

Broadcasting

be withdrawn because he did so in another program in the absence of one of the members of another political party?

Mr. Winch: That is hardly a question.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me the hon. member is dealing with a matter which might properly be raised before the committee. In regard to the relevance of what has been said by the hon. member who has the floor, it is simply that here is a matter which might well be reviewed by the committee in its investigation of radio and television broadcasting, the subject matter proposed to be referred to it.

As I have said earlier in this debate and on previous occasions, and this was also said by my predecessors, the discussion of matters which will properly come before the committee is relevant only by way of illustration of the need for the committee, or the desirability or otherwise of proceeding with the committee. It can be argued either way. The motion is to set up a committee to review radio and television broadcasting.

I am not going to read the citations, but hon. members will find support for this view of the proper course of debate on a motion which is simply to set up a committee for a specific purpose in May's 16th edition at page 452; and instances where my predecessors in the chair have pointed out the desirability of hon. members restricting their examples as much as possible, and also the desirability of not attempting to do the work of the committee by roaming over the whole field, will be found in *Hansard* of 1955 for May 28, at pages 2441 and following pages, *Hansard* for January 27, 1953, at page 1366, *Hansard* for May 10, 1954, at page 4558, as well as the references I have made myself to the proper practice, as I see it, on a motion of this kind.

Mr. Drysdale: May I just speak on the point of order?

Mr. Winch: If it is a question; otherwise I have the floor.

Mr. Drysdale: I should like to speak to the point of order. I think the hon. member for Vancouver East is very fairly putting forth an important point and an important principle regarding freedom of speech. I think in essence the question is whether the board of broadcast governors is to rule on the matter of freedom of speech, or whether the program moderator is to do that. What I was seeking to bring to the attention of the hon. member for Vancouver East was another situation, which he has not drawn to the attention of the house, where the moderator himself withdrew one of the broadcasts. I wanted to obtain his comments on that particular proposition.

[Mr. Drysdale.]

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Well, the point I was making was that to debate the merits of the illustration, which has been chosen by the hon. member for Vancouver East was going beyond the scope of the debate. That is why I intervened.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, I was nearly at the end of my remarks. It was because of what was said the other day that I realized there were other examples, and I thought I was correct in giving only one example as to why I felt this matter was of such importance that it should be dealt with. The hon. member who has been asking a couple of questions undoubtedly can see, or has already accepted, the importance of this matter and the fact that I have tried to put it in a fair way. I therefore feel absolutely certain that he will support my contention with respect to the seriousness of the situation and the need for clarification of the matter before this committee, and the best possible guarantee given that a program, which has been on the air for 16 or 17 years without criticism, will not be taken off without the fullest investigation and a guarantee given of the maintenance of free speech and of public discussion of matters of concern of that nature.

(Translation):

Mr. Heward Graffley (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in support of this resolution providing for the setting up of a committee to deal with that corporation which, after having done so much for our country, will continue, I hope, its good work.

At the beginning of my remarks, I should like to stress the fact that having taken the floor is no indication that I intend to deliver a speech against or in favour of the C.B.C. I should like simply, Mr. Speaker, to discuss objectively a few particularly important aspects of the situation before the setting up of such a committee.

(Text):

I understand that under the rules, Mr. Speaker, when we speak on resolutions of this kind we should speak in general terms and, as you have just said, stick to the criterion of what constitutes the desirability of setting up such a committee.

This morning I want to speak very briefly on two main topics. The first topic I will discuss is simply the general desirability of examining crown corporations in committee. Second, I shall speak in very general and objective terms, and this is where I want to underline the fact that when I speak under the second heading my speech will not be anti anything or for anything. I simply want