

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

our C.B.C. Washington correspondents immediately after the broadcast: "At last the attacks are getting to President Johnson", and "he is running scared."

I would call this deliberate anti-Americanism. Anti-Americanism is not a new phenomenon in C.B.C. and on Canadian television. I quote the following from an editorial which appeared in the *Ottawa Journal* on March 3, 1966:

The impression left by some reports—notably by some C.B.C. commentators—of the "great" U.S. debate over Viet Nam has been that President Johnson was a man beleaguered on all sides by dissenters from his policies...

What we have not always had is a proper perspective on these dissenting views. The implication was often left that these men represented widespread attitudes in the U.S. Congress (Senators Morse and Fulbright).

This week's votes—932 to 6 in the Senate and 392 to 4 in the House of Representatives—approving another \$4.8 billion to finance more forces in southeast Asia should adjust the perspective.

It is significant that 41 per cent of those interviewed in a nation-wide poll approved the way in which Mr. Johnson is handling his job, a rise from 38 per cent recorded in the Gallup polls of September and October. I say this to hon. members: None of you saw this on C.B.C. from our Washington correspondent, but every time public opinion polls dropped against the president, James Minifie or his friends quickly made Canadians aware of the fact.

Even worse, the strong bias of some of the C.B.C. public affairs crew against the United States position in Viet Nam shows up time and time again. Tom Gould, who recently spent two years in Viet Nam, expressed his views at a faculty dinner speech reported in the Carleton University newspaper of November 17 as follows:

Today's prevalent anti-American feeling is caused by television, Gould said. Cameramen in Viet Nam are only photographing the sensational, even if it is irrelevant to the war effort. He told of one instance where a group of laughing marines were filmed setting fire to so-called South Vietnamese peasants' huts. People sitting back in the States nice and comfortable in their \$35,000 homes, naturally think these fellows are savages. "Sure they are laughing" says Gould, "they were alive." A couple of hours later these same marines were almost wiped out—that was a Viet Cong village that they had destroyed. The television commentator neglected to mention this point, he said. With television, film coverage is a necessity; if there is no film clip to go with a story the story just doesn't get told. Gould urged the audience not to rely solely on television for their information on Viet Nam, but to also read newspapers, magazines and books on the subject.

Further on the article reads:

"The number of innocent people being killed by the Viet-Cong is far greater than the number being killed by the Americans", he said.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Later it states:

He also had criticism for the Chester Ronnings and other "self-appointed" Viet Nam experts. He explained, "I used to be intimidated by these people but when I returned from Viet Nam I realized how little they know.

**Mr. Brewin:** May I ask the hon. member a question? Is he associating himself with these remarks about Chester Ronning, a very distinguished Canadian diplomat?

**Mr. Stafford:** I am simply reading certain excerpts, and there are thousands, to show the bias and imbalance of these programs. I think this will be self-evident if the hon. member will listen for a moment or two.

I have here another serious area of concern—an area of blatant propaganda. I will read the key parts of the statement made by one Gerry Sperling over C.B.C. "Viewpoint" on November 27, 1967. Let me begin with a quote:

"Our every action is a battle cry against imperialism, and a battle hymn for the people's unity against the great enemy of mankind: the United States of America. Wherever death may surprise us, let it be welcome, provided that other men intone the funeral dirge with the staccato singing of the machine guns and new battle cries of war and victory."

This is the concluding paragraph of Ernesto Che Guevara's last published work, his message to the tri-continental congress. It is clear that Che's attitude towards revolution in Latin America has also been the attitude of the Cuban government...Cuba says—and I must say I agree—that the only way to change this situation is through violent revolution. The entire rotten social structure must be overturned and in its place states must be set up on the Cuban models.

Further on he says:

The Cubans believe, as I have said that these changes can only be brought about by violent revolution. Dedicated guerillas such as Guevarra will be the trailblazers.

And again:

The United States' puny efforts on behalf of social reform through the Alliance for Progress and its hysterical reaction to the possibility of a mildly reformist regime in Santo Domingo has convinced Cuban and other Latin American revolutionaries that no meaningful change can be brought about in Latin America through peaceful democratic means.

Cuba will support revolutionary movements in Latin America morally, materially, and by example.