

## THE SENATE

Thursday, March 17, 1949

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

### EXCHEQUER COURT BILL

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE

**Hon. Elie Beaugard** presented the report of the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce on Bill N-2, an Act to amend the Exchequer Court Act.

He said: Honourable senators, the committee have, in obedience to the order of reference of March 15, 1949, examined the said bill, and now beg leave to report the same without any amendment.

#### THIRD READING

**Hon. Mr. Robertson** moved, with leave of the Senate, that the bill be now read the third time.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the third time, and passed.

### TOURIST TRAFFIC

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE

**Hon. Mr. Buchanan** presented and moved concurrence in the second report of the Standing Committee on Tourist Traffic, as follows:

Your committee recommend that it be empowered to inquire into and report upon the activities of the various agencies concerned with promoting tourist travel in Canada, and that the committee be authorized to send for persons and records.

The motion was agreed to.

### DIVORCE BILLS

#### FIRST READING

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine**, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Divorce, presented the following bills:

Bill R-2, an Act for the relief of Gordon Aylmer Thistle Shirres.

Bill S-2, an Act for the relief of Walter Jasper Blake.

Bill T-2, an Act for the relief of Margaret Murray McKinnon Trenholm.

Bill U-2, an Act for the relief of Walter Wilson McBroom.

Bill V-2, an Act for the relief of Mabel Florence Dunk Wright.

Bill W-2, an Act for the relief of Thomas Somerville.

Bill X-2, an Act for the relief of Joseph Wilfrid Leon Desrosiers.

Bill Y-2, an Act for the relief of June Lucille Odell Woolnough.

Bill Z-2, an Act for the relief of Christopher Edmond Cobham.

Bill A-3, an Act for the relief of Jack Zelinsky.

The bills were read the first time.

#### SECOND READING

**The Hon. The Speaker:** When shall these bills be read the second time?

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** With the leave of the senate, now.

The motion was agreed to on division, and the bills were read the second time.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** When shall these bills be read the third time?

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** With leave of the Senate, at the next sitting of the house.

### THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

On the Orders of the Day:

**Hon. Wishart McL. Robertson:** Honourable senators, you may recall that on Tuesday last I stated that it was my intention to table the North Atlantic Pact concurrently with its tabling and publication in the capitals of the various countries that are directly interested in it. I then supposed that this would occur tomorrow afternoon at 3 o'clock, in which event it would have coincided with our usual hour of opening. I am now advised that the pact will be made public in London at 8 o'clock tomorrow morning and that it will be tabled in the House of Commons at 11 o'clock; therefore, I desire to move that when the Senate adjourns today it stand adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m. Such a motion, of course, requires unanimous consent.

The motion was agreed to.

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Senate resumed from yesterday, consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's Speech at the opening of the session, the motion of Hon. Mr. Farquhar for an Address in reply therein.

**Hon. Athanase David:** Honourable senators, yesterday, in my desire to curtail my remarks and avoid becoming tedious to this house I omitted one observation which I believe has for the other provinces as much importance as the one I made concerning Quebec had for that province. It is this. When and if the day comes that Canada has the right to change her own constitution, no special constitutional right which has been conceded or granted to any province should be altered,

changed or abrogated without the express consent of the province to whom that right has been conceded. Such a provision would do something, I believe, for the good administration, the stability, even the prosperity of this country. Any right that is taken from a province, whatever it may be, creates unrest; and where there is unrest there is no stability; and where there is no stability there cannot be any prosperity.

These shall be my last words on the subject: my dream for Canada may be exaggerated, but I visualize her in years to come as one of the great nations of the world;—

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** She is now.

**Hon. Mr. David:** Well, she is not always treated as such, —and I believe that it is the duty of everyone today to prepare for this future, for though we may not see it, we can have the satisfaction during our lives of knowing that we have promoted it, and, in dying, the consolation of having assured it for our children and grandchildren.

I come now to another topic. No subject, I believe, has been more discussed in recent years than Communism. Speaking about it, I know, gives rise to certain difficulties, which I will note as I go on. I believe I cannot better commence these remarks than by quoting from a book written very recently by Eisenhower, entitled "Crusade in Europe." On page 476 the author states:

Volumes have been, and volumes will be, written on the collapse of world co-operation and true significance of the events that accompanied the tragedy. For us, all their words will amplify one simple truth. Freedom from fear and injustice and oppression will be ours only in the measure that men who value such freedom are ready to sustain its possession—to defend it against every thrust from within or without.

I should like to refer to a real Churchillian note and cite what Churchill—I do not refer to him as Winston Churchill because the name Churchill is sufficient—said in the House of Commons last year. It is this:

Democratic government is the worst form of government except those forms of all categories that have been tried from time to time.

We find in these remarks one of the best examples of Churchill's humour.

Honourable senators, how many communists are there in Canada? I believe the number is of very small importance when it is realized that Russia, with its six or seven satellites, and a total population of 250 or 275 millions, has no more than 25 or 30 million members of the Soviet party. Communism under Stalin is not so much an ideology or doctrine as a faith. I will not discuss the anti-religious campaign carried on in each of Russia's satellite countries under the direction

of Moscow. Every member of this chamber is familiar with that campaign and it is unnecessary to review it here.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** May I interrupt to ask my honourable friend a question? Did he use the word "faith"?

**Hon. Mr. David:** Yes, faith, "une foi". It is a religion.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. David:** Honourable senators would be right in asking if it is possible to give a definition of "communists" and "communism". I admit that this is pretty difficult. The only explanation given, even in the modern dictionaries, is that a communist is one who is a co-possessor or co-proprietor, and that communism is a doctrine that establishes co-proprietorship and co-possession. Well, we all know that communism today is not that at all. If I might venture an opinion, I would say that communism today is no longer what Marx and Engels contended it was, a little more than a century ago. Marx's ideology or doctrine passed through many channels of thought before becoming what Stalin made it in our times.

