

Mr. DURANLEAU: —and he must have received sound reasons.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, my mind is not satisfied. The hon. minister is a very able and prominent lawyer, and in that capacity he has evaded the question. I have listened with great interest to what my hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power) has said, and my curiosity has been aroused even further. Since my hon. friend the Minister of Marine has spoken; I will tell you why, and tell you very candidly. The hon. member for Quebec South has shown great earnestness and great sincerity in praising the minister. He says: I do not complain about the fact that it has been given to *La Patrie*. We do not object to it; *La Patrie* may deserve it. It is not the fact that the licence was granted that we object to; it is the way in which it was granted. English is not my native tongue, and it is not the native tongue of the hon. Minister of Marine, but I express myself as well as I can; I could repeat the same thing in French or in Latin if you prefer. The point, the crucial point in this discussion, is this: Why on earth was it given under such circumstances?

Mr. DUFF: Not on earth; in the air.

Mr. POULIOT: No, it was given on earth to be used in the air. Let me quote the old Latin maxim so often memorized by members of the bar of such eminence as my hon. friend: *Quis, quid, ubi, cur, quibus auxiliis, quomodo, quando?* How was it given? Why? What was the *raison d'être* of granting it? What was the reason of the granting of that licence? That is the point. As the hon. minister of Marine smiles, I am sure he has understood the exposition of the facts.

There is another reason why I am very curious. My mouth watered when I listened to my hon. friend from Quebec South. Now I feel more eager after having listened to the minister, and why? The reason is very simple; it is that he said there was nothing wrong with the granting of the licence. If there was nothing wrong why does he not tell us the whole truth? Why does he conceal something, and leave something in the shade? If there was anything wrong he would be ashamed of what has been done, but if everything is all right he has no reason to be ashamed. He has done no wrong; he is like the king, who can do no wrong. Why then does he not tell us what happened? This is just as fascinating as a detective story.

Let me give the minister some pointers. The acting minister was the principal in granting the licence, while the present min-

ister was an accessory, but now the minister is responsible; he is the principal. We do not doubt the motives that inspired the granting of that licence, but in order that we may have no reason to be suspicious let him speak openly, tell us the whole truth and hide nothing. Be fair with us; tell us everything about the granting of that licence and perhaps we will agree that everything has been all right. Until the minister does give us all the details, however, it will be impossible for us to agree that everything is in order.

Mr. CASGRAIN: In order that there may be no doubt as to what took place I think it would be well to read to the house the questions asked by my hon. friend from Quebec East and the answers given by the minister, which appear in *Hansard* for this session at page 1915. These were the questions and answers:

Mr. Lapointe:

1. Since the coming into force of the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act, 1932, how many licences for broadcasting stations have been issued, to what persons or corporations were they issued, and where are those stations located?

2. Were any of such licences issued for new stations, and if so, to what persons or companies and on what dates?

3. When were the members of the radio board appointed and when were they sworn in as commissioners?

Mr. Duranleau:

1. One; issued to *La Patrie Publishing Company, Ltd.*, of Montreal; station situated at 180 St. Catherine street east, Montreal.

2. Yes; licence issued to the *La Patrie Publishing Company, Ltd.*, on the 28th October, 1932.

3. They were appointed October 5, 1932; the chairman and the vice-chairman were sworn in on October 31, 1932; the third member of commission sworn in on January 18, 1933.

To-night we have had the whole situation explained by the hon. member for Quebec East, the hon. member for Quebec South and the hon. member for Témiscouata; we understand exactly what took place in connection with the granting of the licence to *La Patrie Publishing Company* of Montreal. The commission had been appointed, but just before the commissioners took office this licence was issued. Why was that done? Clearly it was done for a political motive; evidently the government were not sure that the commission, after it came into existence and began to function regularly, would grant the licence under the conditions which existed. We know who is behind this newspaper in Montreal; everybody knows it. Everyone knows that this is a Tory newspaper in the broadest and largest sense of the word; there is no doubt about it. I think it is plain that