

*Motions for Papers*

irrelevant at this time to comment on certain other expenditures made by the C.B.C. which perhaps would give us a point of reference from which to consider the payments made to these professors concerning which papers are being asked for. Later I shall deal with the question of whether or not I feel the papers should be produced.

At times it is easy to agree with the hon. member for York-Humber but at other times it is perhaps a little more difficult. Concerning the question of the C.B.C.'s expenditures, I feel it would be impossible to expect any given program presented by the C.B.C. to delight or excite all the people of Canada. A sports program is of interest to some while others prefer the news. Some prefer one type of music, others prefer another. It would be unreasonable to expect all programs to please all people. Even if we take people with similar tastes in that they prefer sports, we may find that some may consider a particular television sports program to be very good while others find it to be of no interest or even distasteful.

The C.B.C. spends what would appear to be considerable amounts of money on television and radio programs. It brings in controversial figures over long distances and in some cases pays them for their appearance. Yet there are vast areas of Canada, particularly in the Canadian north, where the people rely for English language broadcasts on Radio Moscow in order to receive world news. There are also vast areas in Canada which are not covered by any Canadian radio service, nor are they covered by Canadian or any other television.

I suppose that the evaluation of the amounts paid to these two professors who appeared on the C.B.C., and who of course could not be heard in the areas which the C.B.C. does not reach, is to assist us in considering whether or not it is right that many Canadians do not have the privilege of receiving C.B.C. broadcasts, whether we consider the content good or bad. One sometimes wonders whether, if we did not have the C.B.C., we would not have to create it.

The question which comes to my mind is whether, if we do make public the amount paid to these individuals, we will really be in a position to say that it was too little or too much. Of course these amounts will have to be compared with the amounts paid the same people for other services in other areas. They will also have to be compared with the amounts paid to other people appearing on or performing services for the C.B.C. To decide

whether or not these amounts are justified we would have to consider the opinions of the people who have seen or heard the performances of these two gentlemen and perhaps get an evaluation of whether they were overpaid or underpaid. Of course there is always the possibility they were not paid at all.

● (6:30 p.m.)

I should like to quote from another book in which these two gentlemen took a part in the authorship. The book is entitled, "The Modern Era" and was written by John C. Ricker, M.A., John T. Saywell, Ph.D. and Elliot E. Rose, M.A. It is a historical book and I give this reference so that hon. members who may wish to pursue their interest in these particular authors can consider some of the points which have been raised by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) concerning their attitude toward the communications media. The introduction to this book reads, in part, as follows:

The years from 1900 to 1914 form a distinct period in the history of Great Britain, the United States and Canada. In its own way, each country passed during these years from the old world of the nineteenth century to the modern era. At the beginning of the period, Great Britain was a mature industrial nation with a vast empire; yet she had passed the peak of her power and faced "a time of troubles" at home and abroad. The United States was just emerging as a powerful industrial nation, young and confident, rough and untamed, and was embarking on an empire-building experiment of her own. In 1900, Canada first began to develop her rich heritage of natural resources in real earnest. Although still a colony, she was becoming conscious of herself as a nation. When the twentieth century began, each country had reached a different stage of national development. As a result, the specific problems each faced in the new century were different.

I turn now to page 379, where I read:

History is an unending process; today's newspaper headlines may be history tomorrow. At the same time many of today's headlines will never be important historically, while events that have been hidden in the back pages of our paper might be. In other words, many of the events that seem so important today may not be considered important ten years from now. It is difficult to determine the historical importance of events that have occurred close to our own times; yet looking back at the years between 1900 and 1960, it is possible to see some evidence of tasks completed, as well as of problems unsolved that remain for this generation.

One of the most striking developments in the modern era has been the alliance of the three English speaking democracies that border on the Atlantic Ocean. At the beginning of the century, the United States and Britain were divided. Canada was beginning to assert her independence of Great Britain and, during the Alaska boundary dispute and the election of 1911 on the reciprocity issue, showed her resentment against the United States. Yet in the face of dangers common to