

Our people in Toronto thought as they had a number of copies left over of the book "*Of Things to Come*" that by taking space in that magazine and in another one they would have proper contact with the public.

Q. Who wrote up the advertising display? Was it the *Canadian Forum* or the C.B.C? I do not want to embarrass anybody—it does not matter much to me—but the display certainly gave certain individuals a little more prominent mention than others.

Mr. COLDWELL: I have not seen the ad. I do not always see the papers.

The WITNESS: I would say this ad which came out was not according to our general policy. We do not do those things but it just happened somebody thought it was a good thing and they proceeded with it but it is not our policy to do that. I do not think it will be done again.

Mr. HANSELL: I have no particular objection, but I think if one booklet is advertised there should not be any particular prominence given to any one or two individuals. I do not think the names of those who were mentioned in the ad. were necessarily the best broadcasters or the best programs of the series. It is all right though; it does not matter.

*By Mr. Ross:*

Q. Mr. Sedgwick said that the private broadcasters should have been called in when the white paper was reviewed. You say here:

I do not see why it is necessary to deal with broadcasters, as a group, when the interpretation of the rules concerns mostly individual stations and their local problems.

Is that quite so? It seems to me that the private stations have their own organization and they should have been brought in. Mr. Sedgwick seems to think they should have been. I wonder if you can say anything more about that?—

A. First of all, the white paper is a statement of policy as to how we want to handle political broadcasting. As it is policy it is decidedly within the authority of the board to decide what should be done. When it comes to private stations interpreting that policy then it becomes almost a local problem. You may want to use some station and the owner says, "I cannot give you that time," because of some reason or another. The paper says there should be one half-hour on each side of the political broadcasts free of political controversy on the station. He may say, "I have an old commitment; I have a news bulletin which is fifteen minutes". He will say, "What can I do?" We will say, "All right, in that case you keep your bulletin", and we arrange with them. It is a matter of arranging local schedules to help broadcasters. In the Saskatchewan election the last time I am told we did allow them to carry programs within the half-hour limit to help them because it did not interfere with the political broadcasts, and we thought it was all right. That is what I mean when I say that the interpretation or application of the white paper is a good deal a matter of dealing with each individual according to the local problem. When it comes to saying whether they should be given time or not on a network I think that is up to the C.B.C. to decide, especially when we use for these broadcasts only time reserved for us, time ear-marked on stations for our own use.

Q. The only thing I see about it is they have their own organization, and there are bound to be matters which would concern the industry as a whole. Therefore, it seems to me they should be called in on these matters. That is my own opinion.—A. The only question which came up which had to be decided was whether there should be time made available between election periods for political parties. If they had said, "We do not like it," I suppose it would have been the duty of the C.B.C. to say that it must go on the air. Whether we consult them or not the matter of having free time for political parties between election periods is, I think, exclusively for the board to decide.