

In fact, Mr. Brockington was only sorry that the general manager of the corporation had not gone further in suppressing the promotion of public welfare by this engaging personality; and had he been in Mr. Murray's position, he would have made it impossible for my message to be heard even by means of recordings. I say he is taking unto himself very dictatorial powers which were never intended by this parliament.

Completely ignoring all rules of logic, Mr. Brockington quotes from the rules of the Columbia Broadcasting System and the National Broadcasting Company in defence of his policy of discrimination, remarking that these two companies were, to use his words, "Just as sage as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation." But, in another part of his evidence, he asks whether the committee would like broadcasting in Canada to be administered by private interests and "placed under the domination of advertising, of cupidity and of wealth." These are fine phrases; but if the conduct of the two major networks in the United States is so exemplary that it evokes Mr. Brockington's admiration and provides him with authority for the defence of his own policy, how can he reason that a government controlled radio monopoly is the only trustworthy and unobjectionable instrument for controlling the power of radio? If the two commercial networks, CBS and NBC,—which are privately owned—are able to discipline in the public interest, and if their rules are a model upon which Mr. Brockington is pleased to pattern his corporation's conduct, why should he assume that if control of radio in Canada ever escaped his own hands, it would fall into the hands of "politicians, of advertising and cupidity and of wealth"? These same broadcasting systems, from whose regulations Mr. Brockington derives comfort and support, permit advertisers to purchase time during which such well known commentators as Lowell Thomas and Edwin C. Hill, among others, freely express their opinions. You gentlemen here know that every Sunday evening one of the greatest programs on the air, and one of the most influential moulders of public opinion, is Mr. Cameron of the Ford Motor Company; yet Mr. Brockington contends that the CBC should prevent a newspaper from purchasing time on a network for any representative of its own to express its views—not, mark you, because that representative has no views worthy of expression, nor because he is unable to express them acceptably, *but because he possesses a bank account.*

I might also mention the well known broadcasts of Father Coughlin of Detroit, over a network of forty-six private stations. That has nothing to do with the CBC there; that was through the NBC.

Mr. BERTRAND: That was not a very great contribution.

The WITNESS: You are speaking of the Father Coughlin broadcasts?

Mr. BERTRAND: Yes.

The WITNESS: Continuing: I might also mention the broadcasts of Colonel Frank Knox, publisher of the Chicago *Daily News*; and as recently as April the first, Frank Gannett, publisher of the Gannett newspapers, was the principal speaker over a broadcast from the National Republican Club's Saturday discussions over the NBC Blue Network, the subject of his talk being "America's Future."

At this point a statement as to the view of the very large and representative body of American public opinion might not be out of place. In a recent review of American radio entitled "Broadcasting and the Public," the Federal Council of the Churches of America summed up the whole question of the relations between the institution of broadcasting and the state in the following words:—

At this point, however, an acute problem arises. Control in any degree over the quality of programs, through authority to give or withhold a licence, is a power to be used cautiously and to be vested in a federal commission only under the strictest safeguards. The American

[Mr. George McCullagh.]