There was a time when great French statesmen declared in the Chamber of Deputies that free thought and anticlericalism were not exportable products. Evidently that is not the opinion of the Politbureau or of the Russian dictator, because the chief exports of Russia today are the communistic principles that she wishes to spread throughout the whole world. May I add that, in my own opinion, communism was formerly a doctrine that influenced politics, but today it is politics that influences a doctrine. The aim of communists is world domination, and they declare that to establish it they would go so far as to destroy and ruin our modern civilization and all forms of government that adhere to principles which are democratic, and which they consider to be inimical to their own.

If the foregoing can be accepted as a broad definition of communism and communists, then I would say that every communist, in whatever country he lives, is a person who, notwithstanding any oath of allegiance that he may have pledged to that country, still receives orders from Moscow and works day in and day out for the triumph of communism all over the world, and who to attain this objective is ready, first, to help in destroying constituted authority, and afterwards, the government itself in the country of his residence. If that be so, as I honestly and conscientiously believe it is, then every communist living in a democratic country today is a traitor to that country.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. David:** This seems to have been the thought of the honourable judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia who refused the appeal of Mr. Gordon Martin, an avowed member of the Labour Progressive Party, from the decision of the Benchers that, inasmuch as he could not take the oath of allegiance required of every lawyer, he was not a fit person to practise at the Bar. Here is a man who wanted to be a lawyer, but who cannot be admitted to the Bar because of his inability to take an oath of allegiance and respect it. Some persons might ask whether this was not an attempt to deprive a man of freedom. I shall come to this later.

It is quite unnecessary for me to point out that since the last war unrest, dissatisfaction and discontent have prevailed nearly all over the world—in countries that were military victors as well as in those that were vanquished—and it is to be feared that some considerable time must elapse before the necessary equilibrium is re-established in social, political and economic domains. Evidently there are many reasons for this; but I may point out that economics are dominated by politics, and that economic prosperity is an essential condition to political strength and stability. That is more important now than ever before, because in this twentieth century nations are so interdependent that political instability in any one country is felt not only by all classes of its own society, but probably by all classes in every other country. This I believe explains in part why clashes between classes have rapidly superseded international rivalries. This unrest and instability, together with perhaps a certain lack of orientation and a fearful hesitancy on the part of statesmen, makes all the easier the work of demagogues in persuading the working classes that they are still being exploited.

The "equality of man" is the enticing bait that the demagogues have used in the past, are using today, and will continue to use in the future among the millions who are dissatisfied with their lot in life. Envy is one of the last characteristics of humanity to die. The preachings and teachings of the doctrine of the equality of man, allied with envy and a desire to improve one's lot in life, account in certain measure, I seriously believe, for the risks taken by so many in their activities in the black market, in speculation, in fiscal evasion and in civil disobedience. The masses, claiming that they cannot obtain justice from others, have believed themselves justified in taking the law into their own hands. It is my opinion that that belief is the greatest element of disruption there is, and that it lies at the root of the total, absolute and complete lack of respect for authority, whether

moral, spiritual or governmental, which exists in the world today.

If this be true, I affirm without hesitation that disorders of the mind are even more serious and more to be feared than material disorders. When order, spiritually and morally, has been destroyed, do not look for it in the other domains, for it no longer exists. This was well known to Marx, Lenin and Stalin, and it is the reason why in every country one finds emissaries trying to create turmoil and unrest. Is it not true that one seldom finds hatred among a contented and satisfied people, but that it may be instilled into a discontented and dissatisfied people? This was the policy of Marx and Lenin, and it is now being continued throughout the world by Stalin twenty-four hours a day.

Honourable senators, I said a moment ago—though to you it may seem longer—that regardless of where the communist finds himself today he receives his orders from Moscow. Whatever may be his oath of allegiance to the country where he lives, the communist follows orders from Moscow, and cannot be anything but a traitor to his country of residence.

We need not go very far to find evidence of this. During the recent war Thorez fled from France to Russia; he did not want to fight; and he has recently declared that if there is a war the French will not fight against the Soviet Republic. A similar declaration was made in Italy by Togliatti, who has said that if the Russian armies enter Italian territory the Italians will not fight the communists. Similar declarations have been made in England and in the United States. Mr. Buck has not made such an announcement, but were he called upon to do so could he fail to follow his orders from Moscow?

Now, what is the duty of a state or country that is exposed to this danger? Communism is a threat to everything a Canadian citizen cherishes and loves. In the face of such a threat a free citizen of this country must be just as jealous of his responsibility as he is of his liberty. We must have the courage not only to speak, but to act; we must meet the communistic menace as we would meet the threat of an epidemic which might destroy the health of the individual.

I have read so often of liberty of thought and freedom of speech, that I doubt if there is anyone in this house more democratic than myself. But, thank God! I distinguish between freedom and licence; between liberty and slavery under the guise of liberty. Any man among us who is the father of a family knows that when his wife or child suffers an

attack of a contagious disease—be it typhoid fever, scarlet fever or any such ailment—an officer of health comes to the door and places a placard on it prohibiting anyone from leaving the house. This practice is considered proper for the protection of other individuals living in the community. Now, is it an impeachment of freedom to tell a man that because a contagious disease has been found in his house he and his family must remain indoors? I do not believe anybody has found the restrictions of quarantine revolting, because everyone has always thought, and rightly, that the freedom of the individual must sometimes be curtailed to safeguard society as a whole. Spiritual health in a country is as important as, if not more important than, physical health, because bodily disease may be cured, and sometimes rapidly, but the cure of spiritual disease takes a very long time.

