

Supply—Transport

appointments of the Canadian National directors. We did not regard political faith as being the paramount qualification for appointment or continuance in office. I was very surprised that a man such as Carlyle Allison should have been given such cavalier treatment. He was a man who understood the business. He had been in it for quite a number of years. Now he has gone. Today there is a vacancy.

Since this government came into office the recommendations of the B.B.G. have not always been followed. We in the previous Conservative government followed their recommendations whatever they were. Therefore I say to the minister: What are his views on this application? The minister endeavoured to evade the whole matter by saying that he, in his shining armour of Canadianism, was doing his part to preserve channel 3 for Canada. Channel 3, Mr. Chairman, cannot go to the United States. The statement by the minister was simply a red herring designed to cover up—

Mr. Pickersgill: The right hon. gentleman will find nowhere in anything I said any statement that channel 3 could go to the United States.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I see.

Mr. Pickersgill: I said that it could be lost to Canada. I did not say it could be lost to the United States.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is not my exact recollection.

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps the right hon. gentleman would let me finish.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I have got the floor.

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes. I apologize to the right hon. gentleman.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Pickersgill: I apologize to the right hon. gentleman. I know how allergic he is to facts.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I certainly am allergic to the subterfuges posing as facts that come from the hon. gentleman. I am allergic to that. I know his capacity with words and I say to him that if he did not use the actual words I attributed to him he left the impression that channel 3 might be lost to the United States. I, for one, want to see that what is Canada's remains Canada's. The United States should not get channel 3.

Mr. Pickersgill: I never said that.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: I see. That excuse goes by the board. In 1952 an international agreement was reached between Canada and the United States covering the allotment of television channels. I ask the minister this: Has the minister already secured from the Federal Communications Commission in Washington its consent to channel 3 being disposed of to Snelgrove and associates? Has the minister been in communication with the F.C.C.? I should like some information on that. I have a file on the matter but I want to find out what the minister is going to do in this regard. Has he not in the course of this debate come to the conclusion that all is not well in this field? Surely he has, if he is not allergic to facts.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is nothing but an endeavour on the part of Snelgrove and his associates to secure their reward for the contributions that they made from September on in particular. I ask: What is the view of the minister as to the award of this channel to Mr. Snelgrove and his associates? The minister has shown every sign of not being affected at all by it. Is he, after all, allergic to facts? Is that his position? Why does he not come before the house and make clear, after listening to all the arguments, what his views are?

Sir, it is all very well to go before the B.B.G. but suppose the B.B.G. decides that it is in favour of this application. Is the government going to approve the recommendation? They did not in other cases. I ask the minister: Why is there any difference in the applications of Snelgrove and his associates?

The hon. member for Cumberland referred to a letter he had received from the Secretary of State. I make no apology for placing it on *Hansard* again. That letter dated January 25, 1966, from the Secretary of State to the hon. member for Cumberland reads in part:

As you are aware, the Board of Broadcast Governors has not proceeded with such applications at the request of the government while the question of providing alternative television service was under policy study.

The reference to applications is to applications for licences. The letter continues:

While, as you have noted, the government has now received the recommendations of the Fowler committee on this and other matters, it has not as yet had time to reach a decision.

That was on January 25, 1966. The letter then goes on:

Until such a policy statement has been worked out and announced, the B.B.G. presumably will continue to maintain its current attitude toward applications for the creation or extension of alternate T.V. service.