

*By Mr. Decore:*

Q. When you approach these people, like Dr. Chisholm, to make these broadcasts, I suppose you already know something about their background and the type of opinions that they might express on the air?—A. Our program people naturally have an idea of their background and opinions they are likely to express.

Q. In other words, does the C.B.C. encourage these talks or this type of broadcast over the air?—A. As I say, we have the trust to keep the airways free for the expression of different viewpoints. Many people are interested in this matter of modern psychology. This was an effort, not a very big effort, to get the views of four leading psychologists on the air and to give people a chance to hear them.

Mr. SMITH (*Moose Mountain*): At our last meeting Mr. Dunton, in speaking, mentioned, I believe, that on these broadcasts that we are now speaking about, the comments to C.B.C. were 10 to 1 in favour. I think that is what Mr. Dunton said. I wonder if that should be taken too seriously. I question whether the majority of the people are in favour. Now, if I may say a word on that—probably I am Peck's bad boy on this thing—but I mentioned this matter in the speech from the throne, and I want to say here I was not prompted to do so by the head of any church or any churchman. I was speaking to the average listener in my constituency. Now, as a result of that speech I have had a comment from one Catholic priest in my constituency who wrote to congratulate me, and also comments from three Protestant ministers. I had two telegrams, one came from New Brunswick and one from British Columbia. I have, I think it safe to say, 15 or 20 letters, and I want to say here that although ten were in favour of what I said and none opposed, yet that does not say that the public agree with what I had to say.

The WITNESS: I was asked how the comment had been and I said what it had been. It appears to have been favourable. We have not heard any criticism from heads of churches, although I would be anxious to know if there had been any. There has been favourable comment, not necessarily agreeing with the views, from one church publication, in Saskatchewan.

Mr. LANGLOIS: I gather from the answers so far given by Mr. Dunton that these speakers have not requested time on the C.B.C. but have, on the other hand, been invited by C.B.C. to express their opinions.

Mr. FLEMING: And paid for it.

Mr. LANGLOIS: And paid for it. How can the witness now say that by not inviting them we are curbing, in a sort of way, their freedom of speech or their freedom of opportunity of expressing their own opinions?

The WITNESS: May I explain, Mr. Chairman, that Dr. Chisholm, Bertrand Russell, or any others have not a right to go on the air in Canada, because the air is limited as to the number of channels and the number of hours. My understanding is that the people of Canada have a right to listen to different opinions, and it is our function to arrange that these different opinions do have a chance to be heard. We have found that in so arranging, and dealing with all sorts of people, it is necessary to pay a little money to see that we get good representatives of the different points of view. I do not think Dr. Chisholm has any right as of himself to be on the air. I do suggest to you the principle, however, as we understood parliament, that the people in Canada who wish to hear ideas on modern psychology should have some chance to do so.

*By Mr. Langlois:*

Q. So therefore, in your opinion, we are not curbing anybody's freedom of speech by stopping these broadcasts?—A. Supposing parliament should decide to curb freedom of the air, should say certain opinions may go on the air and