Here is an editorial on freedom, in a newspaper whose opinions I do not always share. I have made it a rule in my life that when something which is right appears in a paper with whose general point of view I do not agree—something which arrests my attention and grips my mind—I appreciate it, often I admire it, and I use it. The *Ottawa Journal* of February 23 of this year contains this comment:

There are those we know, who will object—who will say that if we ban communism we shall be banning thought, betraying ourselves into hysteria over a "Red scare", with peril of "witch hunting". The answer is that a Criminal Code amended to outlaw the communist party would not ban thought . . . All that would be done, all that could be done, would be to say by law that communists among us be not permitted to organize for our destruction.

Later in the article:

But while we need to remember that freedom is a living thing and that all who work for it honestly and peacefully are entitled to respect, we must at the same time, for our own safety, make distinction between those who aim merely to enfranchise man's spirit and those who, through deceit and treachery, would choke all freedom.

The Prime Minister said not many days ago that there would be no persecution directed against communism or communists. It is agreed that there should never be persecution of anybody. But neither should there be senseless toleration. We cannot be tolerant of an evil which creates such a menace to our democratic institutions. It is not cowardice but, rather, our duty to be afraid of what the future will hold if we do not at once take means to safeguard those institutions. I therefore believe that to outlaw communism in Canada cannot and would not constitute an attack upon individual freedom, but would be purely and simply a measure of protection against endeavours which, were they successful, would destroy the liberties

and the rights of the majority. I think I can safely affirm that, should the communist effort succeed, at least 12,700,000 of the 13 million Canadians would be deprived of their rights to freedom and liberty. For these reasons I believe that drastic action of the appropriate kind, applied without fear and without hesitation, has become a patriotic duty that all citizens have the right to expect from a free government, which must remain the guardian of the liberties of our country.

**Hon. W. Rupert Davies:** Honourable senators, I am sure you will all realize that it is with a good deal of trepidation that I rise to address you after you have listened to such a scholarly address by the honourable and learned senator who has just taken his seat. I am sure that we all enjoyed it very much, and I believe the great majority, if not all of us, concur in everything he said.

There are a few things I would like to say about the Speech from the Throne. It was not possible for me to be here during the first week or two of the session. I therefore did not hear the mover and the seconder. However, I should like to take this opportunity to add my congratulations to those which have been showered upon these two senators. I only hope that they were not as nervous when they addressed this honourable body as I was when I did so for the first time. Incidentally, it is a condition with me which, I am sorry to say, does not seem to improve as the years go by.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Oh, oh.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** I propose in discussing the Speech from the Throne to reverse the usual order of things, and to say a word or two about the last paragraph first. I refer to the paragraph dealing with the retirement of Mr. Mackenzie King. I was present at the convention in 1919 when Mr. Mackenzie King was chosen as leader of the Liberal party. I have followed his career throughout, and have always been one of his ardent admirers. Many incidents in his career stand out in my memory, but none more clearly than the speech he made at the dinner given in honour of the delegates from the various parts of the Commonwealth to the Imperial Conference held in London in 1926. I do not wish to imply that I was a delegate to that conference; I was simply there as a press representative. I remember well the masterly address delivered by Mr. King on that occasion, and the applause which it brought forth. I had the pleasure of sitting next to that fine old Irishman, "Tay Pay" O'Connor.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** This is a good day to mention that story. I shall never forget how

lustily "Tay Pay" applauded the remarks of Canada's Prime Minister on that occasion, which breathed the spirit of optimism for Canada. Honourable senators will recall it was at that conference that the Statute of Westminster was born, and Mr. King made a great impression on all those in attendance.

I listened attentively to the speech made by the honourable senator from Kennebec (Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt) last week and the speech made by the honourable senator from Rosetown yesterday (Hon. Mr. Asetline). I paid particular attention to their remarks on divorce. I have my own views on divorce, but I do not propose to discuss the rights or wrongs at this time. I do, however, want to say something about the Senate Committee which has the laborious task of hearing divorces.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** I feel that the Senate Committee on Divorce should be adequately paid for its work. It is impossible for this committee to cope with its list of approximately 350 applications per year without sitting on week ends, a time when most senators are free of any duties. I suggest to the leader of this house (Hon. Mr. Robertson) that he discuss with the government the matter of additional payment to the members of the Senate Divorce Committee. My understanding is that it is really a judicial committee made up, for the most part, of lawyers, who are sitting without any extra remuneration. As this committee is doing the work that should be done by judges, I see no reason why they should not be paid for it. I do not suppose that I would be asked to serve on that committee; I would not wish to be, because it seems to me that it should be composed entirely of lawyers.

It was with mixed feelings that I read the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne relating to an amendment of the Supreme Court Act. I realize that now we have become a full-grown Canadian nation we should settle our own disputes and no longer take them across the sea to the Privy Council. Nevertheless, honourable senators, as a British-born Canadian I will probably be pardoned if I feel a certain amount of sadness at the severing of the last connecting link with the Motherland. What the members of the Canadian Bar feel about the proposal to abolish these appeals will no doubt be learned when the bill is being discussed. It is one of the growing pains which must be endured if Canada is to assume its full nationhood.

I hesitated a long time before I decided whether to say anything about family allowances. I shall try to keep close to the notes I have written, because it is easy to say the

wrong thing about family allowances, and I do not wish to do that. I note that a bill is to be introduced this session to broaden the scope of the Family Allowances Act, as a further instalment of the policy of the government to provide a national standard of social security and human welfare designed to assure the greatest possible measure of social justice for all Canadians.

