly the same thing as has been done for Saskatchewan—give them a high-power station which will provide complete coverage of the whole of that province, not

[Mr. Graydon.]

only the southern part, but it will be so situated that there will be complete coverage for the whole of Alberta.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Alberta can hear Watrous very clearly.

Mr. McCANN: Not all of it.

Mr. BLACKMORE: North of Edmonton they can hear it.

Mr. McCANN: That is the very reason we are putting in another high-power station in Alberta, namely, that we have had so many complaints from Alberta that, although in the southern portion of the province they can hear the Watrous station, in other parts of it they can not. In addition to that, we want to build up a chain of stations, one in Alberta, one in Manitoba, one in Saskatchewan, two in Ontario, one in Montreal, and the one we have in Sackville, to carry out the policy which was recommended by the Aird commission, the policy which has been endorsed by every radio committee which has sat and made inquiry from that day, to this.

This is not a matter of new policy with reference to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. This appropriation, let me say, is not a matter of a gift or a vote; this is a matter of a loan. A loan to whom? To the C.B.C. on behalf of the people of Canada, for whom they are trustees. And I want to tell the committee that we are dealing with people who have on former occasions borrowed money and have paid every cent of it. The C.B.C. does not owe the people of Canada one five-cent piece. We have made loans to them on former occasions and on every occasion that money has been returned.

Mr. CASE: Have they paid any taxes or fees or like charges such as private enterprise pays?

Mr. McCANN: They pay the same taxes as other public bodies do.

Mr. CASE: That is not an answer to the question.

Mr. McCANN: The hon. member himself knows the answer.

Mr. CASE: The answer is that they do not, and they should pay taxes.

Mr. McCANN: What this asks for is a loan, which will be repayable. All these discussions which have taken place upon the supplementary estimates might well have taken place had we gone ahead with the bill which was proposed and came to second reading. That bill was not dropped because