THE PROPERTY OF
THE
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Canada. Parl. H.of C. Special
Comm.on Broadcasting, 1952/53.

J
103
H7
1952/53
R33
A1

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Seventh Session—Twenty-first Parliament
1952-53

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. ROBINSON

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 1

THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1953
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1953

WITNESS:

A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1953

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. Robinson,

Vice-Chairman: Mr. Pierre Gauthier,

and Messrs.

Beaudry	Dinsdale	Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*)
Boisvert	Fleming	MacLean (*Queens*)
Breton	Fulton	McCann
Carter	Gauthier (*Sudbury*)	Mutch
Coldwell	Goode	Richard (*Ottawa East*)
Courtemanche	Hansell	Rilev
Decore	Henry	Smith (*Moose Mountain*)
Diefenbaker	Jones	Whitman

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

ORDERS OF REFERENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
FRIDAY, March 20, 1953.

Resolved,—That a Select Committee be appointed on broadcasting to consider the Annual Report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and to review the policies and aims of the Corporation and its regulations, revenues, expenditures and development, with power to examine and inquire into the matters and things herein referred to and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, and to send for persons, papers and records; That the Committee have power to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be deemed advisable or necessary; That the Committee have power to meet while the House is sitting; That the Committee shall consist of the following Members: Messrs. Beaudry, Boisvert, Breton, Carter, Courtemanche, Decore, Diefenbaker, Dinsdale, Fleming, Fulton, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Gauthier (*Sudbury*), Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Knight, MacLean (*Queens*), McCann, Murray (*Cariboo*), Mutch, Richard (*Ottawa East*), Riley, Robinson, Smith (*Moose Mountain*), and Whitman. That Standing Orders 64 and 65 be suspended in relation thereto.

FRIDAY, March 20, 1953

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Goode be substituted for that of Mr. Murray (*Cariboo*) on the said Committee.

FRIDAY, March 27, 1953

Ordered,—That the quorum of the said Committee be reduced from 14 to 9 members.

THURSDAY, April 2, 1953

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Coldwell be substituted for that of Mr. Knight on the said Committee.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

REPORT TO THE HOUSE

FRIDAY, March 27, 1953

The Special Committee on Broadcasting begs leave to present the following as its

FIRST REPORT

Your Committee recommends that its quorum be reduced from 14 to 9 members.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

W. A. ROBINSON,
Chairman.

73405—1½

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, March 26, 1953

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. this day.

Members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Breton, Carter, Decore, Dinsdale, Fleming, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Gauthier (*Sudbury*), Henry, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), MacLean (*Queens*), McCann, Richard (*Ottawa East*), Riley, Robinson, Smith (*Moose Mountain*), and Whitman.

On motion of Mr. Whitman, seconded by Mr. Decore,

Resolved,—That Mr. Robinson be Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. Robinson thanked the Committee and read the Orders of Reference.

On motion of Mr. Whitman, seconded by Mr. Decore,

Resolved,—That Mr. Gauthier (*Portneuf*) be Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

On motion of Mr. Decore,

Resolved,—That a recommendation be made to the House to reduce the quorum from *14* to *9* members.

On motion of Mr. Gauthier (*Sudbury*),

Ordered,—That, pursuant to its Order of Reference, the Committee print from day to day, 700 copies in English and 300 copies in French of its Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence.

Agreed,—That Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the C.B.C. Board of Governors, be heard at the next meeting; and that the planning of further proceedings be referred to a sub-committee on Agenda and Procedure comprised of the Chairman and 6 members to be named by him.

At 10.55 o'clock a.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

WEDNESDAY, April 8, 1953

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 11.00 o'clock a.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Beaudry, Boisvert, Carter, Coldwell, Fleming, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Gauthier (*Sudbury*), Hansell, Jones, MacLean (*Queens*), Mutch, Robinson and Smith (*Moose Mountain*).