I do not expect there is much use expressing an opinion on family allowances which is in any way contrary to the spirit which seems to permeate both the Liberal and the Progressive Conservative parties today. Nevertheless, I should like to issue a note of warning to this house. When family allowances were first talked about, I was opposed to them, not because I begrudged the help to needy families, but because I felt that they would help the thriftless and penalize the thrifty. However, I listened to the debate in the other place and also in this house, and I was won over to support the measure. I am still in favour of it, but I think we have gone far enough. Where is all this paternalism going to end? Why do we need to talk so much about social justice in these times of abounding prosperity? Wages were never so high in this country nor work so plentiful. I expect this amendment will be the answer to the resolution passed at the Progressive Conservative Convention. It is a case of out-Heroding Herod. I say that is what I expect it will be.

I was lunching with a Progressive Conservative friend of mine in Toronto the other day, and I was good-naturedly twitting him a little bit about this matter. I knew he was not in favour of family allowances when the bill was introduced. Like many of us, he had to fight his way up from the bottom without any help from the government. He educated himself with money he earned by remaining after school on Saturdays and sweeping out the business college he attended. Today he employs and pays good wages to over 500 men and women in his various plants. As I say, I twitted him a little about it, and he said to me "Politics certainly make strange bed-fellows". I said "Indeed, they certainly do".

Honourable senators, I would not go so far as to say that either the Liberal party or the Progressive Conservative party were endeavouring as yet to climb into the socialist bed; but it looks to me as if during the coming election campaign the two old, staid, tried and true parties—the Progressive Conservative party and the Liberal party—which by their policies have made this country great, might yet have a merry scrap to see which one shall wear the top of the socialist pyjamas, and which one the pants, before they lie across the foot of the socialist bed.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Oh, oh.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** When this bill is discussed here I shall probably vote for it, as no doubt we all shall. I do not usually vote against government measures without some very good reason. Family allowances are now part of our economic life; but let us take the long view; do not let us go too far and kill initiative and ambition. How many of those listening to me today would have been senators if, when they were young, there had been family allowances? They learned early in life to battle for a place in the sun, and they got here as a result of their achievements, by overcoming obstacles. They know, as I do, that when we were young a dollar or two earned after school, or in the evenings and on Saturdays, not only helped out the family treasury, when necessary, but also gave a good deal of pride and satisfaction to the earner. But today no young person in Canada has to worry about such a thing as earning a few dollars after school or on Saturdays. Ask employers of labour. Ask men who want boys or girls for occasional work after school. Listen to some of the remarks of mothers who are in receipt of family allowances: they will tell you quite frankly that their children do not have to work after school. Yet those children always seem to have money to admit them to the movies.

Honourable senators, I seriously wonder just what effect all this government generosity is going to have on the rising generation. It seems to me that this is something we have got to consider. Will the boys and girls of today have the same ambition and desire to achieve that was developed in people of past generations—such as the great adventurers who came from France during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, or the pioneers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries who blazed a trail through the forests and pushed civilization farther and farther up our rivers? Let us never forget, honourable senators, that character is built, not by sliding down the mountain side to the green and pleasant valleys, but by climbing up over crag after crag to the heights. True, as Lloyd George said when he became Prime Minister of England, "It's awfully cold at the top." But where would this glorious country be today if it had not had men willing to endure privations and hardships—or, to put it metaphorically, the coldness of the mountain top—in their efforts to build a strong and united Canada?

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** In the Speech from the Throne a paragraph that interests me very much is the one relating to the proposed appointment of a royal commission to investigate our cultural life. I am deeply concerned

about our cultural life, as I am sure every honourable senator is. It has been well said that man cannot live by bread alone. Cicero told us many long years ago that cultivation of the mind is as necessary as food for the body. Great writers and thinkers all down through the ages have expressed the same idea in different words.

But let me read you the paragraph:

It is the view of my ministers that there should be an examination of the activities of agencies of the federal government relating to radio, films, television, the encouragement of arts and sciences, research, the preservation of our national records, a national library, museums, exhibitions, relations in these fields with international organizations, and activities generally which are designed to enrich our national life, and to increase our own consciousness of our national heritage and knowledge of Canada abroad. For this purpose, the government intends at an early date to establish a royal commission.

If I were not speaking in the Senate I would say that was a "doozer"; the first sentence contains 78 words.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Oh, oh.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** I intend to discuss the paragraph seriously, but in passing I may say that when I first read it I was reminded of an incident in my young days as a reporter. I began to learn reporting under a bluff Scotsman from Glasgow who had a rough tongue. The honourable leader of the opposition in this house (Hon. Mr. Haig) may have known him. His name was Bruce Walker, and I understand that he later went to live in Winnipeg.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** That is right.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** A good many years ago Bruce Walker had two regular reporters working under him, and also he had the assistance of a couple of young fellows who worked in a printing office by day and did a little reporting at night. I was one of these. For this work, I may say, we were not paid in money, but got words of encouragement or blasphemous criticism from Mr. Walker, depending upon what he thought of any particular piece of reporting we did. One evening my young fellow-reporter was assigned to write an account of a concert at which his sister played a piano solo, and he thought he would "do her proud." I shall never forget the verbal explosion that I heard next morning when Bruce Walker was reading my colleague's copy and came across this sentence:

The wavy and billowy-like volume of sound threw the audience into a state of most exquisite pleasure, from which they emerged as it were with inspiring impulses.

