

agree with very many of George McCullagh's views, but I do not think he should be placed in any different position from George Drew in that regard. In addition, in the correspondence between Mr. McCullagh and Mr. Gladstone Murray, which I glanced over this morning and which I have before me, Mr. McCullagh states that even a communist gets the opportunity to speak over the air which is denied George McCullagh. Well, I have some objection to communists speaking over the air. I have no objection to socialists, but my objection to communists being allowed to speak over the radio is that the fundamental principle and the whole doctrine of communism is revolution. They believe in world revolution; they believe in upsetting governments not by evolution, not by the ballot but by the bullet. Yet Tim Buck or some other communist may have the privilege of speaking over the radio—and this was not denied by Mr. Gladstone Murray—in order to air his views, while George McCullagh, a business man, may not do so.

I repeat, sir, that I believe any law-abiding business man who is willing to pay for the time he takes on the radio should have the right to speak over the air, so long as there are not so many of them that they take up the time that should be used for the legitimate purpose of entertainment. I believe it is the right of George McCullagh to express his views over the air; at least as yet I have not been convinced to the contrary, and I do not believe that any individual, Mr. Gladstone Murray in this case, should have power to say who may or who may not speak over the radio. If this system is to be carried on there should be something in the way of a commission or a committee, some body of men—it should not be limited to the judgment of any one man, I care not who he is—to decide who shall or shall not speak over the air. After all, sir, I should be glad to listen to some of these big business men, as I was glad to listen to George McCullagh yesterday, though he was not very complimentary to the Prime Minister, to myself or to anyone in this house. As I say, I should be glad to listen to the views of these men, because I think for the past twenty years, at least during my experience in public life, it has been too much of a habit on the part of too many big business men to condemn out of hand, as sort of half-witted men, those of us who dared go into public life, and I should like to know some of their reasons for so doing. When they get on the air, as George McCullagh did yesterday, we may hit back if we choose to do so. When they are deprived of that opportunity while others who have messages perhaps not so

appropriate or not so sincere are permitted to broadcast them, then I do not believe the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is carrying out its full duty. After all, if the radio is to be controlled in this manner we might well ask ourselves if it is the press that is going to be controlled next.

To show the foolishness of it all let us consider the position of George McCullagh. In a sense he owns the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. He is backed by one of the richest men in Canada, if not the richest; I refer to Bill Wright, who largely owns the Wright-Hargreaves mine. If McCullagh wants to do so he can not only publish his ideas in his own newspaper; he can broadcast them in every paper across Canada. He chose a very expensive method yesterday of circumventing the order of the radio corporation, and if he so desired he could do that on a very much more extensive scale. It seems to me that the whole ruling shows a lack of judgment which is not good for this country; that is my opinion for the present, at any rate, until I know more about the matter than I know at present.

We have to listen to all kinds of people on the air. Last night, in order to make myself forget the difficulties of my present position, I listened for a while to Jack Benny and Charlie McCarthy. After all, probably I profited more by listening to George McCullagh in the early afternoon than I did by listening to Charlie McCarthy in the evening, although I did not laugh so much at George. There are others who have been on the air for some years, and whom we could very well dispense with, much better than we could dispense with George McCullagh. For example, there is one commentator in the United States—I do not like to name him, because I am not sure enough of his name, though I think I know it—who was born in England but who came to the United States and became naturalized. Now, his chief pride is in abusing the British empire, abusing England, and telling about the tyrannies from which he escaped when he came to the United States. When I listen to a fellow of that sort talking over the air, across our country, as he has been, and giving opinions, it annoys me very much indeed. And when I listen, as I did during the international crisis of last September, over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation network, under the same management, to broadcasts made by commentators from Germany who were giving nothing but the German aspect of the whole affair, it also makes my blood boil. Again