In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, Donald Manson, Special Consultant, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, H. Bramah, Treasurer, Geo. Young, Director of Station Relations, R. C. Fraser, Director of Press and Information, P. E. Meggs, Supervisor of Information, R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors and J. A. Halbert.

The Committee proceeded to the consideration of the 1951-52 annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Mr. Dunton was called, presented a review of the Corporation's activities during the past year and outlined the objectives of the C.B.C. in the field of television.

At 11.40 o'clock a.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m., Thursday, April 9.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

APRIL 8, 1953
11.00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum. I am afraid that your chairman has chosen a rather bad morning to hold our first meeting. I understand there are several caucuses and other events scheduled for this time. I wonder, under those circumstances, if it would be agreeable to the committee to hear a statement from Mr. Dunton and then perhaps defer our questioning until a meeting to be held tomorrow at an hour which is agreeable to the committee? Would that be agreeable?

Agreed.

Perhaps we could sit at 3.30 tomorrow afternoon. Would that be agreeable?

Agreed.

Since that is agreed, I shall now call on Mr. Dunton.

Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman, Board of Governors, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, called:

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, I believe this is to be quite a brief statement, and that questions will be deferred until tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right, yes.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, we have not any long, prepared presentation for the committee, perhaps because this year we have nothing special to ask the support of the committee for in the way of financial arrangements or things such as that.

I thought it might be useful to you if I, very briefly, reviewed developments since the period covered by the annual report, which I think the committee has before it.

On sound broadcasting there are really no major developments, or changes in policy, or changes in direction to report.

The main change in our physical facilities has been an extension of the French language network to western Canada. This extension went into operation last fall, and now links the former network in Quebec with French language stations in northern Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta.

A project has also been started for the establishment of a French station at Moncton, New Brunswick, which will also be linked with the same network, so that we will then have three national or nearly national networks of each well over 3,000 miles in length. These are the only real developments on the physical side.

On the programming side again there are no major changes in policy or direction to report. I think on the whole it has been a year of consolidation and general advance. I believe there have been improvements, and new programs, and new types of programming in just about every field of the corporation's programming work.

It has been more a development of previous broadcasting which you know, and as reported upon in the annual report, with, I think, quite worthwhile improvements in just about every department and every kind of broadcasting. I shall not take up your time to review them in detail, but if you wished, I could give them to you later.

I should like to draw the attention of the committee to something I am sure it knows about, namely, a change in the management of the corporation. Mr. Donald Manson retired as general manager on December 31, 1952 and Mr. Alphonse Ouimet was appointed general manager as from January 1, 1953.

Mr. E. L. Bushnell, the former director general of programs replaced Mr. Ouimet as assistant general manager, and Mr. Manson is staying on, at the request of the corporation, as consultant, and an active consultant he is indeed.

In general, the policy of the corporation in respect to sound broadcasting is to continue to maintain and to develop further the sound broadcasting system, to improve further and, we hope, to enrich the programming of sound broadcasting, and to extend further the coverage of the sound broadcasting networks in outlying areas.

That is really about all there is to report on sound broadcasting.

The major developments of the year have, of course, been in television.

As is mentioned in the annual report, the intensive training program for the television organization began last January. I think at the time the last parliamentary committee sat we explained there was a plan ready to go into action six months before the centres in Montreal and Toronto would be ready. We became confident in January 1952, and the training program then went into operation. I think it was a very interesting affair.

Our management did not rely on sending Canadians to other countries to learn how to do television. Nor did our management bring instructors and people in from other countries apart from a few people as occasional lecturers. Although, of course, we had watched developments in other countries very carefully. But on the whole the television organization crews were self-trained, trained by themselves here in Canada.

The plants were ready for operation during the summer and they went into operation on a preliminary basis in Montreal and Toronto during the summer. And they went into formal operation at the beginning of September.

We are very pleased with the work which our engineers did in the physical equipping and the lay out of the plants.

