

certain may not, that would be curbing the rights of Canadians to hear different opinions. Remember, a lot of people wish to hear Dr. Chisholm and these other psychologists. If parliament bans them, those people have no right to hear those opinions.

Q. Just as the law provides that no driver shall drive at 80 miles an hour in the city of Ottawa. Mr. Dunton, in answer to a question some time ago, you said that the C.B.C. does not approve of the opinions expressed, but do you not do so, though?

Mr. FLEMING: Not necessarily.

*By Mr. Langlois:*

Q. Not necessarily. But does he not think that the people know that these people are paid by the C.B.C., that they get this time free, that he gives the authority of the C.B.C. to whatever they say. Is not that thought in the minds of the people listening to their programs?—A. I do not think so. I do not think when people are listening to a spokesman for the Liberal party that the C.B.C. is approving that opinion, or that when a Progressive Conservative speaker is talking, that the C.B.C. is confirming his opinion.

May I go ahead? I think most of the people in the country understand and are fairly glad to have a chance of hearing different viewpoints. Remember, they can shut their set off if they do not wish to listen to them. I think these people know that the C.B.C. is not approving any opinions that go on the air but is merely providing a chance for those different opinions to be heard.

Q. Do you announce at the beginning of your broadcasts that these opinions are not shared by the C.B.C.?—A. I think we used to.

Q. I notice that there is such a notice in newspapers publishing letters to the editor.—A. We have understood that most people at least understand the question of freedom and understand that the C.B.C. is not sponsoring any opinion that goes on the air.

Mr. FLEMING: You do say that with regard to political broadcasts.

The WITNESS: I do not think so.

*By Mr. Langlois:*

Q. Mr. Dunton, in your answer to my question you established a comparison between political speeches over the radio and said that the people understood that the C.B.C. did not share the opinions expressed necessarily, but in the case of these political broadcasts, as in the case of religious broadcasts, you mentioned that the speaker belongs to such a party or belongs to such a religious sect or religion or group, and right away the listener is warned that these men are expressing the opinions of their groups. If, for example, an Anglican is listening to a sermon by a Catholic priest, he will know right away that this man is not expressing C.B.C. opinions but those of his own church, and vice versa in the case of a Catholic listening to a sermon by a Protestant minister on the radio.—A. I would suggest the same thing applies pretty much to other broadcasts. They are identified and the people right away realize that these people are speaking their own points of view.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there an introduction which identifies them?

The WITNESS: Yes, there is always an introduction on every talk.

*By Mr. Langlois:*

Q. I note here that at the end of these scripts you have notes on the life or previous activities of the speaker. Is that all that is said to warn the people that you do not share the speaker's opinions, because I think these comments give authority to whatever is said.—A. I would have to check, Mr. Langlois,