When I heard the roar from Bruce Walker I looked up in fear and trembling, not knowing whether he was going to have a stroke or, perhaps, kill the reporter. However, after

some very strong language the incident passed over, but I have never forgotten it.

Peculiarly, as I have said, this paragraph in the Speech from the Throne brought that incident back to mind. The paragraph certainly sets out a very comprehensive undertaking for the proposed royal commission. It looks as though the commission would have to gather people from Dan to Beersheba in its search for information relative to our cultural life.

I am strongly in favour of the spirit of this proposal, but to me the proposal itself seems much too sweeping. It is not specific enough. It may be that in its tour around the country the commission will not call people before it, but will go out on the highways and byways and discuss the various matters mentioned in this paragraph. If the commission members do that, they may have a journey something like what G. K. Chesterton had in mind when he wrote these lines:

Before the Roman came to Rye or out to Severn  
strode,  
The rolling English drunkard made the rolling  
English road.  
A reeling road, a rolling road, that rambles round  
the shire,  
And after him the parson ran, the sexton and the  
squire.  
A merry road, a mazy road, and such as we did  
tread  
That night we went to Birmingham by way of  
Beachy Head.

If this had been St. Andrew's Day, for instance, instead of St. Patrick's Day—I would have ended that verse with a different line from the same poem, which I am sure would have pleased the senator from Vancouver Centre (Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie):

That night we went to Eannoekburn by way of  
Brighton pier.

I would suggest that when the royal commission is appointed, it should first look into radio and television, and after that investigate the possibility of establishing in Ottawa a national library and building a new art gallery. There is no hurry about any of the other items mentioned in that long paragraph.

Honourable senators, I should like to take a few minutes to refer to television, which is now a subject of very wide interest. Television has arrived, and I do not think Canada can afford to wait very long for a royal commission's report before taking some action in this matter. In its development we do not want to lag too far behind Great Britain and the United States. I saw a splendid television broadcast at Broadcasting House in London a dozen years ago, and six years ago I watched a broadcast at the studios of the National Broadcasting Company in New York. Although we have no television broadcasts in Canada at present, I am told that in Toronto there are nearly

two hundred sets receiving broadcasts from Buffalo. I was under the impression that the General Electric Company in the United States was turning out approximately five hundred television receiving sets a day, but I believe now that my estimate was low.

In order that I might give honourable members some accurate information about the matter I secured a copy of an address delivered by Joseph Sedgwick, K.C., to the Advertising and Sales Club of Toronto. As many honourable members may know, Mr. Sedgwick is a prominent lawyer in Toronto. He is solicitor for the Association of Canadian Broadcasters, and naturally takes a keen interest in television, although not alone for that reason, but also because his brother is one of the big stockholders and General Manager of CFRB, one of the most powerful stations at Toronto. I shall read not the whole of Mr. Sedgwick's address, but only certain excerpts:

At this moment, television in Canada is a little like the weather—everybody talks about it but nobody does anything about it. This however may be said in extenuation, the inactivity of the private radio stations and certain others interested in television is not of their choosing, but is a state of lethargy enforced by orders from above. In a word—television like radio operates on channels—in this country the licensing of those channels is controlled by the C.B.C.—the C.B.C. cannot make up its mind as to how best to solve its almost insoluble internal problem—and thus no licences are issued. But 1949 has every appearance of being the year of decision, so a quick look round—here and abroad, may be of some service to people like yourselves who are concerned about all publicity media.

Now, 1949 is not going to be the year of decision, unless the commission is appointed promptly and does a good deal of travelling in a short time.

Mr. Sedgwick goes on to say:

During the last two years television in the United States, so long experimental and haphazard, really arrived. The status of television in the United States during 1947 changed from that of a demonstrated technical reality to a firmly established broadcasting service. Take sets in use as one measure.

This, honourable senators, is really enlightening.

Prior to the war (1941) there were 10,000 television sets built in the United States. Post-war production started in October, 1946, and in that month 827 sets were built. Only two years later, in October, 1948, the monthly production was 95,000 sets. In November, 1948, it was 122,000 sets, and in December 125,000 sets. And as for 1949, it is estimated that the average production will be 160,000 sets a month—or almost two million sets this year. Putting the figures a little differently—at the end of 1947 there were 170,000 sets in use in the United States; at the end of 1948, some 900,000 sets were installed, about 800,000 of them in homes and 100,000 in bars, restaurants, clubs and other places of public entertainment. And the estimates as to the future are staggering; the industry estimates (and I am told conservatively) that by the end of 1952 there will be about 13,700,000 sets in use, and by the end of 1953 something in excess of 18,000,000.

And we in Canada have done nothing at all in this field.

If you will place beside that figure—

says Mr. Sedgwick,

—the suggested saturation one of 24,000,000 sets in use, you will see how rapidly television is likely to approach economic saturation in its field—and how rapidly it will displace, if not completely, largely, A.M. broadcasting.

Mr. Sedgwick says a good deal more which I shall not tire honourable senators by reading, but I should like to quote something with particular reference to Canada:

Then of course there is the scarcity of channels, a problem even more acute in television than in A.M. broadcasting. Only 12 channels are available by international agreement, for television broadcasting in North America, and not all of them are available in all parts of Canada; in Toronto, for instance, close as it is to highly populous parts of the United States, only three channels are open; in Hamilton only one. But neither in television nor in A.M. can a country just sit on channels.

This information, gentlemen, is startling.

