

Supply—C.B.C.

backwards to favour the criticisms of the opposition. They are not even giving the whole story. On the program, "The Nation's Business", the time is divided up, as hon. members know, as follows: Four spots to the Liberal party; three spots to the Conservative party; two spots to the C.C.F.; and one spot to the Social Credit party, a total of 10. Out of the 10 spots the opposition parties have six chances to criticize the government. We sit here in the House of Commons with a large majority. A good many of us would like to be on television to present our own private views. We, with 170 members, have four chances out of 10, as against 100 members of the opposition, and they have six chances out of 10 to present their views to the people of Canada.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I watched with a great deal of interest the proceedings on the pipe line as reported by the C.B.C. I think I should take a few minutes to bring to your attention exactly what took place to give you a good example of the C.B.C. coverage of the news on the Toronto station. I believe the Toronto station covers Ottawa, and part of its news is piped into Montreal. In going through the Toronto news I have found that a good portion of it was duplicated on other T.V. and radio stations across Canada. Here is an example from the C.B.C. news coverage of the pipe-line debate in the House of Commons. While these programs are presented to the people on the basis of news reports that are received from the wire service of the House of Commons, they do not give all the truth and a daily diet of slanted news or half-truths is bound to sink into the minds of the people sooner or later, and they are going to begin to wonder just how this country is being run. For instance, on May 9 this came from the C.B.C. central news room in Toronto at six p.m. You cannot call this an untruth. It says:

Mr. N. E. Tanner, of Calgary, holds only two of nearly 2 million shares of the company. Well over three-quarters of the shares are held by five companies which are owned mainly in the United States.

I would not say it is exactly untrue, but it does not tell the whole story. It does not say they are Canadian companies mainly owned by interests in the United States. Then in the ten o'clock edition of the news they said practically the same thing except the following:

. . . three-quarters of nearly two million shares are held by four big companies that are owned mainly in the United States.

So there must have been a correction made at that time. Then, it goes on page after page. On May 14, in the 6.30 news, they said:

The Conservatives have urged that the line be built under Canadian control. The C.C.F. wants it under public ownership. Mr. Howe said there was no way, short of public ownership, of guaranteeing Canadian control over the pipe line.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce never said that at all.

Mr. Knowles: He did so.

Mr. Reinke: He did not. He never said that at all. Then we come to May 14, eleven p.m., and we find a whole page devoted to radio there, the same day that the Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke in the House of Commons and delivered a speech explaining the whole pipe line. At eleven o'clock there is nothing but George Drew. The same thing happened again on May 15 and May 16. Here it is again:

The Conservatives want the cross-Canada gas pipe line under Canadian control and the C.C.F. want it under public ownership.

Nothing for the Liberals. Here we come to May 17 and we find the following; finally the truth comes out:

Mr. Howe went on to say that no one should worry too much about Canadian control of the line. He declared that Canada would have control of it.

He is reported to have said that on May 17 when, in fact, he said it on May 14, right here in this House of Commons, as reported at page 3864 of *Hansard*. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said:

In other words, an all-Canadian pipe line, whoever may own it, is completely under Canadian control.

Previous to that he had gone on to explain that parliament legislates the laws and regulations. What is referred to in this news broadcast is his statement on that day where he said, at page 3864 of *Hansard*:

Whenever I have mentioned this 51 per cent offer, I have taken care to point out that it does not guarantee control by Canadians.

But it is a different thing altogether when the people of Canada have been led to believe that this government was not in favour of a pipe line under Canadian control or under control of Canadian regulations.

Then we go on. It goes on every day the same, reports of silly little things that the opposition have said like:

Mr. Regier said he wondered how much of the money was contributed to the Liberal campaign fund in 1953.

The headline is:

Charges that Trans-Canada Pipe Line Limited contributed to Liberal party funds.

You might as well call the Minister of Trade and Commerce a crook. Here is another example of it. On nearly every day that is