

tions and there might have been very good reasons that I do not know of. At the present time it looks as if it would have been better for us not to have set a ruling against one group. I would insist, however, that people in Quebec heard all they wanted to against the plebiscite.

The WITNESS: You said you were trying to get at the policy. The policy is as it is laid down in the White Paper. We still stick to that: that in important matters of public affairs in Canada, every important viewpoint should have the opportunity of expression on national networks.

*By Mr. Ross (St. Paul's):*

Q. You will remember that much earlier in the meeting of the committee I devoted some time to the same questions. Then Communism was under discussion. I was not entirely satisfied with your answers because I did not think they were comprehensive or complete; it seemed to me that your answers were astute but they were not definite. If you can do anything at this time to make clear the policy of the board as regards broadcasts by persons who are putting forth views that the majority of the board does not share I will be very glad to hear that expression.—A. I thought I had made that pretty clear. I tried to, and certainly I think I made myself extremely clear. You said first of all something as to the question of someone putting forward points of view which the majority of the board do not share. I should like to emphasize at no point do the views of the board come into the question. Regardless of whether the individual members of the board think a view is good or bad we feel it is our duty to try to see that all differing important points of view, represented by a reasonable body of opinion in the country, have a fair and equitable chance to express that point of view on the air. It seems to me that is extremely clear. We understand that as being freedom of the air.

Q. I asked the question in an indirect way. I asked if the owner of a private station had the right to refuse a communist, for instance, the right to broadcast over his station provided he paid the charges and met the requirements, and in so far as I was able to appreciate your answer I did not get a definite reply to that question.—A. I tried to give you as definite and as clear a reply as I could. It is that the station operator is responsible for everything that goes on the station and he can at any time schedule what will or will not go on the station at a certain period; but at the same time we believe that he has an overriding responsibility, a share of the responsibility that all radio has, to give a fair chance to all different important points of view represented, in the case of a local station, in his community. We believe that is freedom of the air. Certainly the man controlling the station has the right at any particular time to say "yes" or "no" as to whether a programme will go on. Naturally he is responsible, but at the same time there is an overriding responsibility on him to give all differing points of view a fair chance. We believe that is freedom of the air.

Q. I am not going to pursue that question any further because I do not think the answer is definite. It may be that you cannot give a more definite answer. I want to ask you another question, Dr. Frigon has said that even when a refusal—

The CHAIRMAN: Would the gentlemen at the end of the table try not to talk so much? It is hard to hear.

Mr. ROSS (*Hamilton East*): We have as much trouble down here hearing what is going on up there.

The CHAIRMAN: If you had indicated that we would have tried to cure it, but the way to cure it is not to start another conversation.

Mr. ROSS (*Hamilton East*): We might as well do that.

Mr. HACKETT: Do you not hear what I am saying? Is that it? I will speak louder if that is the difficulty.