Without doubt Canada lost the right to make the fullest possible use of some of its A.M. channels because for years the C.B.C. power freeze compelled stations to operate on less power than the maximum permitted to the channel occupied. So in television, U.S. interests are already eyeing enviously our vacant channels, and are saying, with some justice, "if you don't want them or can't make up your minds, then let us have them who want them and will use them immediately". Nor is this thinking confined to station operators or would-be television broadcasters. In his *Maclean's* article, Blair Fraser says:

"In Washington I had a chat with Wayne Coy, Federal Communications Commission chairman. He dropped a broad hint that if television channels are badly overcrowded the U.S. might want to take over some channels now allotted to Canada. To do so it would have to negotiate a new agreement and the Canadian case would be sadly weakened if we had decided to make no use at all of the channels we have."

And significantly, Mr. Fraser's article is headed:

"We're falling so far behind on television we may never catch up. Ottawa balks the C.B.C. and the C.B.C. balks private showmen."

What are the facts asks Mr. Sedgwick.

Firstly, without any doubt, able and well-financed Canadian interests are willing and anxious to enter the television field. In Toronto, for the three available channels, four applications are before the C.B.C., from CFRB, CKEY, CHUM, and Famous Players Canadian Corporation. In Montreal, CKAC and Canadian Marconi, operators of CFCF, have already applied, and without doubt there will be others.

That is the situation with regard to television, honourable senators, and it is a serious one. I think it is about time Canada got busy and looked into the whole question and decided just what is to be done about it. There are a limited number of channels, and unless we claim them they will be grabbed up by the United States.

I wish to turn for a moment to radio. This is a branch of our cultural life which is

developing at a tremendous rate. We all know that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is trying to provide programs which will suit all tastes. Some of us prefer the New York Symphony Orchestra on Sunday afternoons; others prefer "Amos and Andy" and "Fibber McGee and Molly". These programs come from south of the border over C.B.C. networks and are relayed through networks of private stations. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is doing a fine work, particularly in the production of "Stage 49" every Sunday night, and also in its special Wednesday-night programs.

There are about 90 private broadcasting stations in Canada. Many of them are small local stations, but their cultural aspects should not be discounted. They are spending a certain amount of their revenue every month to develop local talent, and it is interesting to note that this talent seems to be improving every year. We all realize that in some small cities there is a dearth of good local talent which can be put on the air, and the local stations are doing what they can with it.

The British system of broadcasting may have its advantages, and it may appeal to the British people, but it is confined to national interests only. In Canada our local stations are part of the community and are always willing to help any worthy cause. School children are often heard over local stations; likewise, local church services. This is something which would be impossible if we did not have the small stations scattered from one end of Canada to the other. A few weeks ago the Kingston station cleared the air of all programs and advertising from 8 until 11 o'clock in the evening so that the people of that area could hear Handel's *Messiah* performed by the Mendelssohn choir and the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, under Sir Ernest MacMillan. I am sure that program was enjoyed by all who heard it.

I feel that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is very well managed, but I am of the opinion that it might be better if it did not have the power to regulate its competitors.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** I do not think I would go so far as to say that Canada should allow private networks to develop. I feel that the interest of the state is greater than that of any individual or group of individuals. I have not yet persuaded myself that we should follow the example of the United States in permitting private networks. I do feel, however, that a commission separate entirely from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation might be a better authority to regulate the private stations. Many private stations resent being controlled by a body

which competes with them for many forms of advertising.

But while we are studying radio, television and films, let us not forget for a moment the Little Theatre movement. That is an activity in which I am keenly interested. At the present time regional festivals are being held all over Canada. The Dominion Drama Festival was originated by Lord Bessborough, with the assistance of Colonel Henry Osborne and other gentlemen here in Ottawa, and groups were formed in the various provinces. I am sure Ottawa senators will be interested in knowing that the Ottawa Little Theatre group won first prize three years in succession in the Eastern Ontario Drama Festival. The Edmonton Community Players are another group that is doing excellent work. Two years ago, at the finals in London, they produced a play called "My Heart's in the Highlands", which was warmly welcomed both by the audience and the adjudicator. Particularly outstanding was the acting of eleven-year-old Stewart Kerby, a school-boy who says he wants to be a professional actor when he grows up. Mr. Robert Speaight, who was the adjudicator of the finals here in Ottawa last year, and this year is the regional adjudicator, in speaking the other day of the Alberta Festival said, "it is the best I have seen across Canada." During the finals in London I had a chat with young Stewart Kerby and his mother. They told me that they belonged to a group which rehearsed in a basement somewhere in Edmonton, that this group had a great struggle to get along, and that they paid their own way down to London for the finals. She and her little boy travelled second-class, either tourist or colonist.

To illustrate the cost today of an enterprise of this kind: one of the finest amateur productions of Shakespeare that I have seen was done at the Eastern Ontario Regional Festival in Brockville two or three weeks ago by a group of school teachers from Peterborough. They played "The Taming of the Shrew". It was really a magnificent effort, and while it did not win first prize, it was very highly commended by the adjudicator as a colourful production most beautifully done. But it cost \$900 to take it from Peterborough to Brockville. The players, a group of school teachers, wanted to bring it to Ottawa, but found that they could not afford the expense. There is no theatre here large enough to allow of sufficient admissions to pay the expenses of the group—who, I believe, call themselves the Peterborough Little Theatre group—so they did not bring the production to Ottawa. This Little Theatre work is a branch of our culture which should have some encouragement, and I say again that a grant of \$10,000 a year would be a Godsend to the Dominion Drama Festival. It would help little groups out in

the West and in the Maritimes, and even in Ontario, to move from place to place giving performances. Not only that; it would enable them to buy or rent the proper costumes and do all sorts of things which are necessary to adequately produce these plays.

