

law. The law has already been taken care of by giving complete authority to the board to exercise its judgment in the case of violation of regulations.

One or two senators in the course of their remarks referred to "cranks" on the air. Let me remind the leader opposite, for one, that it is the "cranks" that make the machine go round. It is men with ideas that differ from our own who provoke thought and bring about progress. It seems to me that when the C.B.C. is no longer a fit subject for criticism because we agree with everything that comes over the air, it will then have run its course and it will be time that it was abolished. When criticism ends, thought stops. When C.B.C. programs are restricted to those which have universal appeal, they certainly will be colourless and useless. I think it was Tennyson who uttered words to the effect that he is all fault who hath no fault at all. Certainly that would apply to broadcasting. As soon as anybody can feel sure that when he turns on the radio he will hear only a voice with which he agrees, the time for turning on the radio will have gone by.

It is very difficult to know what should go on the air. It is not enough to keep within the law; one must always keep within good judgment and realize that he has a franchise to the ears of the thinkers and listeners all over Canada, and must give them, not necessarily that with which they agree, but certainly that which is not profane, or immoral; which, to use the words of one of the speakers this morning is not anti-social. But for goodness' sake, let us not put a ban on the cranks; they are the ones who stir us into action.

Hon. L. M. Gouin: Honourable senators, I have listened with great attention to the remarks which have been made on this very important bill. First of all, I wish to join in the protests which have been made today by my fellow senators from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) and Churchill (Hon. Mr. Crerar) and, I believe, last week, by the leader of the opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig), concerning the fact that these important measures come to us by the truckload—so to speak—at the very end of the session. I think that this system, or absence of system, is one of the factors which, sorry as I am to have to say it, tend to discredit this house in the eyes of the public. All of us are put in a humiliating position when we have to stand up suddenly and approach so momentous a question as, for instance, the very nature of the rights of those who are interested in broadcasting, the private stations and the state-owned radio.

Two suggestions have come to my mind concerning the possibility of adopting some procedure which would put us in a more favourable position to do full justice to the subject of these various government bills

which reach us only in the dying hours of the session. The honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity, whom I greatly esteem, has made a suggestion which surely deserves consideration, that at the beginning of the session the Senate should take a fairly long recess, and that at the end of the session we should remain on watch, maintaining our vigil as long as is necessary. However, in all fairness to our colleagues who live at a great distance from Ottawa, those who are neither from the Queen City of Canada nor the metropolis of Montreal, it must be remembered that they would be greatly handicapped if they were obliged to come here for the opening of the session and then return to the west coast or the east coast or some other distant place. Personally I am inclined to think that what, under the very able leadership of our colleague from Churchill (Hon. Mr. Crerar), we did concerning the budget is the only practical solution. For instance, if the subject-matter of Bill 17 had been referred to the Finance Committee at any appropriate date during the session, it would have been possible for the members of that committee, or others who wanted to attend its meetings, to get a much better picture of the subject than the one I myself have just now. I am more or less like a lawyer who at the very last moment is entrusted with a case and has to plead it. So I make these remarks fully realizing that I cannot do justice to this very difficult subject.

On the vital question of the nature of the rights of those who exploit private broadcasting stations, which we have just heard discussed by the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity, may I first say that I am not personally interested in any station, so that I am able to express freely what my conscience requires me to say on the subject. As an example of these private enterprises, consider what I would call an historical broadcasting station, CKAC Montreal. Let there be no doubt about it that this station and others like it enjoy the support and sympathy of the French-speaking public. All I know about the actual ownership of CKAC is that according to my information, it is the property of *La Presse* newspaper. I do not argue that the owners have a legal vested right in the channel used, but—and I say this sincerely, and not merely in compliment to our colleague, the honourable senator for Repentigny (Hon. Mr. DuTremblay)—this station has been giving exceedingly satisfactory service to our French-speaking public; we regard it as a national institution, and it is listened to with the greatest attention and satisfaction by great numbers of working people in such areas of Montreal as St. Henri, my own native constituency of St. James, and the northern part of the city. For these