

to make this series of broadcasts, but to my mind they traverse on the democratic line somewhat and I think we could do without them in the future. I do not know that they are going to be receptive to the great majority of the Canadian people. Although I do not want in any way to curtail freedom of speech, I do think that this committee should make some sort of recommendation to the governors of the broadcasting corporation along the lines of freedom. I am all for freedom of speech, but when freedom of speech borders on licence whereby our democratic institutions may be in danger, I think that a line should be drawn. I know it is difficult to define what freedom is, it is like "salvation is free". I think perhaps if we made a general recommendation along the lines I have suggested this morning and leave it to be the good sense of the governors to make their decisions, we may probably go as far as it is advisable to go at this time. At the last meeting Mr. Dunton asked for a directive in that direction, and that is my feeling on the matter. I am a democrat, always have been and always will be, but when I find or I feel that our democratic institutions are being undermined and the C.B.C. used for that purpose—I do not say it is used, but if it can be used in that way, I think the line should be drawn there. I may say I do not like either of these broadcasts, I do not think they are going to do us any good. I suppose those broadcasts by Mr. Russell cost us quite a bit of money and I think we can economize by abolishing that sort of thing.

Mr. SMITH (*Queens-Shelburne*): When Mr. Stick started his remarks he made some reference to a broadcast by Mr. Line. I wonder what part of that broadcast he takes objection to.

Mr. STICK: My remarks were general, to start a general discussion. I felt that we should leave the decision to the C.B.C. I know the professor is expressing his own views in that. He touches on religion, for instance. He says: "So it goes that if our parents were Catholic, we were Catholics. If they were Liberals, we were at home under a Liberal regime; and so on;" I think he is attacking our cherished institutions that we have had for hundreds of years, and if he is not doing that, then he is certainly casting aspersions on them.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I might express a view somewhat different from that of Mr. Stick. I agree that free speech, freedom of speech, dare not be allowed to degenerate into licence, but what concerns me is this: however much I am in disagreement with what is being said so long as what is being said does not contravene the laws respecting sedition, libel or blasphemy—who am I to judge what shall be said? If we ever arrive at a position whereby the right to think and to express oneself under the law is going to be in the custody of the C.B.C. or any other group, then once and for all we have denied freedom. Certainly, truth is relative and if we are going to take the position of being censors over what shall be said, so long as it is not blasphemous or libelous, we actually place ourselves in a position where the majority will do the thinking for the minority in the country and where truth will have been established, finalized, once and for all. I take strong exception to a stand being taken by the C.B.C. that will deny reasonable freedom of speech by different individuals regardless of how much I disagree with what they are saying. Truth has never yet been finalized, and if it had, many of the advances we have today would never have occurred because the majority would have denied the minority the right to express itself under law. I am very much afraid that if C.B.C. places itself in the position of being a censor, freedom will receive a very serious setback in this country. I disagree with much that some of these people have said, but at the same time, while disagreeing, I do not want to deny others the right to hear their views, the views of these individuals, providing those views do not contravene the law. And if the law