

## Broadcasting

all of the article because at one particular point, it does not seem quite exact. I quote:

The C.B.C. has lost the strike. Did not the C.B.C., publish in the *Star* March 7, on the very day the official agreement was signed, an advertisement which was no doubt sent before a final decision had been reached, clamouring its opposition to all forms of trade union activity on the part of administrative personnel?

A comment in English is added here in brackets, about that article.

I quote:

(Text):

The C.B.C. has not changed its position of being against any form of management union.

(Translation):

After closing the brackets, the article continues as follows:

It can be surmised that on this point the government-owned organization had been under pressure by big business and had undoubtedly been "advised" by the political counsellors of the cabinet having connections with the magnates of industry and finance. If a C.B.C. representative can still maintain that a "professional union" of television producers, considered as being part of the managing staff, negotiating a collective bargaining agreement, and in a position to resort, if need be, to unbiased arbitration, does not constitute a management union, he should be returned to school.

To me this is nothing less than a charge, insinuating that there had been undue influence or pressure on the part of the political advisers of the cabinet alleged to have connections with industrial and financial magnates.

Mr. Speaker, I think the committee would do well to check up on this. I, for one, do not believe that any political influence was exerted during the strike either on C.B.C. or on the producers themselves. Of course, there was a march on Ottawa. At that moment, some pressure was brought to bear on the members, asking them to intervene, but I believe that, finally, everything was settled by the force of circumstances and by public opinion which, contrary to what might have been expected, I dare say, took little interest in the strike.

Mr. Speaker, let me again emphasize the absolute non-interference of the government which, to my mind, refutes and denies the charge laid in this article of the magazine *Relations*.

In that famous article I find another idea which I would like to bring to the attention of the committee. This part of the article reads as follows:

What is less known, but should be made known, is the shameful complicity of the Canadian Labor Congress in taking no effective means to see that justice be done, and that the C.B.C. recognize the right to establish unions. What was the reason for this? Many of its officials, being members of the C.C.F. party, felt that a government agency should not be made to lose face. Already political requirements are stifling union basic principles.

I will go further than the article. According to information I was able to obtain, I would say that the strike might have been secretly instigated by the labour movement just mentioned as a means of determining to what extent the government would intervene.

Possibly C.C.F. members within the labour movement did not wish the strike to spread across the country. But I think they made use of the strike by employees on the French network as a test, with the intention of organizing producers into a management union, as it was called then. I would like the committee to go closely into that matter also. Naturally, much was said about the strike at the time, but I think it would be good to investigate that angle.

Resolutions or suggestions have been sent to us concerning some inquiries that should be carried out by the C.B.C. or perhaps by the B.B.G. In any case, the committee to be set up could look into that.

Then, I suggest that the brief presented last July by the Canadian home and school and parent-teacher federation should be considered. Since one of these questions is of special interest to me, and in order not to take the time of the house, I shall read a passage entitled:

(Text):

Re Television Research.

Be it resolved that the Canadian home and school and parent-teacher federation strongly urge the board of broadcast governors to undertake comprehensive research into the effect of T.V. upon the minds and personalities of boys and girls.

(Translation):

Mr. Speaker, this question might be studied during the sittings of the proposed committee. It is not a matter of dictating its course of action but by going to the core of this question, possibly supplementary information can be found in that area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal with questions which may be of local interest or with cases picked at random which were brought to my attention and which deserve to be mentioned here, even though they may concern my region more particularly.

Before going into those cases, I should like to go back to an answer given to me by the C.B.C. about a news bulletin broadcast at nine o'clock p.m., May 15, 1959, concerning the Unemployment Insurance Act. I asked for a copy of that bulletin and I will tell you later