

standing committees in question. I think that the Committee on Transport and Communications and the Committee on Banking and Commerce have been identified with some of the most important legislation which has been brought before parliament during many years past. The outstanding feature of my first session in the Senate, 1938, was the handling of the Transport Bill by the Standing Committee on Railways, Telegraphs, and Harbours, as it was then known. The work of that committee had a great deal to do with the final outcome of that matter. As to the relationship of the provinces to these very important national matters, I do not need to refer senators back farther than to 1903, when the Railway Act came into existence; or to 1922, when there was a very important development over the Crowsnest Pass Agreement. I think that the Turgeon Report, with its recommendation for zonal rates and the possibility of completely changing transportation economics in this country, introduces once more that feature of provincial concern in whatever action we may take. It seems to me that to reduce the number of members of the Transport and Communications Committee at this time would be to suggest very definitely that the Senate is relinquishing its active interest in the very important subject-matter that has been assigned to this committee in the past.

I have no objection at all to the proposed reduction in membership of the other two committees—the Committee on Finance and the Committee on External Relations—because I do not think that they are in the same class at all as the Transport Committee, from the point of view of subject-matter or of historical record.

As to the bill which will be brought down, first in the other house, to implement the Turgeon Report, I regret very much that the government, which is responsible for the procedure in parliament as a whole, could not have seen its way clear to refer the matter to a joint committee before bringing down the bill. That could have been easily done. This proposed amendment of the Railway Act to make it fit in with recommendations of the Turgeon Report will be, I suppose, the most far-reaching and vital measure that the representatives in parliament have had to deal with for many a year, and I think that for the purpose of keeping public opinion informed on the matter we should have proceeded through a joint committee. The Turgeon Commission, which held sittings over a period of nearly three years, followed court practice with respect to the presentation of material to it. That is, only lawyers were allowed to appear before the commission. Agricultural, labour, manufacturers and other

organizations, for instance, were not permitted to make representations except through legal counsel. It is no secret that that procedure created a certain difference of opinion while the commission was sitting. My point is that full opportunity should now be given to all sections of the country to present their views and suggestions on the Turgeon Report to a committee comprising representatives of both houses. I say it is particularly important that the Senate, because of its historical connection with the development of transport legislation in this country, should be represented on the committee.

One other matter that has come into my mind while I have been thinking about the work of the Transport Committee is the prospect of establishing a new and larger field for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. While no bill has so far been brought down to deal with the subject, we have at least the prospect of mass communications. In the past the jurisdiction of the Board of Transport Commissioners in matters of communication has been limited largely to telegraphs, but I am assuming that whatever development is undertaken in radio and television will come under the head of mass communications, and may be—of course, I do not know whether it will be—brought under the jurisdiction of the Transport Board. That is something about which we can express an opinion when the legislation comes before us. I wish to say now that I do think our Committee on Transport and Communications should deal with this whole question of radio and television.

And here again I feel that, having in mind the public reaction to these things, the government would be greatly benefited if a joint committee of both houses were to consider the question. We all know something of what is involved in this—a suggestion of a larger and more extensively subsidized form of communications through the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; but I do not believe that the people of the country have begun to appreciate all that is involved in the setting up of a tremendous state organization in this field. There is of course already a state organization for broadcasting, but the proposal is to add to its powers over television and radio communications. Nothing but good would have resulted from the appointment of a joint committee, where public reactions to the government's proposals could have been studied.

I have made these remarks in an endeavour to emphasize the distinction that I see between the Committee on Transport and Communications and the other two committees mentioned in the motion. My suggestion