

Canadian Broadcasting Act

Whenever we are hard put to it we use great moral causes to justify our ends, but what sort of democracy justifies the use of suppression? What sort of religion is it? I am unable to say, but I doubt if it is one that I am prepared to accept. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew) told us that there was blasphemy on the Canadian air. He told us it was much worse because it was an insidious type of blasphemy which sometimes is not detected for what it really is. I feel we should congratulate him. He at least could see it even if nobody else could. But his statement would have been much stronger if he had named those who were responsible for the blasphemy. Surely it was an amazing omission to forget to name them, to forget to tell us. Unhappily he amongst others apparently craves for orthodoxy. There must be no adventuresome thinking. Above all, speakers must be safe.

What he is really asking for is the stultification of democracy. I should like to quote from Dr. J. H. Newman's "Essays, Critical and Historical". He said:

A man who can set down half a dozen general propositions, which escape from destroying one another only by being diluted into truisms, who can hold the balance between opposites so skilfully as to do without fulcrum or beam, who never enunciates a truth without guarding himself from being supposed to exclude the contradictory . . . this is your safe man.

I suspect that is the sort of man who would broadcast on the private radio stations, because he would say nothing and everybody would feel completely and absolutely safe. I regret very much that the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low) has been called away from the house on business. I was going to devote some little time to him but in his absence I shall have to modify my remarks. At least the hon. member for Peace River named names. He named one, Dr. Brock Chisholm, who he said has a poisonous mind. A Liberal member said the other night in the house that atheism was being preached over the C.B.C. When I asked him afterwards who was responsible he said it was Dr. Brock Chisholm and Dr. Ewen Cameron.

At least we have names and we have the scripts of what these men said over the C.B.C. They said more or less what is being taught in the universities and colleges of Canada today. Why should not the ordinary person have the advantage of that teaching? Now let us consider this poison of which Dr. Brock Chisholm is accused. He said—and this seems to be his philosophy—

When we can live together in understanding and tolerance and compassion and in the hope that we may be able, enough of us, to love our neighbour, whatever his race, religion, colour of skin, ideology

or economic or social group—when we can do that, we shall no longer be found in the ranks of man's last enemy—himself. Instead we shall become friends of, and assets to, mankind.

Yet the hon. member for Peace River states at page 888 of *Hansard* by way of condemnation:

How in the world can people safeguard the faith, wholesomeness of mind and thoughts of their boys and girls if they are going to be subjected day after day to voices over the radio that have not the slightest conviction, the slightest evidence of faith, loyalty or patriotism in them . . .

Mr. Blackmore: Will my hon. friend permit a question?

Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North): I doubt if I have time. Ask me afterwards. Let us consider Dr. Chisholm's statement again. He said:

When we can live together in understanding and tolerance and compassion—

Is that poison?

—and in the hope that we may be able, enough of us, to love our neighbour—

Is that treason?

—whatever his race, religion, colour of skin . . .

Is that disloyalty?

These are the things which Brock Chisholm believes. These are things which I am certain he spoke of with conviction.

Mr. Blackmore: Is that what the member for Peace River (Mr. Low) had in mind?

Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North): He mentioned Brock Chisholm and said his broadcasts were poisonous. Therefore I can only assume that is what he had in mind. If you prefer, I can take one of the broadcasts of Bertrand Russell. Let me ask you if these are the words of a man who speaks without faith and without conviction when he says:

I cannot believe that what is dark and dreadful and destructive in the souls of men is essential to the production of great works of imagination. I believe, on the contrary, that it lies within the power of man to create edifices of shining splendor from which the glory and greatness of which human thought and feeling are capable shall spread a light unmixed with darkness, filling men's hearts with joy, and their thoughts with clarity. Such a world is possible.

Who is there to disagree with him? Who is there to say this is a man without faith, conviction or loyalty? I remember hearing the hon. member for Peace River in a broadcast a few years ago, and I should like to quote from the context of his remarks made on December 18, 1946, on the program, "The Nation's Business". He said:

Do you know that the same group of international gangsters who are today scheming for world revolution are the same people who promoted the world war? Do you know that these same men promoted and financed the Russian revolution? Are you aware that these arch-criminals were