I think perhaps what seems to us an equal achievement was the way these special crews of young Canadians stepped in, right from the beginning, and took on full scale television programming production.

Television programming production is an extremely complicated, difficult, expensive, and often exasperating thing. Consequently I think those who had trained themselves and trained these closely-knit crews deserve a great deal of credit.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that it may be possible for the committee or for members of the committee to visit either, or if possible, both of the production centres in order to see them in operation, and to see rehearsals going on, and to see some programs being produced. I think you will find that you could get more understanding of what television is by watching shows going on than you could from listening to a lot of papers and speeches. I am sure also that you would find it very interesting and helpful in your consideration of questions on television.

Both stations started in September, as you know, with fairly modest program schedules of about 18 hours a week. That has since grown gradually to well over 30 hours, varying a bit from week to week.

The basis of the program schedules is Canadian live production. But in addition there is material from outside Canada on film, by kinescope, by direct network connection, so far in the case of Toronto.

I shall not try in detail to go over the programs and what has been produced. There is quite a wide range of programs, drama, lighter variety, various kinds

of panel shows, news shows, and a good range of programming. We could file schedules in greater detail if you wished to look over them.

Development, of course, has been pretty fast in both of these places. In Toronto, the number of sets in the area has risen—I refer to the area covered by the station—from around 65,000 when the station went into operation, to close to 150,000 at the present time. In Montreal the number has risen from almost nil to over 50,000.

I think in both places we find examples of the kind of problems that Canadian television as a whole has to face. For instance, in the Toronto area, the station at Buffalo, New York, can be received very clearly on most sets. I have often heard it said that perhaps competition from the Buffalo station is the most difficult in the world. Buffalo is a single station in that area, and in effect they pretty much have the pick of programs from all four American programs—chiefly the two biggest and strongest—through which comes a really massive array of very expensive and attractive programming. I think after any given evening in Buffalo the total cost of programming will run to between $150,000 to $200,000—not paid by the station itself because the programs come from a very wide area or perhaps on film.

We find, according to some of the commercial rating services, that very often more people in the Toronto area are looking at the Buffalo station than at our station. That, of course, is a bit discouraging at times, but I think that we, and other people, have to realize that what is happening is that in one case new Canadian production is just starting with a tiny fraction of the available resources behind programming, compared with a flood of programs costing enormous sums of money, very attractively done by expert showmen. However, we are not discouraged. I think most people, looking at the programming in the Toronto station impartially, would agree that though it is by no means perfect, and there are weak spots—a great deal of extremely effective production is being done. I would say that most of the drama production in the Toronto station in general compares favourably with anything done on this continent and perhaps in the world. I do not think we can say the same thing about light entertainment, but I think some light entertainment has been surprisingly good. The news type of coverage is developing in a very interesting way. I think perhaps that if, say the Toronto area, was away by itself on an island and television just came, people would think what was being done was entirely remarkable, but compared with the programs that pour across the line they are not always so impressed.

But, as I say, we have confidence in what is being done, and we have confidence in the talent that is turning up in Canada, in the production ability that has developed in the crews, and that is continuing to develop, and we think that as television grows in Canada it will stand up very well with anything going on anyplace.

In Montreal there is a different type of problem. There is not any telecasting coming in from outside. It is a city of two languages and we have so far only one transmitter and have to broadcast programs in two different languages. I think you could probably imagine what happens. It is the sort of thing familiar to us in the C.B.C. We get a great many letters and telephone calls from French speaking people asking why all the programs are in English, and we get calls from many English people asking why all the programs are French. In effect —though we have not been working to a definite percentage—it has worked out that the percentage over the months has run about 50 per cent in each of the languages. Naturally, a person who easily understands only one language is a little upset if he hears a program in his language for an hour and then the language changes.

The situation in Montreal will be improved when we have a second transmitter, so that one transmitter can be broadcasting French service and the other English language service.

