

Going ahead to the week of January 20 to January 26, 1950, my investigation of broadcasting logs showed just under 19 hours in that week for CJBC for non-Canadian talent, and 5½ hours for commercial.

As to the number of stations with 83 per cent of programming which is all Canadian in origin and content, my figures on these two C.B.C. station in Toronto show that on CJBC we are getting about 20 per cent Canadian talent or content and about 45 per cent on CBL. The only way that C.B.C. can arrive at that figure, I presume, and get it up to 83 per cent is that in some areas there must be a greater number of Canadian talent and information being broadcast, in order to bring that figure up to 83 per cent, or by including in it all their record shows as being shows of Canadian origin.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. That has nothing to do with the question of inaccuracy in their submission. Does their submission say that they do it differently from somebody else?—A. No, it does not.

Q. The point of the submission now is that it is in places dangerously inaccurate?—A. That is right.

Q. And that is one of them?—A. This is one that I am going to talk about for the moment.

Q. Just a moment. Let us get the facts first. You have said that is one which is dangerously inaccurate. You have told us that their statement is dangerously inaccurate in saying that the percentage of Canadian talent is so and so while in fact it is something different?—A. Yes.

Q. Is there some other inaccuracy which you can point out?—A. What I do not see—

Q. We can enlarge on it afterwards, if the members wish. But let us get the facts down first. Is there some other inaccuracy that you can point out?—A. In the C.B.C.?

Q. Well, your own statement is that the report, as you call it, but you really mean submission, is dangerously sketchy. We have dealt with it. Are there any other inaccurate places? I have used the adverb as applying to both of these adjectives.—A. I shall take the “s” out, and singularize it.

Q. Your sole case with reference to inaccuracy is that they have over-stated the amount of Canadian talent shown?—A. That is right.

Q. I think you would agree, would you not, that the word “dangerously” is rather recklessly applied?—A. It may be recklessly applied.

Q. By you, in your letter?—A. Yes, not necessarily, no.

Q. Just as you like.—A. Perhaps the word is strong. I pointed out what I understood was a sketchiness. But I did not say it was in relation to the report. That was a matter which was of prime importance to the C.B.C. during the period of 18 months.

Q. If you think that your rhetoric in this respect is all right, that is your decision.

Mr. FLEMING: It is not an adverb.

The CHAIRMAN: “dangerously inaccurate”? Does not an adverb modify an adjective? “Dangerously” is an adverb.

Mr. FLEMING: I quite agree.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary West*): A couple of you men should get jobs on the C.B.C.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that one of those fellows on the C.B.C. is very dissatisfied, and Fleming and I are competing to get his job.

*By Mr. Langlois:*

Q. The witness will no doubt admit that in their submissions the C.B.C. was dealing with all their stations in Canada, not alone with the two he