

*Supply—C.B.C.*

was convicted under the Smith act and is serving a term in jail for her subversion and conspiracy.

Here is something else my hon. friend has forgotten or perhaps did not know, but it is time he and others did know this fact. The current propaganda line of the communists is to portray in the most dramatic form possible the convicted subverters of the communist party as champions of the peoples' rights and victims of class persecution. They use this propaganda for the purpose of trying to destroy any anti-communist security measures that might be taken by governments, and also to work on the sympathies of the masses of the people in such a way that those communist subversive agents who have been convicted and are in jail will soon be turned loose. That is what they are after.

They portrayed Joe Hill and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn as victims of a frame-up; that was the line. That was the purpose of the play. That is what the people got out of the play and that is exactly what I am complaining against. They portrayed them as victims of frame-ups the purpose being, of course, to make the public believe that communist conspiracy and subversion are mere figments of the imagination and not realities; and I am afraid my hon. friend has fallen for the line. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, it is far more serious than any acceptance of the mere portrayal of the life of a trade union leader.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that the selection of this play was not just a matter of a lapse of taste or mistaken taste. Considering the build-up this play had and considering the fact that the Joe Hill story was linked up with Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a subversive communist agent, who was convicted under the laws of the United States, I certainly cannot believe that this was a mere mistake in judgment. Somebody in the C.B.C. deliberately chose that subject and wrote it up for the purpose of putting over the communist line and using the C.B.C. network to do so.

The minister said it was chosen exclusively for its dramatic substance. May I also point out to my hon. friend the minister that this is the communist way of doing things, too. Does the minister not know that today the communists everywhere are dressing up their propaganda and subversive ideas in the most attractive and alluring way, giving them the most beautiful dresses and sending them out to the people expecting them to be swallowed whole because they do contain some beautiful thoughts?

Let me point out to the minister that I hold in my hand two marvelous magazines that

are published by the red Chinese government. These magazines are delightful to behold; they are dressed up in a most attractive way. The printing is beautiful, the paper is of a very high quality, and the magazines are full of lovely illustrations. One of these is called "People's China", building up the communist regime in China and spreading it over this country. Why would they spend all that money? Why would they secure the finest artists and the finest printers in the world and employ them in the production of these wonderful magazines to send to Canada?

This is done in order to convince us that the red Chinese government is a humanitarian regime that does nothing but give the people the results they want from the management of their affairs. The other magazine is called "China Reconstructed". I hold it in my hand; look at it. There are some beautiful thoughts in this magazine, and some wonderful poetry. Does the minister say that the C.B.C. would be justified in buying up these magazines with the taxpayers' money simply because they are beautiful, and sending them out to propagandize the Canadian people? That is exactly what he is saying.

The minister spoke concerning the matter of costs and indicated that there was an out of pocket cost for this production of \$3,500. Does that mean, Mr. Chairman, that this figure includes the network costs and the artists' charges and the production costs and producers' fees and the 100 people involved and all that sort of thing?

**Mr. McCann:** Everything.

**Mr. Low:** Would the C.B.C. allow anyone else to have two hours of time over the entire network for the sum of \$3,500? That is absolutely ridiculous. I would not be surprised if \$3,500 represented the fees paid to the artists and so on but that certainly does not include the network costs for two hours. The minister cannot make me believe that. In this case again we received a left-handed answer. I want the facts about it. I want to know not only the out of pocket costs paid by the C.B.C. to the artists, musicians, the producer and properties for that play, but I also want to know what the network costs were and that would give us the whole picture.

I am not going to go any further, Mr. Chairman, at this time, but I am relying on what the minister told me just a few minutes ago. I took it from what he said that he will use his influence and his responsibility as the minister concerned with the C.B.C. to see to it that nothing like this happens again. He has to be watchful, because I remind him that not so long before this great dramatic