

reconciled. It is evident that there will always be a decided conflict of opinion between people as to what constitutes good radio programming. If I am not mistaken one of the reasons for creating the C.B.C. was to protect the interests of the public against those who might be willing to sacrifice the interest of Canadian citizens, to satisfy the greed of a certain type of individuals. Our past performance will prove that I am not fostering a "high-hat" attitude. We believe it is our main function to complement the popular type of programs, supplied by advertisers, with others possibly without great popularity appeal but yet essential to the promotion of Canadian broadcasting as a part of our national life. That explains why our own programs do not get the rating obtained by costly commercial programs. What would be the use of us squandering our money on the type of entertainment which is already offered by sponsors? Mr. Sedgwick ought to know that when he states that "the C.B.C. programs that get an audience for the private stations are for the most part their commercial programs, not their sustaining programs"—and I hope that by this time you know that our chief purpose is not to obtain high ratings with our own sustainers.

With this background, I would like to give a brief summary covering the principal points raised before this committee, especially at the meeting of June 21st.

Mr. Sedgwick says that private broadcasters should have been called in conference when the White Paper was reviewed. The revised edition of the White Paper doesn't change any of the basic principles promulgated in the first edition. Furthermore measures taken under that White Paper concern the use of reserved time on private stations and 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. In practice we have tried to organize political broadcasts on our networks in such a way as to interfere as little as possible with the normal operation of stations.

It has been suggested that there should be a joint committee to discuss technical matters on which private broadcasters would be represented. The duty of dealing with technical matters rightly belongs to the government because of the intricate international agreements which must be taken into account. When required, private broadcasters who are interested in any particular problems are consulted, but I cannot see how representatives at large could help in solving them.

It has been suggested that a commission controlling both private enterprise and the C.B.C. would improve present conditions, the main reason given being that it is fundamentally wrong for one body to rule over private stations while also engaged in broadcasting. We claim that no change should be envisaged until the present system ceases to function satisfactorily. The new organization, if it performed its duty towards the Canadian public, would be at least as severe towards private stations as we are ourselves. Indeed, as its sole function would be to control, it would be inclined to exercise its authority with more energy than we ourselves who know broadcaster's difficulties so well. Do private stations really want more effective control to be exercised over their business?

Under such a commission we would become full-fledged competitors of private enterprise with the very strong temptation to just stay within the law and go all out to get audience and popularity. This could not be achieved while maintaining the highest possible quality of public service broadcasting. You will remember that Mr. Sedgwick said when he spoke