

Mr. KNOWLES: Oh no!

Mr. STICK: Oh yes. Let us be open minded about communism.

Mr. KNOWLES: I think a person who has studied communism and knows all about it, and then rejects—

Mr. LANGLOIS: Would you allow the average Canadian to study communism and form his own opinion on it?

The CHAIRMAN: I thought we had agreed to stick to the questioning of witnesses.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, I suggest in view of the seriousness of our times and in view of the many solutions which have been tried in the past, particularly with respect to thinking, and that have not yet solved our problems, that it would not hurt us to consider new ideas such as these people are submitting to us. I agree with Mr. Mutch that ideas are not dangerous, and I would like to commend the C.B.C. for inviting us to think. If they have not done it for the Canadian people, at least they have made us think in this committee, and that is all to the good.

Mr. MUTCH: I would like to make a correction of one slight remark of Mr. Knowles. I did not say that ideas could not be dangerous. I meant to infer that a thing was not necessarily dangerous even if it was an idea or a new idea. You see, there is a difference. Ideas can be dangerous if certain people use them in certain ways.

*By Mr. Langlois:*

Q. During an exchange between Mr. Fleming and Mr. Dunton, it was stated, I believe, by Mr. Dunton that the reason why these broadcasts were not put over the French network was that, if I understood him correctly, there would be greater opposition from French-speaking Canadians.—A. I did not say that, Mr. Langlois. Mr. Fleming said it. I did not.

The CHAIRMAN: No. Mr. Fleming said that he thought that would be it.

Mr. LANGLOIS: That is why I was against statements being made this morning, because we are going to confuse the evidence with statements made by members of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that Mr. Dunton should clear that up. I do not think he agreed with Mr. Fleming's suggestion at all.

The WITNESS: No. In the first place, the question did not arise. Most of the programming for the two networks is handled completely separately. The question would not come up because we would not think that it would have the same interest among the French-speaking listeners.

Mr. SMITH (*Moose Mountain*): I cannot see why there should be a difference in Canada. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. What is given here for the English speaking people should be given as well for the French-speaking people.

Mr. MUTCH: What is the matter with the C.B.C. using their discretion to put in any area, whether it be racial or not, the type of program which the people in that area might be expected preponderantly to prefer? After all, it is public service and there is some responsibility on the part of the C.B.C. to make some attempt to please their listeners. There is nothing wrong in attempting to do what is undoubtedly true, namely, to realize that this philosophical or psychological approach to some of these questions is likely to be more offensive to some groups or religions than it is to others. So why should the C.B.C. not pick out the people to listen to them? It is not simply the people who do not understand. It may be a mistake to do that.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Dunton referred to the white paper which was issued in 1944, and stated that it had been approved by a parliamentary committee.