

are not too numerous, is it not a fact that in these districts the owners of private receiving sets have sometimes to travel long distances in order to buy their licence?—A. Well, yes, if they want to get delivery right over the counter I suppose they would have to travel, but they can always send in a postal note or a cheque.

Q. And is it not a fact also that since these post offices are receiving, I think, only five cents— —A. That is not true in the case of the rural post offices where, I think, you will find, in some small post offices, they receive fifteen cents.

Q. —is it not a fact that they are not too keen about selling these licences because it is not worth the trouble?—A. We feel it is worth the trouble because it only requires a few minutes of time to write out a licence in triplicate.

Q. I do not know if you have received such complaints but I have.—A. We have received a few from different areas but nothing of any considerable moment.

Q. But people have had to make two or three trips travelling very long distances just to be told by the postmaster that he was out of forms and to come on another occasion?—A. Well, when the postmaster makes his reports he has to say how many forms he has on hand and he is immediately sent another supply if his supply is low.

Q. And now, what is your experience in collecting these licence fees in districts which are what you might call dead spots for radio?—A. Well, of course, it is always difficult to collect licence fees in such areas; people object to paying the licence fee. They always ask the inspector or the collectors, "What are we getting out of this? We are getting poor service, we do not hear stations here, so why should we pay a licence fee?" Of course, we try to give the best answer, we can to that, our objective being to get as much revenue as we can.

Q. Is not the main objection based on the fact that these funds are earmarked for a special purpose, which is to bring revenues to the C.B.C., and these complaints are that, since the C.B.C. is not providing any services, they should not be called upon to pay?—A. Yes, of course; the people are becoming more conscious of that excuse as the years go by.

Q. You said awhile ago that you have studied from time to time the possibility of having a staff to collect these fees. Have you made an estimate of the cost of such a procedure?—A. Yes, I believe we did and we figured it would cost us somewhere in the order of half a million dollars which would be an increase of approximately \$200,000 over the present administration costs.

Q. Well, now you are paying \$637,000-odd?—A. I am speaking now of the administration costs apart from the commission. Having allowed for the commissions which would be eliminated under such a scheme, it would run somewhere close to a million dollars, between \$900,000 and a million dollars.

Q. But this cost will not appreciably increase as the number of licences increase. It would certainly not go up in proportion to the increase in the number of licences sold?—A. I take it now you are assuming that we would do away with the voluntary purchase of licences and that each fee would have to be collected by an individual, a permanent employee of the department, going from door to door.

Q. Yes.—A. That is what our estimate was.

Q. Would it not be then that you would have a better control over the sale of these licences; you would have permanent records; you would be dealing with the same employee all the time? Would all that not help you to have a better control over the sale of these licences?—A. Possibly it would, yes. We would get positive action in every area rather than perhaps depending on people taking out their licence voluntarily in the areas where there is no canvass.

Mr. STEWART: Would it do you a million dollars worth of good?

The WITNESS: I do not think it would. I think the present system that we are following is the most economical, taken all around. Perhaps I might