

sented before the committee, and based on the documents produced before the committee. As I have said, I do not want to deprive anybody of his right to express his own opinion.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I think I understood it quite well. I agree that at the last meeting Mr. Murray asked that we should discuss these matters at our next committee meeting. Is that not right? Well, I think we are in order in discussing them today.

Mr. SMITH (*Moose Mountain*): But did we as a committee agree to the suggestion?

Mr. STICK: I think I was the one who started the ball rolling when I asked permission from the chair to raise a question. I agree with Mr. Langlois up to a point, but I hope that this committee is not going to become a court of law, which is something that might happen if this committee cannot ask questions and express opinions.

The CHAIRMAN: My own recollection of the last meeting was that the scripts under discussion were asked for, and that it was clearly indicated that that subject would be discussed at an early meeting. I think I have allowed a good deal of expression of opinion this morning. Therefore, without making a specific ruling on Mr. Langlois' point of order, might I suggest that since we have already had a rather wide discussion, we should not be too strict in sticking to questioning. And I am sure that if we do attempt to question Mr. Dunton, that in the course of such questioning we will undoubtedly hear part, at least, of the opinions of the questioner concerned. So may we not proceed along those lines without making a specific ruling? If so, I would be very happy.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, I think there will be a good many opinions to be expressed on the subject, and I think it is a question of time. Undoubtedly this committee will not write a complete report until it has clarified its views on the subject. I understand that the C.B.C. asks for the opinion of the committee in that respect.

The WITNESS: As we have pointed out, we operate under principles; and if those principles are going to be changed, they should be changed by parliament.

Mr. DINSDALE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question on the following point: it has been mentioned several times during the discussion that the material presented in these speeches is rather of a rarified nature and would not appeal to a wide listening audience, perhaps. In short, this material is more peculiar to the academic atmosphere than to the atmosphere of the ordinary listener. So I am wondering what the policy of the C.B.C. is in presenting this type of material. I wonder whether they want the appeal of this sort of academic material to be confined to institutions of higher learning? All of us know that Bertrand Russell, Chisholm, Freud and so on are discussed quite freely, particularly in departments of social sciences in our institutions of higher learning. I know that overseas, when the opportunity afforded itself, those of us who were interested used to go out of our way in order to hear Russell and others. As a lecturer he was quite interesting and his remarks were rather unusual. So I ask if it is the policy of the C.B.C. to try to extend, or to try to get a larger group of people raised to the level of thought of his lectures, the level at which they are considered in institutions of higher learning, in our colleges, universities, and so forth?

Mr. MUTCH: Or, do they think that ideas are dangerous?

Mr. DINSDALE: Or, is there some other policy?

The WITNESS: We regard our job as one of seeing to it that different viewpoints get an airing. Our program department arranged for four leading psychologists to give the talks. I do know that there has been remarkable