This is a branch of our cultural life which, since Lord Bessborough started it, has spread across the country. The finals for the current season will take place in Toronto in the last week of April, and I am sure that we are going to see some very fine performances. Indeed, the work of the Ottawa Little Theatre group at Brockville was held by Mr. Speaight to be practically on the professional level. So I urge, honourable senators, that the Dominion Drama Festival be supported.

I would also like to see something done about a National Library. I read the other day that a committee has been appointed to bring some records up to date. I was not quite sure whether the purpose was not to stop the agitation for a National Library. If so, it missed the point. This country should have a National Library, a National Museum and an Art Gallery, and they should be situated right here in the capital city, so that when people come from the United States or Britain, or from the various parts of Canada, there will be something for them to see besides the Parliament Buildings.

Canadians should be able to visit their own National Library, their own National Gallery, their own Museum. The National Gallery that we have today contains dozens, probably hundreds of pictures which have to be stored, because there is no room to display them. The project of a National Gallery should be taken seriously. Surely we are paying enough taxes and raising enough money to spend a little on these cultural agencies. If a socialist government in Britain can set aside one to two million pounds to build a National Theatre, this Dominion should be able to make some provision for a National Gallery and a National Library.

Then, also, we should not forget to encourage our present-day authors. Recently Mr. Will R. Bird, of Halifax, president of the Canadian Authors' Association, has been making a trip across Canada, and he says that he is delighted and surprised at the work which is being done by authors all over this country. I note that in the estimates there is an item, amounting I believe to \$4,000, for retired authors, or what is called the Writers Foundation. The provision is a good one, but I think there should be some similar encouragement of the active living writers of today.

I did not take part in the debate on the entry into Confederation of Newfoundland, because I felt there were many others here who are better informed about it than I am. I have never been in Newfoundland;

however, one of my sons who was stationed there about three years during the war has told me a good deal about the island and its people. He came back full of enthusiasm, and has since returned to Newfoundland for two holidays because he liked it so well. I only want to say that I join others in welcoming Newfoundland, as the tenth province of Canada, into our Confederation.

Having opened my remarks by referring to the last paragraph of the Speech from the Throne, I will close by discussing very briefly the first paragraph, that relating to the Atlantic Pact. As a Canadian, I am proud that our own Prime Minister played a prominent part in the plans for bringing it about. I believe that the Canadian and other governments who are subscribing to it are taking the right course: it is a show of strength.

I listened with great interest to the remarks about communism which were made this afternoon by the honourable senator from Sorel (Hon. Mr. David), and I agree with everything he said. Communism today is a menace to the free peoples. My friend George Drew is no more opposed to Communism than I am. I have a feeling, however, that the influence of communism is on the wane in this country. Nevertheless, it is still with us, and I believe it should be carefully watched and kept strictly within the bounds of the law. We do not want communism in this country. I shall go further than that, and say that we are not going to tolerate communism in this country.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** We shall make the communists strictly obey the laws. If I had my way we would tighten up the law. At the same time I do not think we should aid and abet interference with the governments of other countries. I realize that there are states in Europe today which are not free; but honourable senators have all read history—probably much more than I have—and know that the instincts of free peoples will not allow them to remain bond slaves. We have seen it happen time and again. They remain enslaved for a few years; perhaps ten, twenty or thirty, but they rise up again to become free. The tide is waning already in Europe. We know that. We are sorry for some of the countries and we would like to help them, but we can do little directly at the moment. One thing we can do, however, is to build up our own defence and help those in western Europe to build up theirs.

The name of Canada stands high in the world today. No other country of 12 million people is as highly regarded. Let us keep our country strong and free, and hope that it will be many long years before we have

to go to war again. But, honourable senators, let us make quite sure that if we ever do have to go to war again we shall be ready.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Felix P. Quinn:** Honourable senators, I had not intended to address you on the Speech from the Throne, but during the progress of the excellent address to which you have just listened, a note was sent to me by the member from Vancouver Centre (Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) in which he asked: "Why don't you say a word about Ireland and sing an Irish song?". That is what prompted me to rise.

To be in order, I must first congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address. I did not know the mover of the Address until he came into this chamber, but the name of the seconder is a byword in the province of Nova Scotia.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Quinn:** When the name Willie Comeau is mentioned, all know immediately who he is. We all listened with a great deal of interest to the splendid, homely address which he made. But I am going to take some credit for it, because, when he was going over it the other day with the honourable member from Margaree Forks (Hon. Mr. MacLennan) and myself, he started to tell us about his ancestry. I then said: "Why don't you include that in your remarks when you are making your speech in the house?" He hesitated, but finally agreed to do so. That is why I am entitled to take some credit for the speech upon which he has been congratulated so often.

I must offer my congratulations also to the other senators who have contributed such excellent addresses to the debate on the Address, but I want to particularly congratulate the honourable senator from Sorel (Hon. Mr. David), who spoke so well yesterday and today.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Quinn:** While he was making his reference to communism—something which we all regard as a menace—it recalled to my mind a time some years ago when I was a member of the other house and when the top communist of this country was incarcerated in the Kingston Penitentiary. The late Viscount Bennett was then the leader of our party and Prime Minister of Canada. The subject of communism was brought up at a Conservative caucus, and at the conclusion of his remarks the then Prime Minister said, "Well, thank God we have one bulwark against communism in this country—Quebec and the Catholic Church".

