

*Supply—C.B.C.*

front of the minister and listens to all the things that are said he must get a bit red in the ears. I am not going to help that very much today, I am afraid, because I believe he needs to have his ears pinned back just a little bit in this committee. I think we ought to talk very bluntly and straight to him as well as to the minister, and let them know exactly what we think about this whole C.B.C. situation.

I am always interested in listening to anything the C.C.F. defend. When they rush to the defence of anything it is a sure sign that they think its administration, its policy and so on are all in their favour, and today we saw another example of what we witnessed here some few years ago when the leader of the C.C.F. rose in his place and in his very ardent and earnest defence of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation also charged the private stations in Canada with being guilty of treason, and indicated that because they were guilty of treason they should have their heads cut off, and so on.

Well, as I said, I am always suspicious of anything the C.C.F. go for in a big way, and when the spokesman for the C.C.F. said today that he hoped these silly remarks—I am not going to say whether or not I agree with their being silly—made by the hon. member for Hamilton South would not cause the people of Canada to repudiate the C.B.C.; when I listened to that and then what followed, I could not help feeling that the C.B.C., its whole set-up, its regulations, the statute governing it and the policy laid down for it by the government, all favoured the leftists' point of view, favoured the very thing for which the C.C.F. have constantly stood. It is a socialist conception; it is a socialist-administered body, and it most often portrays the socialist, leftist point of view. That is the reason we see them exulting over the C.B.C. and hoping that nothing will turn the Canadian people against it.

They do not want a change. Mr. Chairman, that is one of the very best reasons in the world why the minister had better take a look at this thing and the chairman of the board of governors with a view to seeing that it is changed and brought more in line with the spirit of free enterprise, if that is what you believe in. If you do not, then of course let it go on the way it is going, because you have not a free enterprise set-up at all, and you never will have under regulations such as you have today, and the statute and the policy laid down by the government. I am talking very straightforwardly about it. I am not blaming the minister nor the chairman of the board of governors of the C.B.C. The responsibility has to be taken by the whole government for this thing.

[Mr. Low.]

My hon. friend of the C.C.F. spoke about quite a number of things in connection with the C.B.C. but, in the main, he defended the whole set-up and pleaded for no change. Well, now, I have never had too much time to listen to the C.B.C. network commentators in the past, but I did this past winter. I was forced by an illness to remain in bed for quite a long time, and I had ample opportunity to listen to commentaries, both from foreign commentators and from our own in this country. While I was convalescing I paid particular attention to what was going on, and I can understand, after listening very carefully to these commentaries over several months, why the C.C.F. exults over the C.B.C. and what is going on, and will rush to its defence so constantly.

I listened to such men, for example, as Milton Shulman, Marcus Long, Leonard Beaton, Murray Ballantyne, Alex Josey and others, some from Britain and some from Canada; and in every single case as I listened to those commentaries they slanted news strictly to the left. They played up the weaknesses of British policy when they were speaking, for example, of the situation in Cyprus, in Malta, or in any other place, such as British East Africa. I heard one of them talk about Kenya. They slanted their commentaries strictly to the left and ran down British policy. They could not have done a better job of trying to destroy the commonwealth and its unity if they had been communists themselves.

I could have understood that if within a matter of a few days, a week or two weeks, I had been able to listen to commentaries that presented the other point of view; but, Mr. Chairman, I listened in vain. There was not a single instance of the other point of view being given a chance on the C.B.C. Is there any wonder that British policy has come under very great, destructive criticism; is there any wonder that the commonwealth is being weakened? Is it any wonder that people are coming to think more and more leftist all the time? I charge the C.B.C. with the responsibility of refusing or neglecting, one or the other, to give an opportunity to commentators on the other side of the question to present their views in order to balance this thing up. I have been told on several occasions that the C.B.C. does try to present a balance. Well, if they do I must say that in all the months I was required to lie in bed, when I had nothing to do but listen to the commentaries and news broadcasts over television, I never heard one single effort made to present the other side of the case; that is the pro-British, pro-private enterprise, the pro-policy regarding, let us say, the right of the self determination of people.