

Supply—Secretary of State

time, but not once has there been an opportunity to express an opinion on the operation of the C.B.C., and I have been on the government side since April 22.

On Friday, December 13, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam rose in his place and quite correctly asked that a mistake in a news broadcast on the C.B.C. be corrected. He was given this answer by the spokesman in this house for the C.B.C., as reported at page 5802 of *Hansard*:

If the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation made a mistake, that could be referred to in debate by any hon. member at any time—

I want to make the flat-footed statement in this committee that there has not been an opportunity to debate the C.B.C. since I entered this house in September of last year. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam was quite correct in what he was doing. He was simply trying to make a correction to a wrong news report. I have been associated with the news business long enough to know a wrong report when I see it; and for an accusation to be made that someone is trying to discipline or trying to censor the C.B.C. because an attempt is made to try and correct a mistake is beneath the dignity of all hon. members of this house. I resent the answer the hon. member received, and I wish to say so now.

My reason for rising to speak on the estimates of the C.B.C. is to inquire what we have hold of here. Is it a white elephant which we have to feed, or a cancer which feeds on us? Hon. members can take whichever simile they wish, because either is true. We are being asked here to vote the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the year 1963-64 the sum of \$87,644,900. In the fiscal year 1959-60, which was four years ago, the estimates of the C.B.C. amounted to \$69,641,975. In four years there has been an increase of \$18,002,925, or 25.85 per cent. The expenses of the C.B.C. for which this government is responsible are up 25 per cent in four years, and unless somebody stops them the end is not yet.

I make the statement that I do not believe even the C.B.C. knows what is going on in the field of broadcasting. I happen to be the hon. member for York-Humber and I have an able Liberal colleague in the hon. member for York West, whom you all know as Mr. Leonard Kelly. We happen to be the only two members in the house who have what is generally known as "pay T.V." in our ridings in Toronto or, as it should be correctly called, "theatre in the home". Is "Red" Kelly or this hon. member ever asked for suggestions with regard to television? What do we know about television? We have about 5,000 theatres in the homes scattered about our ridings, and

we are conceited enough to think that we do know a little about it. I should like to point out that I brought into Canada for the first time closed circuit television sporting events. I was promotion manager for the Toronto daily *Star*, and six years ago, maybe seven, I brought into Toronto at Loew's Uptown theatre closed circuit television of the world heavyweight boxing championship. I remember our concern as to whether or not it would take. But I learned then that closed circuit television in theatres was bound to be a success. For one thing, patrons do not have to go to the place where the game is being played or the sporting event takes place. They do not have parking troubles, and after the event is over, whether the event be in New York, Boston, Winnipeg or Vancouver, they are in their home town and can get home that same night.

I brought closed circuit theatre television to Toronto twice. The first time was the world championship heavyweight boxing match at Loew's Uptown theatre, on which occasion they had to call out the police to keep the people away from the doors. Seats sold at \$6 each and there were a thousand men outside trying to get in. A year later another world's heavyweight championship was held, and we put it on closed circuit television at two theatres, Loew's Uptown and Loew's Downtown.

If anyone tries to criticize the \$87 million expenditure of the C.B.C., heavens above, the corporation is defended like the sacred cows of India. We are told that we are interfering with the freedom of the press, with freedom of expression. We are told not to criticize the C.B.C. All my life I have been mixed up in this business of the freedom of the press. Freedom of the press consists of allowing a person to express his opinion on any matter of the day, provided the laws of libel and slander are not breached. But I submit this is not licence to go off to the sands of Algiers and make a film on the sand tracks in Algiers, or to go off to Patagonia to study the love habits of mice in the long grass. Is there no limit to the extent to which the C.B.C. send these safaris around the world, so they can come back to show us pictures which you can buy from any motion picture production house at one-tenth the cost? There has to be some discipline shown on these expenditures.

We have never been given an opportunity to discuss the C.B.C. estimates during the 20 months I have been in the house. I wonder how many members in the committee or people in the country realize that for 30 years the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian National Railways have been carrying sound to the 195 radio stations