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Quinn:** I need not enlarge upon that. You all know from the pronouncements of the head of the church in Rome, and by the cardinals and bishops and clergy throughout the world, that the stand of the Catholic Church has been made quite clear. The attitude of the communists and soviets towards the heads of the Catholic Church was plainly illustrated in the mock trials—trials of mockery—of Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop Stepinac, and others with whose names you are familiar. Soviets and communists regard the Catholic Church as their number one enemy. We know the attitude of the province of Quebec, and that the ugly head of the serpent of communism will make no progress there. We also know that the slimy head of the serpent of communism will never make any progress in the land of my forefathers, the anniversary of which all Irishmen throughout the world are celebrating today.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Quinn:** It is a legend of St. Patrick that he banished the snakes and the toads from Ireland, and that ban remains to the present day. That is why we need have no fear of communists in that country—they come within the category of snakes and toads.

This festival—la fête de Saint-Patrice, the feast of Saint Patrick—is honoured and celebrated throughout the whole world. You will find Irishmen everywhere. It was many centuries ago that Saint Patrick went to Ireland when it was a land of pagans and converted its people to Christianity in record time. We know the story of the three-leafed shamrock; how he plucked it from in front of his feet and held it aloft to illustrate the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. And so the Irishman wears a shamrock today as an emblem of his nationality and his faith.

Ireland is a land of saints, poets, scholars and missionaries. It has sent its missionaries throughout the entire world, and it has probably done more than any other nation towards bringing pagans and infidels to Christianity. Go where you will throughout the earth and you will find an Irish missionary. Whether he be at the South Pole, in Africa, in China or Japan, you will see that his heart has remained true and still beats just as fast for the dearly beloved land of his forefathers.

We are celebrating the feast of St. Patrick's Day, and I am prompted to exclaim, in the words uttered by the returning exile when he came on deck in the morning and got a glimpse of the old soil:

O, Ireland, isn't it grand you look,  
With the sun your hill-tops adornin'.  
With all the pent-up love in me heart  
I bid ye the top of the mornin'.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Quinn:** I have completed the first part of the task assigned to me by my right honourable friend from Vancouver Centre (Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie), and if you will permit me, I will now complete the second part by singing a verse. You have all heard it sung by Bing Crosby:

And if there's going to be a life hereafter,  
And faith I'm sure that there is going to be,  
I will ask my God to let me make my heaven  
In that dear land across the Irish sea.

God save Ireland!

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Right Hon. Ian Mackenzie:** Honourable senators, if I have rendered no other service during my membership in this honourable chamber, I think I did one this afternoon by being indirectly responsible for the eloquent and moving address that has just been given by the honourable gentleman from Halifax (Hon. Mr. Quinn).

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie:** He sang the chorus of "Galway Bay," which is the most popular song in the United Kingdom today. I should like to read the first verse.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** Sing it.

**Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie:** I cannot sing as acceptably as my honourable friend from Halifax. The first verse reads:

If you ever go across the sea to Ireland,  
Then maybe at the closing of your day,  
You will sit and watch the moon rise over  
Claddagh.  
And see the sun go down on Galway Bay.

Honourable senators, may I ask the indulgence of the house while I say a few words more? We have days of remembrance in honour of the patron saints of the freedom-loving nations—St. Patrick of Ireland, St. Andrew of Scotland, St. David of Wales and St. George of England. Canada too had her saints in the early days of settlement, and we know their names.

I regret that I am not eloquent in the French language, but I should like to say now a few words in that tongue.

(Translation):

Honourable senators, I wish to congratulate the senator from Sorel (Hon. Mr. David) for the stirring appeal which he made yesterday on behalf of the French language in Canada. As long as our country exists, French will remain one of the official languages as provided by our constitution.

(Text.)

The address delivered yesterday by the honourable gentleman from Sorel (Hon. Mr. David) was one of the finest that I have ever

heard in parliament—and by that I mean both houses. I wish to assure the honourable gentleman that those of us who come from the West and know the great pioneering spirit of that part of the country are as determined as he is to see that the rights of the French language as established in the constitution of Canada will always be upheld as long as we are in public life.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie:** I have a particular affection for the province of Quebec. I happen to have studied its history, beginning with the voyagings of Jacques Cartier, who landed in this country from France in 1554, and of Champlain, another French explorer who went first to New Brunswick, then to Quebec, and afterwards as far west as Kingston—and perhaps, as some authorities say, much farther. Then there was de la Verendrye, who reached as far west as what is now the city of Winnipeg. These and others—explorers, pioneers, missionaries and nursing sisters—who came here from France, settled this country and gave it government for one hundred and fifty years.

Then came the great joining of forces, in 1759, and today you will find on the plains of Abraham a twin statue to two great soldiers, Wolfe and Montcalm, who opposed each other there. That statue is emblematic of the unity that we need in Canada today—

unity between the provinces and between capital and labour, and especially unity of all our people in support of the great movement that is going forward in Canada today for the maintenance of international peace in this tempest-tossed world. I am not going to make any political statement at all, but I should like to pay a tribute to the Prime Minister of Canada, who is one of the world leaders in the cause of international peace.

Now, honourable senators, I wish to do something which I know is, strictly, not permitted by the rules. Some years ago Mr. Tolmie, member for Bruce, used the Gaelic tongue in the other house, and what he said appeared in *Hansard*. I ask permission to speak now for thirty seconds in the same tongue:

Agus mar sin tha Sinn an diugh cumail cuimhne air Padrurg Sagart mor Eireann agus tha Sinn a guidhe gum pi Sonas agus Saorsa ann an Eilean uaine Eirinn anns na laithean tha air Thoiseach. Tir Eirinn an diugh.

Tir Eirinn. Am mairlach Eireann an comhnuhd. Eireann gu bragh.

**Hon. Mr. Quinn:** Cha fas mi ach thu.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Honourable senators, I move the adjournment of the debate.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m.