

Supply—Secretary of State

anything too controversial at this stage, but all this is because of the influence of an individual who is not a member of the house. The federal government has got itself into a pickle because it would not stand up and exert its authority on behalf of the people of Canada. As a result we have a few extra millions of dollars going into this monument to the mayor of Montreal.

Mr. Aiken: Are tenders being awarded for this job on a public tender call, or otherwise?

Mr. McIlraith: This particular item is a public works tender called in the regular way.

Mr. Aiken: Is there more than one job, or is it just part of one job?

Mr. McIlraith: There is more than one contract but it is one job. This item does not come under the corporation.

Mr. Aiken: Neither do I want to start raising a controversy at this point, but there is a great deal of concern at the manner in which tenders are being called in connection with the Canadian corporation for the 1967 world exhibition.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Id. Departmental administration including the expenses of the committee on broadcasting—to extend the purposes of Secretary of State vote 1 of the main estimates, 1964-65, to include the expenses of the committee on election expenses and the committee on feature films and to provide a further amount of \$145,000.

Mr. Coates: I read the speech made by the president of the C.B.C. which he made to an audience in Montreal recently, and in which he hoped the Fowler commission would recommend that the government give a ten year charter to the corporation. Has that commission been empowered to make such a recommendation?

Mr. Pickersgill: I cannot recall offhand the terms of reference which were tabled, but I will look up the matter and let the hon. gentleman have the information. But since that kind of recommendation was made in the original Fowler report, and as the commission was asked to comment on that report, it would be quite within its scope.

Mr. Coates: I strongly oppose that type of attitude shown by the president of the corporation, in making public speeches about what the commission should recommend. It should be a job for the commission itself to determine on the basis of plans and proposals put forward by the C.B.C.

[Mr. Howard.]

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Would the commission be dealing with matters such as censorship in the C.B.C.?

I refer to an instance where a clergyman, the secretary of the synod of the Presbyterian church in the maritime provinces, was cut off the air in Sydney, Nova Scotia, because he happened to be expressing a particular theological belief. He has forwarded copies of his text. Since I am not a theological student I would be glad to let the minister read this text for himself, but there is nothing in it to be found by me or by others who have read it which appears offensive to other denominations. However, the manager of radio station CBI cut this person off the air during the series known as "Plain Talk" on this radio station.

I have some questions on the order paper at the present time with reference to this series. As yet there has been no chance for an answer to be given, but this is a matter which I think should be brought to the attention of the committee and of the minister. Number 8 in this series of questions asked: "How much plain talk is allowed by the C.B.C. in their series "Plain Talk"? Apparently the manager of CBI does not believe in allowing freedom of speech. It seems that if whoever is speaking does not please the manager of the station he wants to cut them off.

I hold no brief for the Rev. Mr. Bean, who has written to me on this subject, nor do I have an animosity toward Mr. Kenneth Hill, the manager of the station. I do not know either of them. But it is a serious situation in this day and age when a man who speaks on the C.B.C. is not allowed to expound certain philosophies. In question number 9 of the series of questions I placed on the order paper, I asked:

In the past 15 months, apart from news columnist and broadcaster Gordon Sinclair, how many individuals have been allowed by the C.B.C. to expound the philosophy of atheism on their facilities?

Mr. Sinclair is a member of the C.B.C. backscratcher club, and it would seem that at any time he is able to boast on the air that he does not believe in God. Surely, then, we can allow Catholic priests, Presbyterian clergy, rabbis and others to express their philosophy without the manager of a radio station cutting them off on the ground—in this case, at least—that what was said was offensive to other religious denominations.

To be fair to Mr. Hill, I should like to quote from the *Cape Breton Post* of March 31, 1965: