

see them because of the demand of the advertiser to deliver the greatest number of heads at any one moment. The audience consists of many small groups of people with many different faces, at many different times.

The Chairman: Well, I was just going to say that this is the argument that I used with some of the private radio broadcasters when they were here but it is not an entirely pure intellectual argument. I am sure you will agree.

Mr. Knight: Yes, indeed.

Senator Prowse: You put it more kindly than I would have!

Mr. Gray: May I just suggest...

The Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Gray: But the point really, I think, when we get into discussions of this kind, is whether or not or perhaps to what degree we intend or are prepared to face up to the fact that it is probably impossible to organize any broadcasting for the maximum benefit of the viewer and perhaps even of the producers. Therefore we rely on a commercial base. I think what we have to decide finally, and when I say we, I mean Canadians, is what we are prepared to pay? I think perhaps that, is the point we are trying to make.

Senator Prowse: All right, Mr. Gray, now let us take your point and let us deal with it because I think that it becomes special. The Canadian people are putting up \$160,000,000; out of a \$200,000,000. budget for the CBC today, is that correct?

Mr. Gray: That's right.

Senator Prowse: And you are telling me that CBC is not doing the job it ought to do?

Mr. Gray: Right.

Senator Prowse: Are you suggesting that we then put up the additional \$40,000,000 so they would do the job you are talking about?

Mr. Gray: Money by itself won't do it, no. However, money is part of the issue, yes.

Senator Prowse: The thing that is in issue is talent and ability, is it?

Mr. Gray: No, I don't think entirely talent or ability. Talent and ability is there but

talent and ability cannot express itself or is not used to its maximum potential. As a point, for example, there are certainly writers, directors, actors, scene designers and so on in this country at this moment who are quite capable of putting together competence in programming.

Senator Prowse: How would you decide whether a program was a top-notch program or not?

Mr. Gray: It depends very much on the program and on the audience at which it is aimed. For instance, it would be possible to put together a superb program which was not intended to reach the maximum number of viewers. You could put together a program on a subject which was maybe not of interest to a maximum number of viewers. We have here the most popular kind of program, the hockey game, which is only apparently of interest to only 15 per cent of the viewers.

Mr. Knight: In Toronto.

Mr. Gray: In Toronto. In their words, we begin to think of the mass media as having to deal with everybody at all times, but it doesn't work that way. Not everybody reads the same novel at the same moment or watches the same programs and obviously if we wanted that kind of broadcasting for that kind of—I hate to use the word "culture", but I am going to use it anyway—if we want the best kind of culture at any time, presumably what we have to say to ourselves is how much are we prepared to pay for it. Now, it may be that the people of Canada will decide that they are not prepared to pay for that; then it is time for people like me to be quiet.

Senator Prowse: How do you decide that a thing is good? For example, I don't think that Shakespeare had a royal subsidy. Did he?

Mr. Knight: Can I have a go at answering that question?

The Chairman: Certainly.

Mr. Knight: I think if you examine Shakespeare's plays carefully—for example in Othello there is a lovely scene in the middle where they had gone from Italy and they are now on the Greek Islands and they are sitting on the beach and they are getting slowly drunk. One of them tells a beautiful story—coming from memory this is a group of Itali-