

information." He says, "I consider certain things are not in the public interest to reveal but if you want it we will give it to you, but it is your responsibility if you are reviewing it."

Mr. FULTON: There is no denying that is the case now that the committee is sitting and that parliament is sitting. Perhaps I should qualify my remarks by saying that if parliament is not sitting or if the committee has not been called I think the position is as I have outlined it. I think that is the way the policy works.

Mr. COLDWELL: Does Mr. Fulton think if there were another body that they would consider it in the public interest to reveal these details which Mr. Dunton considers it not to be in the public interest to reveal?

Mr. FULTON: If I am called on to answer that question I would say I could not look into the minds of the people of that body. I am just trying to establish how the policy works. I intend to ask one or two more questions. I will go back to the suggestion that a board of appeal be established. You said that radio is a form of monopoly. You said that in Canada, therefore, you felt that it was perhaps inevitable, or certainly most desirable, that there should be one body charged with the formulation of regulations, the administration of those regulations and the enforcement of them. You thought that was the proper process. I put to you the other situation. That is the one that prevails in the United States where you have four fairly large networks and the Federal Communications Commission. Is not the situation there that you have four competing networks and an impartial referee who imposes the general standard and then simply supervises to see that it is carried out?

The WITNESS: I think there is a very basic difference in radio in Canada and in the United States. In the United States you have very big distances as also in Canada, but you also have a very big population. Therefore you can, as you say, support four, or in some areas even more than four, competing networks. In Canada it was found necessary years ago to set up a public body with funds from licensees to get even one national network going. To get a national system public steps had to be taken. I think that is a very basic difference.

*By Mr. Fulton:*

Q. I think that is quite true, but the point I am trying to make is that although the parallel which exists is not perfect in Canada where we have private stations on the one hand and the national network on the other and thus we do not have two competing networks yet you do have competition between private stations and the government network whereas in the United States you have competition between four national networks. I am saying this: you say it is inevitable for the Canadian commission to impose regulations and to act as referee, and it should do that, and that is an appropriate trend. I put to you the other case in the United States where the person who acts as referee is independent of the actual administration of the networks, and therefore can be impartial. I ask you why that system cannot be achieved in Canada by setting up an independent commission which will not be in any way charged with the administration of the government network?—A. Because it was found necessary in Canada to set up a public body to carry on Canadian national broadcasting without which it was thought you would have none. As I have tried to say, it seems only logical in a medium such as radio reaching all homes if you have a body charged with the responsibility of doing that all across Canada that body is the logical one to make any regulations governing any supplementary service to that national service. I think you have two completely different sets of conditions there.

Q. I am dealing now with where disputes arise between the national service on the one hand and the other service on the other hand. I do not see why it