

*Supply—Secretary of State*

may not be either on account of a special occasion but it might come from something else such as, for instance, new ideas. All this is information, and nobody—neither the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) nor the C.B.C.—can forget it. All these factors must be taken into consideration for that is what makes the news.

• (9:10 p.m.)

For example, when a new power group scores a success, as did the Ralliement Cr ditiste in 1962; when a party holds a convention, as the Conservatives did last year and the Liberals will this year; when a special event occurs, such as the crisis of last February 19—all this makes news of various degrees of importance and coming from various sources. It allows each particular group to come into the limelight at one time and recede into the shadows at another time. That is normal.

What I find abnormal is that a director general—I do not remember his exact title—Mr. Marcel Ouimet, the general manager of the C.B.C., should send “secret and urgent” messages condemning the publicity given to the so-called “L vesque Gang”. I do not consider that as normal for several reasons.

First of all, the Independentists, as any other group, pay taxes. Furthermore, they are good news material, since they have something new to offer at a given time or period. They come up with new ideas as others could.

Secondly, the number of his appearances on television is considered as “secret”, although it has never been so for others. Why send a secret and urgent message to condemn the number of times that the name of Mr. L vesque has been mentioned, when no general investigation was launched to assess the publicity obtained by others on the basis of news they could represent and the circumstances under which they made the news? If instead of a secret and urgent message, a general investigation were launched by the C.B.C. services, on the number of times politicians have appeared, the circumstances under which they did appear and the sources of such news, perhaps then conclusions could be drawn other than those deriving from a mere interest in a specific ideology, the Quebec independence movement, caused by its novelty.

For a year, there have nevertheless been two members in Quebec and one in Ottawa.

**Mr. Caouette:** May I put a question to the hon. member?

[Mr. Gr goire.]

A few days ago, as all those who listened to the news on the national television network, I heard Mr. Pierre Bourgault twice airing his grievances against Mrs. Ferretti, vice-president of his group.

Does the hon. member think that can be called expressing ideas? Must the C.B.C. allow time for quarrels inside a party, between Mrs. Ferretti and Mr. Pierre Bourgault, for instance?

**Mr. Gr goire:** Mr. Chairman, I will give two answers.

I remember very well that when a former member of the Ralliement Cr ditiste, Dr. Guy Marcoux, left the party, the C.B.C. news service broadcast the ideas expressed by Dr. Marcoux, by the hon. member for Villeneuve, by myself and by another member of the Ralliement Cr ditiste.

Moreover, when the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) decided to sit as an independent Progressive Conservative member a week ago, he was allowed to explain the reasons of his decision and the causes of the division within his party.

The R.I.N. has called a conference which is to be held on March 30. This party has several thousands of members but it is divided. The supporters of both viewpoints have been allowed to air their views. I must point out that the R.I.N. receives much less publicity on the C.B.C. than the Liberal party can have now and this is understandable. It receives much less publicity than the Conservatives during their convention last September.

I think I have answered the question.

**Mr. Guay:** No.

**Mr. Gr goire:** The member for Villeneuve asked me if I could explain the matter and I said yes. He had two reasons. First, the R.I.N. convention is the object of as many comments as the Liberal convention taking place at this time and the one the Conservatives had, last September.

Second, that quibbling has been explained over the news, just as all other quibblings that have taken place.

These are but two examples.

**Mr. Guay:** Bourgault is not a member of the house.

**Mr. Gr goire:** That does not make any difference. It is a political movement that has its justification.