

his interpretation, and I think it would be dangerous to have the same person, one of our staff, doing it all the time. That particular person would have too much opportunity to get their impressions across. I think we should have variety.

*By Mr. Fleming:*

Q. I think it might be just as well if you went back of today and explained the methods formerly used in connection with the preparation of material for the broadcasts. Go back a few years because this present system is not as it has always been. I think it is as the result of experience that you have adopted the present system under which you get your news from the Canadian Press and from B.U.P.?—A. I do not think at any time the C.B.C. got it other than from news agencies. At one time the Canadian Press supplied news for the former old commission and then for the corporation free, and then permitted it to go on the air, and later a system developed in which we bought the raw news from them and we wrote it and edited it ourselves.

Q. That is the point. The present system is not the one that has always been in vogue; it is one you have arrived at as a result of experience, the rewriting of news in the C.B.C. news rooms?—A. Yes, and also associations developing on both sides. I think the Canadian Press people were the agency that developed the news to the point where it should be edited before being put on the air.

Q. I think it would be well if you would tell the committee the result of that change, so far as public acceptance of it is concerned. What have you found in the reaction to the present method of conveying news as compared with the public reaction to the former?—A. Well, this goes back quite a long time before my time, back to about 1940, I think the actual change was made, and I think it has been a gradual development. Before that time I think it is right to say that the C.B.C. people thought a better job could be done for air presentation by having the news material rewritten in C.B.C. news rooms for the needs of the national system. I find it hard to compare the public acceptance before and after. It does seem to me that the public acceptance in general of the objectivity and impartiality of the Canadian Press news is very high.

Q. You have not been getting many protests?—A. Very few; and in saying that I would like to pay a tribute to the resources of our raw material. It is due to both those who supply us with news and those who get it in the form of news onto the air.

*By Mr. Knight:*

Q. How does the C.B.C. handle their material?—A. By essentially the same system. They get material from the various agencies and make up their news from that. They do in some cases use material from correspondents of their own, which is very carefully identified as such when it is used.

*By Mr. Whitman:*

Q. You spoke of editing the news and you said you have different editors. They are not always the same?—A. I think there is confusion about that. They are quite distinct. There is one in each news room and so on. The commentators—each goes on from Ottawa and these people are not C.B.C. people at all and they are usually handled by an entirely different department, the Talks Department, and that comes into the field of interpretation and opinion.

Q. That is what we want to get at, this interpretation and opinion. Do you change those people frequently?—A. Yes, on all the programs there are different observers, most of them from Ottawa or Ottawa newspapers, but we