

done, and I think the facts have proved they were right because of the very great interest in the talks evidenced by large numbers of the listening public.

Q. Then it is the responsibility of some individual, a panel or a committee—I do not want to use a general term of talks department—it must be the responsibility of some individuals or set of individuals to choose whom the speaker should be.—A. It is finally the responsibility of the corporation as a whole.

Q. I know that, but somebody has got to do it, and I do not suppose the corporation as a whole says to Mr. X, "Now, why did you recommend this particular speaker?"—A. Frequently there is criticism in checking up inside the corporation. Mistakes naturally are made and there has to be a chain of responsibility.

Q. It is just like saying that the board of directors of the C.N.R. have the responsibility to see that their trains get in on time.—A. I think it is a little more than that because, particularly in this field of opinion and idea broadcasting, we try to watch out pretty carefully from the top, and it is more than the responsibility of having a train come in late. Mistakes are made. We try to check up and sometimes it is considered in advance.

Q. I will come directly to my point. Can you give the committee the names of those who constitute the panel of men who choose these speakers?—A. There is no such panel, Mr. Hansell.

Q. Pardon?—A. There is no such panel.

Q. Somebody must do it.—A. A number of officials all the way up. They are officials in the talks department, through the head of the talks department to the general supervisor of programs, to the director general of programs, on to the general manager and myself, and the whole board, but at any particular stage there is no one panel of people doing it.

Q. The answer does not satisfy me because I do not think it can be done that way, frankly. Somebody has got to start it. Somebody has to call people together. Somebody has got to discuss it. Somebody has got to write to these people to ask them if they will do so.—A. Yes, that is so, but there is a chain of checking all the way up and it will vary according to the circumstances, as it should in any well run body—they might have one or two individuals deciding important questions on their own.

Q. May I ask, then, since I do not seem to be able to get very far on this, could you submit to us the names of those who are employees of the talks department, together with their particular positions?—A. I could do that if the committee wishes, Mr. Chairman. I think it would be very unfortunate if the committee began questioning or considering individuals when it is the C.B.C. as a whole which is responsible. I much prefer to deal with it as a matter of corporate responsibility.

Mr. Mutch: I suggest it would be highly improper to do that. It would perhaps, unconsciously, end up in an attempt to prejudice the position of an individual—where you are dealing with a matter of corporate responsibility, for the same reason that in the House of Commons you refuse to disclose departmental matters because neither the friends nor the enemies of the administration are going to permit someone in the House of Commons to pillory someone who is performing his duty under delegation. In my view, is the same in your department. So far as I am concerned, I would oppose anything of that type of question.

Mr. Fleming: Can I just discuss that point, Mr. Chairman? This is not a question. I asked Mr. Dunton if he would indicate to us something of the seniority of the persons who are reviewing scripts, for instance. That is a little different from the information Mr. Hansell wants, but I think the com-