

by private interests in Canada which are only too ready to share it. I feel that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation can control television technically as a whole, just as the wave lengths of radio are controlled, but it is not practical from a business viewpoint for this country to say to one of its own agencies, "Here is \$30 million to spend over five years. Go ahead and develop television for the people of Canada". I am afraid that if the evolution in television service reflects the trend of centralization, power, and propaganda—if I may use that term—that has been evidenced in radio, it is not going to benefit Canada as a whole. Some of these points should be explored fully in an impartial and independent way in our committee. I should like to see our committee given as much time as possible to deal with this important subject.

Hon. J. G. Turgeon: Honourable senators, in rising to take part in this debate I am afraid I am going to make two or three remarks which may readily be called contradictory one to another. First of all, I am going to recommend that the supervision of private broadcasting stations should not be left directly in the hands of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I am going to further recommend that we give consideration to the setting up of another body consisting of either three or five members. A membership of three might be satisfactory, but I think five would be better, because of our two languages and the various cultures of the several racial origins which are found in different geographical areas of the country. In my opinion the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the C.B.C. should be *ipso facto* one of the members of this new body. I am going to suggest all this later as a definite recommendation for consideration.

Honourable senators, I agree with the honourable senior senator from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Lambert) that at this stage of the session it would be unwise to make any efforts to materially amend the legislation now before us. This legislation is based on the studies made by the Massey Commission—which I would commend for its splendid work—and by the committee of the other house. It has received the acceptance of the cabinet, which is a committee of parliament, and has been passed by the other place. The Senate has only a few hours now in which to deal with it and needless to say we cannot do this properly. My main purpose in rising is to throw out the suggestion which I have outlined as to a new body to supervise the action and conduct of private stations, and I hope

that this suggestion will come up for consideration in the next session of parliament, which I assume will commence in February of 1952.

Honourable senators, I am opposed in principle to the government—I was going to use the word "interfering", but that may not be the proper word—administering anything that is essentially not government business. I made this statement in 1936, when I was a member of the House of Commons committee under the chairmanship of the honourable senator from Provencher (Hon. Mr. Beau-bien), who is our Acting Speaker today which was studying the legislation to reorganize the C.B.C. I was afraid that if this reorganization were carried out it would not meet with success. In view of criticisms that have been made, I want to say that upon looking back to 1936, when the C.B.C. was established, I think the work done by that body has been extraordinarily good. I extend this reference of good work to each member of the Board of Governors and to all those responsible for administering the affairs of the C.B.C.

This does not mean, however, that every action taken by the C.B.C. has always found favour with me. I agree with what the honourable senator from Kennebec (Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt) said this morning. I do not know just what broadcast he was speaking about, but I know that there has been a discussion lately about broadcasts being directed against religion. I am in thorough agreement with the principle of free speech. I agree again with the honourable senator from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Lambert) that the theory or doctrine or whatever you wish to call it of free speech does not mean that the taxpayers of Canada who hold radio licences should have to pay for the opportunity of hearing opinions or doctrines with which the great majority of Canadians do not agree. I am not critical about what has been said by the various men and women whose names have been mentioned during the last few weeks of parliamentary discussion. I want to point out, though, that all the arguments made by the representatives of the Soviet Union against the free world are based upon two things: one is what they call capitalism, and the other is what they call religion. These are the two things that the communists are trying to destroy in this world. Therefore I would suggest that great care be exercised by those directing radio organizations, and particularly the public broadcasting corporation, as to statements that may be made along that general line.

I am not against free speech. Speaking in this chamber in the session of 1951 on the work of the United Nations, after I had had the honour of being one of the five official