

Q. There is some danger of laxity of the rules in this respect?—A. That would be a matter for parliament.

*By Mr. Fleming:*

Q. We were told here that this series of broadcasts we are speaking of now went out over only the English, the trans-Canada, network, I think. Why was that? I am not suggesting you should have put it over the French network, but if you thought it was a good broadcast for the English network, how do you draw the line? You do not apparently put a translation nor a corresponding broadcast by some French-speaking psychoanalyst of the same point of view? Is it not a fact that the reason you do not put these over the French network is that you would give a great deal of offence to the listeners on the French network?—A. A lot of different broadcasting is put on the two networks. We often wish that they were closer together, but there is a difference of atmosphere and wants and needs. In the first place, our people would not think of putting it on the French network. They are in English, and are English opinions. And secondly, in our judgment, there would be far fewer people interested in this sort of thing.

Q. Is it not for this reason: that you think there would be a very strong public protest against it on the part of listeners on your French network?—A. Very possibly.

Q. Your interpretation of policy is that you say it is the duty of the C.B.C. to give various points of view, and because there are some people who like the point of view of these psychoanalysts, therefore time should be allowed to them on the air. I do not follow you consistently on that, when you put it over the English but not over the French networks.

Mr. RICHARD: It is because the French speaking people are not interested in the same psychoanalysts as the English people would be.

Mr. FLEMING: That may be. But I think you would get a much stronger public opposition.

The WITNESS: You see fewer people are interested.

Mr. MURRAY: Fewer people with intelligence would pay any attention to it.

Mr. KNOWLES: I wonder if any member has the right to accuse Dr. Cameron and by inference the C.B.C. of putting out ideas that are intended to deny belief in God, when in reality all that people like J. A. Cameron do is to re-define a concept? It seems to me that there are times when ones accepted definition of God is challenged, and to some people it is a bit uncomfortable to have any accepted idea, challenged even if all that is suggested in a new definition. I invite the committee to consider the possibility that there is essentially a religious character to some of these broadcasts. I felt that to be the case when I read through them. There are paragraphs in some of these scripts which I thought are, in nature, essentially religious and perhaps more religious than some of the traditional concepts which we sometimes accept.

Mr. LANGLOIS: How can you call this religion?

Mr. KNOWLES: For instance, Dr. Cameron in his concluding paragraph expresses hopes that are very idealistic; so I am satisfied that far from these broadcasts being contrary to religion, we should be open minded enough ourselves, as members of parliament, and realize that the ideals put forward might provide at least a long-range solution to some of the problems of our time.

Mr. STICK: What about communism?

Mr. KNOWLES: I think the thing to do about communism, enough is to study it and come to one's own conclusions as I have done, and I reject it.

Mr. STICK: The same principles apply.