

origination to see to it that no script violates the regulations. It is up to him. If he wishes, he may see the script, just to make sure. But it is up to him to do so. He has the right, just as a private station man. As I have said, our people are under instructions not to change anything in any way because of any opinions stated.

*By Mr. Diefenbaker:*

Q. Does profanity violate the regulations?—A. Yes, it does.

Q. Well, I have heard that there is a surfeit of profanity in the scripts of some of the plays going over the air.—A. Yes.

Q. I do not want to mention names because I do not want to go into details like that. I understand that too strong language has been used, language which was entirely unnecessary in order to express the thought that the author intended to convey. However, you now say that the script is examined for the purpose of seeing whether or not it does or does not violate the regulations. What do you do about these plays which seem to regard profanity as an ideal vehicle for the conveyance of thought?—A. We have had complaints about some of the plays which were originated by C.B.C. itself. It has been taken up with the program department, and steps are being taken to have more careful supervision of that sort of thing. It does raise difficult questions particularly in connection with some classical plays and certain modern plays where the author has thought that in some cases fairly strong language is necessary to convey what is often a pretty important idea. It becomes not an easy matter to decide just how far the language should go, or rather how it should be modified. I think some slips have been made, and they would certainly be checked up. But I do not think that there has been a use of profanity in a loose way for the sake of dirt. I think that usually the author has used profanity with a very sincere purpose in mind. But I think that purpose could often have been expressed just as well with a modification of the language. It is not an easy subject.

Q. I realize that it is not, and I do not want to have an unnecessary explanation. But there was one play which I listened to recently which would not have lost anything if it had not had so many words of profanity included in it.—A. I agree. Some writers seem to think they need to use strong language in order to get an effect. That should not be allowed at all. I think in some cases there is often bad judgment used.

Mr. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, is it taken for granted then that Mr. Bertrand Russell's material is all blasphemous and unworthy?

The CHAIRMAN: No, not at all.

Mr. MURRAY: Then I think somebody should point out the blasphemous parts of it and that we should not condemn the material without forming opinions on it.

The CHAIRMAN: We are merely questioning the C.B.C. officials while they are here and available to us.

Mr. MURRAY: But have we not taken it to be specific material which should never have gone on the air?

*By Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf):*

Q. I would like to ask Mr. Dunton if he knows whether the scripts which I mentioned were offered to the C.B.C. by their authors, or if the C.B.C. asked for them?—A. I believe the way it would be done is that the C.B.C. program department would get in touch with, probably, several leading psychologists, and would probably find, let us say, four who would be interested and willing to do scripts. The C.B.C. would not suggest what they should put in the scripts, or censor what was in them.