

Q. I was endeavouring to point out that if the private stations be curtailed in their coverage the refuge of the party or the group which cannot find an outlet for its views through the CBC is likely going to be curtailed likewise?—A. I cannot accept the suggestion, Mr. Hackett, that any important body of opinion in this country will not find a reasonable outlet for its views on the CBC. If not, we are not doing our duty, and parliament should tell us so. I cannot accept that statement.

*By Mr. Hansell:*

Q. Along that line, Mr. Dunton, we have been confining our questioning to points of view which, of course, involve subject matter. I should like to ask a few questions on persons rather than points of view. It is very seldom, I take it, that an individual broadcasts over a national network more than one view; an individual holds a certain view or a certain philosophy and naturally what he broadcasts must be coloured by his own convictions. And now, it is all very well to talk in terms of political broadcasting because of divergences of views of political parties. I am not so interested in that. I am interested rather in another type of broadcasting of which I think you are aware. And now, in respect to people who broadcast news—for instance, commentators—I will not say news announcers but I will say news commentators, such as News Roundup and talks of that kind. How are the people chosen to do that work?—A. They are chosen with a good deal of what you have just said in mind. First, we agree with you that if anyone is going to comment on, say, current affairs, it is likely his personal view will colour what he says to some extent; it will, perfectly naturally. That is the reason, as I have said, that we feel it our duty to see that different points of view are represented on the air; therefore, more care is taken to try to have commentators, whom we are discussing now, who would not necessarily be tied in with political parties, because most commentators deny that they have any connection with political parties, but are observers or from groups of observers holding generally different points of view. And I think if you look at our various commentators whom we have on our different programmes over a period of time you will see that that policy, which is a very basic one, is pretty well carried out. There will be a man on one day who perhaps broadcasts from the viewpoint that is generally accepted as being progressive-conservative; another will be a man who is thought to be not too critical of the government; then there will be another person who would be more progressive in his views, one whom we might classify definitely as being more to the left. That is the policy of trying to maintain a balance of opinion and judgment amongst commentators.

Q. Would you carry that a little further and say that the policy is to divide the time more or less equally among the same individuals?—A. It is not quite as rigid as that because there are different programmes, different talks, different forums. We try to maintain a reasonably impartial balance between the different points of view. One example is "Week-end Review". The regular pattern on that throughout the winter would be Elmer Philpott one week, George Ferguson of the Winnipeg *Free Press* another week, and Dr. Stewart of Halifax another week. From these three commentators you get three different approaches to public affairs and international affairs, and I take it, a pretty good balance. The same applies to other programmes on other subjects that are discussed. I think it is the kind of thing that cannot be worked out completely arithmetically because there are different factors to be taken into account. That is our policy. That is what our people try very hard to do.

Q. I mentioned Mr. Philpott the other day and I did not say so at the time but I do not know this (and I think your records will prove it), that Mr. Philpott follows the news broadcast form Vancouver, which I think covers the western