

Q. Perhaps we are not of one mind on the use of the word sponsor. Did the C.B.C. pay for those broadcasts, arrange them and pay those who delivered these broadcasts over the C.B.C.?—A. Yes, but we do not make any distinction whether we pay a person or not. I might explain that these broadcasts had been put on the air by B.B.C. in London, and we have a very happy arrangement with the B.B.C., under which a large number of transcriptions of theirs are available to us for a small annual sum. In fact, it would cost us nothing extra to get the Russell series.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): And what about the other series?

The WITNESS: The others will be paid. Could I just check? The others would be paid as many of the opinions broadcast on the air are paid for.

*By Mr. Langlois:*

Q. You mean the speakers are paid?—A. Yes. For instance, on programs like Citizens Forum, which are a straight forum discussion with a clash of opinions, the people taking part are paid a fee.

Q. Are the speakers on the various religious programs also paid?—A. No, we do not pay any of the speakers on the religious programs. In fact, the churches have asked that they not be paid.

Mr. MUTCH: Is it not the function of your corporation to provide a forum, and having provided the forum to get what, in the judgment of the corporation, are rather acceptable people to present the various points of view, and it stops at that?

The WITNESS: As I explained it before, we try to see that the different viewpoints are represented on the air, and that able and authoritative representatives of those points of view express them on the air, whether they are commentators or political observers and so on, and in the course of events it seems that to get decent people we have to pay them some fees.

*By Mr. Fleming:*

Q. Could you give the committee some information about the payments made to those who delivered the broadcasts under discussion now? Could you get that information for a later meeting if you cannot give it now?—A. I could get that, yes.

Q. Can we have that for a later meeting?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you draw any distinction in enforcing the regulations laid down by the C.B.C. in governing not only its own broadcasts but those of private stations as well, between what is allowed to go on the air, on the one hand, and the programs which you sponsor, in the interests of portraying a form of public opinion?—A. I am afraid that I do not quite understand your question.

Q. Then let me be more specific. I could understand a distinction being drawn between allowing people to have time on the air, on the one hand, over your stations or over private stations; but on the other hand, you are actually going out to retain people to make broadcasts in order to put points of view over your own air waves?—A. Yes.

Q. Might I ask in relation to these two rather different types of sponsorship, if I may use the word in that sense, if there is any distinction drawn either in the matter of policy or in the form of regulations of the C.B.C.?—A. In the first place, we would draw no distinction in our own minds between the two. We see no real difference, as applied to private stations.

Q. There being no distinction then in that respect, I would like to follow with another question. You have indicated your purpose in sponsoring broadcasting of what we are discussing here now, such as those broadcasts by Anna Freud, and Bertrand Russell, and others, is that you are doing it in order to give the public an opportunity to hear authoritative exponents of quite different points of view?—A. Yes.