

on, have to get their own revenues in order to operate. In this case we give one corporation the power to handle news right across Canada. We pay them for doing it and at the same time we put ourselves under their control. That is what we have been doing right along.

Honourable senators, I protest against certain university professors from Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg and elsewhere broadcasting their pet theories over the air on Sunday nights, and no chance being given to anyone to refute their statements. Very few of these men have ever had to struggle in life under business conditions. Recently when a man in London spoke over the radio about the European federation, his speech was immediately criticized by a professor from Winnipeg. You may say, "Well, that is a case of presenting both sides of an argument". But is it? Does that Winnipeg professor know both sides? A good many of us went to universities. When attending university as a young man one sometimes thinks of certain professors as being great men, but years later he realizes that they never did strike at the real difficulties of life at all. I have nothing against professors at all. They can lecture on economics, mathematics, language and history all they want, but I do not like it when they try to tell people how to run politics, a democracy, or a business. Only those who have had experience in these matters are in a position to give advice on them. Why do businessmen put their sons and sons-in-law into business at an early age? It is so that they will learn the business from the bottom up. There are some things that can only be learned from experience; they cannot be learned out of books.

Honourable senators, it may be said that I am opposed to the C.B.C. That is not so, but I am opposed to the administrative set-up and the way in which the affairs of the C.B.C. are handled. I think an independent body, similar to the Board of Transport Commissioners, should be set up to handle our radio service. All business affairs are handled by independent people—and our judges. One side will argue one way, and the other side another way, and a judge will decide between the two.

Here we have an organization which is operated at tremendous cost to the country; yet there is no control over it. Now it is being given the control of our television interests over a five-year plan. This is not democratic. I thought parliament's greatest power was the voting of money each year to carry on the business of the country—and here we are being asked to authorize an expenditure to cover a five-year period. I protest against

this kind of legislation. I think it is a backward step and means that we are giving up some of our control over freedom of speech in the organization concerned as it exists at the present time.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. J. J. Kinley: Honourable senators, I have just a few words to say. I think the leader (Hon. Mr. Robertson) in explaining the bill said that there were nine governors in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It seems to me that we are using this word "governor" too loosely in connection with the affairs of Canada. The office of governor is a high one in the public life of the country. The Governor General holds the highest office in the land, and the office of lieutenant governor is the highest office in the provinces. In the country to the south of us we find a governor at the head of every state. I have been told by Europeans that this term governor creates a wrong impression. They get the impression of supreme authority.

Hon. Mr. Bishop: There are also governors of our jails.

Hon. Mr. Kinley: I suppose they have supreme authority; but it seems to me that in private enterprise or in the setting up of government boards we should not imitate the jails in the use of the word governor.

The honourable leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig) spoke about the influence of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I do not think radio has succeeded in influencing our people as much as the printed word. I maintain that the press of the country still carries more influence than does the radio. I have heard people in my section of the country say that what they hear on the radio goes in one ear and out the other, but what they read in the papers is imprinted indelibly on their minds. The same is true of the movies and the legitimate theatre. Unless a movie is outstanding, you usually soon forget it; but when you see live actors or hear and see light opera—you remember it for a lifetime. I think we can still say that both the printed word and the personal touch exceed the influence of radio.

We hear a good deal about freedom of speech. Well, speech is pretty free in this country and in the United States. Perhaps it is too free. Freedom of speech does not mean licence, and I think the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the private broadcasters should be held responsible under the law of the country for what they put out over the air. I think, for instance, that if they say anything detrimental against a person's character they should be liable to court action.