

as we understand it. We understand parliament does not want us to say what is right and what is wrong, but to try to see that all main viewpoints have a fair and equitable chance to be heard.

Religion plays a very important part in Canadian life and we devote a lot of time to religious broadcasting, particularly by all the main denominations in Canada. We try to provide time for political broadcasts on a fair and equitable basis. We provide time for discussions on public affairs, to bring to the people all different viewpoints on this subject. We try to provide for different views on all kinds of subjects that are on everybody's minds, physical things and mental things, but always trying to see that the different opinions are there, that they are expressed by competent representatives of those views whatever they may be.

We are responsible to parliament and we feel that responsibility very clearly. I think members of the committee will agree that the parent body also has a responsibility to the child. Recently the child, the C.B.C., was admonished in parliament, and it would seem only fair that when it is admonished it should be said what it is being admonished for. It has been charged in parliament that there have been talks on the air which were blasphemous and indecent, but it does seem to me to be only fair that it be said which those talks were. It seems only fair to the corporation; it seems only fair to the scores of people who have talked on the air in recent weeks and months who may not know which of them have been accused of blasphemy or of being purveyors of indecency; and it seems only fair to people of Canada who may have listened to these talks and not known the material would be accused of being blasphemous and indecent.

I do hope the committee will examine this question, will ascertain what broadcasts the charges are made about, and will satisfy itself on this matter. I do hope the committee in considering the matter will not think only of its own opinions of what was said. It is perfectly possible that there might be in the talks opinions which no members of this committee or of the Board of Governors would personally agree with. It seems essentially the question is whether these views should be withheld from Canadians who do want to hear those views. That seems to me to be the question of principle involved.

We have tried to carry out the task of seeing that different viewpoints do get on the air. Parliament may wish, after consideration, to change the nature of the principles which have applied. Parliament may wish possibly to say that certain opinions should not go on the air in Canada. If it does that, I hope that parliament will speak distinctly and will say clearly what the opinions are that may go on the air and what opinions may not go on the air; what opinions are to be held back from those Canadians who do want to hear them. In that way the corporation will know where it stands; the people of Canada would know what opinions can be heard and what opinions cannot be heard; and the people would know just where the limitation on the circulation of opinions in Canada lie. As I understand it, unless and until parliament changes these principles the corporation must continue to try to apply them, and to try to see that all viewpoints which a reasonable number of Canadians wish to hear have an opportunity on the air.

Mr. COLDWELL: If some of these broadcasts—

Mr. STICK: Just a second, now—have you finished with your review? Can we now ask questions?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. COLDWELL: Can we get the scripts for the committee? If the committee wishes to examine any of these scripts are they available?

The WITNESS: I believe so. I am not sure what the broadcasts are.