

So I say, do not let us do this; there is no need of doing it. There is no emergency. It should be left to rest now, and the whole thing can be considered next session.

Mr. HANSELL: I wish to ask the minister a question with respect to the matter of time. Do I understand that a meeting was held in Washington—I believe it was in February of this year—in which the terms of the Havana agreement were extended until 1949? Is it not so that there was an interim agreement drawn up extending those terms? If that is so, why does the minister claim that they must start work on this by 1947, when we have until 1949 to do it?

If he persists in saying that they must start work in 1947, would he kindly tell me the article in the agreement which so states? I am not talking about the Havana agreement, but rather about the interim agreement drawn up in Washington last February.

While he is looking up that information, I should like to say one further word. This afternoon the hon. member for Cariboo delivered what I would call a colourful speech. I am not going to answer it—not because it is unanswerable. I will say only that he certainly is a past master at twisting that which other people say to suit his own argument. I shall leave it at that. I shall leave his speech and my speech on the record. I will leave it with people in Canada who know radio from the ground up; I will ask them to read those two speeches and I am willing to rest my case with those who know.

Mr. McCANN: The Havana agreement has been extended to 1949; but it is on the understanding that the channels which are given to Canada shall be occupied and completed by 1947.

Mr. HANSELL: My answer to that is that the channels are occupied now. I want to know what clause in the interim agreement says that the work must be started on them by 1947.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. BRACKEN: No.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I have one word to say. I do not wish to hold up the committee, but I would repeat that I see great danger in the monopolistic control we have at the present time. If we vote this money we shall make it worse. Not only that, but the situation to-day is detrimental to the future of radio.

We have, for instance, the matter of television; no one can get a licence for television. We have facsimile, but no one can

get a licence for facsimile. There are other enterprises going on, but no one can get licences for them.

It is just the same old story. Perhaps hon. members have heard about the dog in the manger. Well, he is here. The old dog in the manger sits over there. He will not let you do anything; that is that. That is the C.B.C. at the present time. I feel strongly about this matter, or I would not have moved the amendment.

Mr. HOWE: Don't cry about it.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Let them talk as they like; but there are many in the House of Commons who do not know anything about broadcasting. We see private enterprise willing and ready to go ahead with the development of radio for Canada; on the other hand, we see the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation jealous of its position. And the reason they are jealous is that the government of the day wants to keep controls for itself. I hope every hon. member who believes in free enterprise will vote for my amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. CASE: Don't be in too big a hurry. After all, I think we are all anxious to conclude the session. This is an item of considerable magnitude and the results would be far-reaching. As the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario has said, we are really determining policy; I believe that was admitted by the minister.

He has quoted from Viscount Bennett. I can say that I happened to be in a position where I was not a follower of Mr. Bennett, so that I do not necessarily approve what the minister has read. I am one of the newcomers to the Progressive Conservative party—

Mr. ABBOTT: Whom did you follow then?

Mr. CASE: I am over here as a matter of conviction. I certainly am not prepared to join with the minister when he suggests that we should remove the word "Progressive" from the name of our party. I believe all and sundry in Canada will recognize that we have progressive ideas. Among them is a means whereby we can preserve that one great measure of efficiency, and that is the old law of competition.

I am going to be brief, and say this—

Mr. ABBOTT: Take your time.

Mr. CASE: I thank the minister. I am glad I have his support.

I believe that the only method by which we can measure the standard of efficiency is