

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): No; I try to be accurate in what I say. I know *The Economist* is not socialist, but I am speaking of *The New Statesman*, and that is socialist. A writer in that journal referred to a certain decision made by the B.B.C. to keep a certain man off the air, for reasons which I will not go into.

Mr. GILLIS: You are not quoting the article. If you are going to quote it put it on the record. You are only commenting on it.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I will quote the part which I wish to quote. The hon. member can check it up in *Hansard* of last Saturday. The writer, commenting on the incident in question, made this statement:

I believe in competition in the things of the mind.

I believe those are the right words. At any rate, the hon. gentleman can find the quotation given accurately last week.

Mr. GILLIS: Is that an editorial opinion?

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): This writer said, "I believe in competition in the things of the mind." That was in a column which appears regularly, and to the best of my belief it represents the views of *The New Statesman*. There is nothing to indicate that it does not, and I explained all that on Saturday last. By that statement, I take it, they meant that it was desirable that no one body should have complete and exclusive access to means of propaganda which has such unbounded powers as the air now has. To me, the argument that is stronger than any other is that so expressed by this writer. To quote what was said fifteen years ago, in the light of all that has happened in the intervening years, is simply meaningless, because, I suggest, the argument which I have just quoted, in the words of that writer in *The New Statesman*, far outweighs all the others. That is the strongest argument in my opinion for accepting the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and allowing the matter to stand along with the other items in the bill until we can deal with them all together next session.

What is the reason for the urgency? I cannot find anything in all this debate that indicates any urgency. I have already indicated the suggestion of the hon. member for Calgary West that the matter should stand until next session. I do not believe there is any difficulty in the way of that proposal. If work needs to be begun—

[Mr. Gillis.]

Mr. McCANN: May I interrupt the hon. gentleman to say that there is great difficulty, because equipment is ordered and will be here this fall.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I am surprised that the minister should say that, because apparently the hon. member for Calgary West had an entirely different idea, and I assume he did not get it out of the air. He says:

You have already your material on order for the stations you intend to build. You know you cannot get it yet, but the time will come when this material can be obtained. So why not let this matter rest? Remember that all the Alberta members—I am glad the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) is not here because he might not concur—at all events, all of us who are here will agree that we do not want this thing.

But if that is not so, and there is danger of time being lost, the private stations say they will do it and, as I said, you have plenty of power over them, so you need not be afraid.

I am going to tell the committee what I think is the real reason for this, and this is a reason which I submit most earnestly to hon. members. I think the reason is—and I say this with all due respect to the C.B.C.—that the C.B.C. feel that now is the time to get this power, and they do not want to delay. They do not want to run the risk of any further consideration, and perhaps by next session a different view arising, a view whereby perhaps we would decide that radio should be put in the same position as the railways, and that we should have two great institutions—which I think we should have—one national institution and one private institution.

At any rate, all I am asking is that we should use our time to look at this, and that we should not, in the dying moments of this session, and under the guise of voting an amount of money—take a step which will be irrevocable and which is so unfair to radio.

So I say again—and I am pleading as earnestly as I can—that no harm will come, and that if we debate this matter next January or February and reach the conclusion that we should follow the minister's advice and have state-operated, state-owned and state-controlled radio, then it will be all right with me. If that is decided by parliament, then I shall abide by it.

But what I point out is that if we are to decide on a vote to-night we shall come together next session and begin to talk about this, but by that time the private stations will be down the drain; the C.B.C. will have gone ahead, and everyone will say, "Oh, what's the use; it is all done? You are talking about water that has gone over the dam."