

understand, there falls upon some of us "outlaws" on this side of the house the responsibility of voicing some criticism of the work of the C.B.C.

I have two criticisms to offer. In the first place, it is not compatible with democratic principles that a body which competes for public business should have the power to control those with whom it competes. Yet private stations which seek business from the same clientele which is served by the C.B.C. are under the corporation's authority. When I questioned a member of the commission who appeared before our committee as to the circumstances of a broadcast made from a private station, and pointed out that the intending speaker was required to submit his typescript a day ahead of the delivery, he professed surprise and questioned my statement. But that is the fact, and it is a type of control of local stations which to my mind is objectionable. The people of Canada will never be satisfied from the legal standpoint until all stations operate under a separate and independent board. I have been told that there is a similarity between the jurisdiction of the C.B.C. and that of the Board of Transport Commissioners, but I find nothing in the regulatory powers of the Transport Board comparable to those of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. By this bill the board's powers are further increased. It is proper to remind ourselves that today freedom of speech is an issue of world-wide importance. I believe that if the Russian people were at liberty to express themselves about their government and its activities, bitter resentment would be shown; but criticism is stifled.

Newspapers which have struggled for years to give the public service in this respect are sometimes prevented by law from doing what they regard as their duty, or are menaced with libel actions if their statements exceed certain limits. As a result of this, perhaps there is no public agency in this country today so powerful as the radio station. It can do something which no newspaper can do. If, for instance, a newspaper in opposition makes statements to which the government objects, government writers and speakers can reply. While we in this chamber do not usually discuss politics, we are not ignorant of public affairs, and most of us know that in a recent election in one province a certain newspaper, because of the sort of campaign it carried on, had more to do with the re-election of the government than all the government speakers combined. Other newspapers answered its charges: the electors read and compared the record, and

gave their decision. But radio messages come to anyone who may be listening. Those attacked have no protection, for they are not present to answer the arguments of their opponents. The C.B.C. authorities have told us that they allow all sorts of opinions to be broadcast. Some rotten things have been said by various speakers on special occasions, for example on Sunday night programs, but I never heard any answer at all. Cranks and and some sorts of theorists are the people who, above all others, want to circulate their ideas. Under ordinary conditions of communication they are unable to make an impression, because people will not listen to them. But on the radio they have their opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Hayden: Is not this the essence of free speech?

Hon. Mr. Haig: The trouble is that there is no answer, at any rate no immediate reply. Let anyone start a story, and see how long it takes to catch up with it. All of us who have had experience of elections know that once some tale gets into circulation it is almost impossible to overtake it. That is the preferred position which a broadcaster over the C.B.C. occupies. I am not accusing the commission of political bias, but I do say that a system of this kind could be used to tremendous effect by any government which wanted to employ it. The commission asserts that it is independent of the government. How can any body of men be independent of an authority which every three years can re-appoint, or otherwise, as it sees fit, any member except the chairman? We of the Senate are independent; but if our tenure of office lasted for only ten years, and we were then subject to re-appointment, how independent would we be? I suggest that we would be the hirelings of the government in power at the time. Why? Because, no matter what a man's occupation is, he cannot give it much attention if he is to carry on his senatorial duties. I have some personal experience of this in my own vocation of the law. People to whom I have been personal solicitor for years come into my office, pass my door to consult my son or my brother: they say, "You know, Jack, you are never here, and these other fellows are always around; we want to see the men who are here." I know of lawyers from my part of the country who, after ten or fifteen years in parliament, have found when they returned to practice that they had no business at all. That is an unfortunate consequence of parliamentary life which is known to most of us.

To return to the subject, my advice is that we request the government to have radio