

Mr. Leeson agreed with the statements made by the President that the program could have been confined to a half-hour production and suggested that in his opinion the producer had placed an over-emphasis on the dramatics.

Mrs. Aitken felt that this was not just a question of poor programming, but was also a reflection on the integrity of the Corporation who presented a program which shaded the truth. Mrs. Aitken advised that the interviewee's employer had called her from Brantford and had stated that the facts of the story as presented in the program were not accurate. The employer advised Mrs. Aitken that the interviewee had not quit his job, but had been fired and given the option to resign. The next point raised by Mrs. Aitken was the statement in the program that the interviewee was down to his last \$10 bill. The producers were aware that the interviewee and his wife were to receive approximately \$500 for their services. By shading the truth in this instance, again hurt the Corporation, which could be accused of trying to accomplish, or over-emphasizing the dramatic side of this interview. In Mrs. Aitken's opinion, the Corporation did not present a good portrayal of an unemployed family in distress; has damaged the man's reputation as well as preventing him from securing employment.

Mr. Ganong re-emphasized that the program had hurt the prestige of the Corporation, and particularly that of Close-Up. Mr. Ganong reported that he heard people say that they would not believe anything that was stated in the future on Close-Up.

Mr. Dupuis felt that the program in general had been very bad, and felt it was the intention of the producer to deceive the public and that Management should take corrective measures so that similar incidents would not happen again, even if it meant the dismissal of some employees. In Mr. Dupuis' opinion, if the producer responsible has placed the Corporation in a similar situation before, then the question of his remaining employed should be reviewed immediately.

Mrs. Armstrong agreed with the statements referring to the damaged reputation of the CBC and of Close-Up and felt that the Corporation could no longer look back with puritan pride to the fact that CBC shows were not rigged. By the very fact that such programs as the divorce broadcast and now this story on unemployment which were products of the same producer, in her opinion, placed the Corporation in much the same light as the "rigged" American TV network panel programs. If some measure to prevent a repetition of such an incident could be taken, Mrs. Armstrong felt that it should be done without delay and that CBC network facilities was no place for cheap publicity for any producer and certainly should not be used for personal advancement.

Mr. Dunsmore stated that if the program had been announced as a dramatic presentation, much of the criticism would have been alleviated. This particular interview depicted what was professed to be an authentic instance and he agreed that great damage had been done to the CBC as a whole, as well as to the program to such an extent that would be impossible to measure. Mr. Dunsmore suggested that in his opinion the producer had been remiss and should therefore not be permitted to remain on CBC staff. The Chairman also agreed with the criticism that the program had been far too long and that the second half had been very repetitious. Misrepresentation of fact to the public results in a loss of confidence which may never be regained.

Mr. Ouimet pointed out that although he agreed with much of the criticism expressed by members of the Board, that it was important that the program not be criticized for things it had not done. In Mr. Ouimet's opinion there was no deliberate intention to deceive but only a desire to produce something which would be of interest and have impact. It is also true that certain precautions were not taken, but as far as the producer is concerned, Management should take a close look at keeping him on staff. It would be most unwise if appearing before the Parliamentary Committee, the President was required to report that the producer of the program had been dismissed. Mr. Ouimet suggested that such a decision should be taken at a later date.

At 4:25 p.m. Dr. Lumsden withdrew.