

the merits of the bill and listen to representations from officials, if the government is to oppose the committee's recommendation?

There has been some reference to the lawyers on the committee. My honourable friend opposite is always joking about lawyers, but if he got into trouble he would run to a lawyer faster than anybody else. In fact, he would hire a taxi to get to the lawyer's office at the earliest possible moment.

**Hon. Mr. Beaubien:** Do you mean me?

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Yes, that is just what you would do.

I certainly cannot be accused of not attending committee meetings. This session I have not missed a single meeting of any committee of which I am a member, and in every instance I have sat right through the meeting, except perhaps when someone sent for me and I had to step out for a short time. I say that without fear of challenge. But what is the good of sitting on a committee for two or three hours, examining witnesses and studying a bill thoroughly, if we are to have the experience that we have had here today? The amendment that the committee reported was moved by a senator who belongs to the same party as that of the government in power and it was carried by a majority of members of the same party, yet the leader of the government gets up in this chamber and asks that the amendment be not concurred in.

**Hon. Mr. Beaubien:** What would be the use of this chamber if it could not reject a committee amendment when deemed necessary?

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Don't worry; I will get to that. You don't need to hurry me at all. I could understand that the leader of the government might feel it desirable to challenge the committee amendment if it were directly contrary to government policy, but that is not the case here. The government had already inserted into the bill an amendment making possible appeals to the Exchequer Court on any question of law arising out of the making of an order by the C.B.C. for the suspension of the licence of a private station, and the committee's amendment simply struck out the words which would limit appeals to questions of law.

I agree entirely, as any lawyer would, with what has been said by the senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck). Here is the situation. The C.B.C. regulations prohibit anyone from broadcasting over the air a statement prejudicial to any

race or religious creed. If any station disobeyed that order its licence would be subject to cancellation, but the C.B.C. has never yet cancelled a licence. That is what the record shows.

**Hon. Mr. Howard:** That is a good record.

**Hon. Mr. Lambert:** There has not been a case justifying cancellation.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Therefore this subsection (7) must be intended to apply to some other order. Remember, regardless of what appeals are made under this subsection, the Minister has the right to cancel a licence if he sees fit.

**Hon. Mr. Howard:** Certainly.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** There is no question about that. He has discretionary power to cancel the licence of a station without a recommendation from anybody.

Let me illustrate the effect of the committee's amendment. Suppose the C.B.C. ordered the suspension of the licence of a private station in Montreal, alleging that the station violated some regulations. There would not be much difficulty in establishing the facts before the court. A copy of the script that was used would be available, and it could easily be shown that the broadcast was made. There would be no difficulty in establishing the facts.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Or the regulation.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** No. It would not be like an action for libel or slander, where a judge has to hear a lot of witnesses and decide who is telling the truth and who is lying. There would be no difficulty of that kind at all, for all the evidence would be on hand.

Those of us who voted for this amendment in committee think that it would make the C.B.C. a little more careful before cancelling a licence, and provide for a fairer basis of appeal in any case where a licence was cancelled. Of course, the C.B.C. can refuse to renew any licence at the end of the year; and, as I have said, the Minister can cancel a licence out of hand at once. Furthermore, I cannot imagine that a Judge of the Exchequer Court would allow an appeal if the Minister thought that the continuation of a licence to a certain station was against public policy. And I have such confidence in the Minister that I feel sure he would suspend the licence of any station which broadcast a statement prejudicial to people of any race or colour. For instance, suppose a certain station broadcast that coloured men should not be employed in a certain industry. I believe that, no matter what any judge might say, the Minister would