Again, I think it is extremely encouraging to see the kind of talent and ability that is developing in French speaking Canada for television. I have seen, and I know outside observers from Europe, England and the continent have been quite amazed at some of the production being done by people who probably had not seen a television set or a camera eight or ten months ago.

Again, some of the programming we know perfectly well is weak, but there is not money nor facilities at the moment to make it more elaborate or better.

But many of the productions, looked at objectively, are a very real addition to the life of the country now.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like very quickly to review the aims and general purposes we are trying to follow in television development. As we understand them, they stem from the objectives set by parliament as a whole for the corporation and the broadcasting system, and I would like to say how we are trying to carry them out in television.

In the first place, we are trying to develop a pattern of programming such that the over-all effect, on balance, is good; or, to put it in another way, so that the minds of young Canadians being exposed to it will, through the years and in general, have something added to them, and not subtracted from them, and, on the whole, will have a positive, not a negative effect.

That does not mean it is all aimed at things instructive or educational or anything of that sort. A great deal will be aimed at being purely entertaining, but we do hope to shape the general pattern so that the over-all effect week in, week out and year in, year out is for healthy stimulated development of the minds of people both young and old who are exposed to it.

We have, in the corporation, a sense of very heavy responsibility in televising. We know very well from observation in other countries and from what we already know in Canada that television has an enormous impact and a strong appeal which makes an extremely vivid impression on people's minds. Young people are very impressed by it. We know inevitably it is going to grow and grow very fast. We believe it is extremely important to try to see that the general over-all pattern, in balance, is a good and useful one. Television is so effective that it can put across entertaining things very well, very easily and very naturally. But it can put across mediocre and rather second-rate slick things, very effectively, and while people will look at them, and want to see them, and while we think a very large part of it should be entertaining and diverting, we do not, however, think that second-rate kind of things should have an eminent place on television.

In our programming now and in the future there will undoubtedly be quite a lot of things that will have no lasting value. We have wrestling shows in Montreal, and some people do not like wrestling, while others find it highly diverting, in any case it possibly does no great harm. But, on the other hand, we have put on and will continue to put on extremely fine musical and ballet performances in Montreal. Some people find them boring, but we think that type of entertainment also should have a chance on the air.

We are convinced of one thing that if programs of a better value are shown and produced, a great many more people will get to like them and people's appreciation will develop. We do not understand that it is our job to cram culture down people's throats. But we do not think it is our job, at any rate, to operate a station and let any sort of cheap stuff go out endlessly to be viewed by people.

We think we should try to maintain a wide balance of different types of programs that, while they are entertaining, will also convey information to the people about their country and the life around them in their country,

and in the world; and that brings new insights and new glimpses of beauty and new appreciations, and a wide variety of ideas that cover a wide range of human value and human interests.

Following that kind of a policy is a good deal harder than trying to express it. You run into all sorts of clashes of tastes. Television time and resources are limited, and different members of the public have different views about what they want. We know, too, that often the program, which is obviously of more value to the people who wish to listen to it, will attract fewer listeners than something which costs less and is rather a more slick and showy kind of thing. We still think we should have a good, a fair proportion of programs that have some real value to them, as well as being attractive, and that they should be on, because the people who listen to them will perhaps listen or view them more intensely and get more out of them, and the sum total of what is added or put out into society will be more worth while. But that means that, at times, our so-called audience ratings will be lower. We do not too often put on heavy plays, too much Shakespeare or too much heavy music, but we think that sort of thing should have its fair place in programming.

The second main objective is, as we understand it, should be to have a core of Canadian produced programming. Of course it has always been our policy, as approved by various bodies that looked into broadcasting, to carry also a good proportion of programming from outside Canada. We do that in sound broadcasting and we plan to continue in television to bring in suitable programs from outside the country. But we believe the basis of the development must be Canadian production, production of programs for Canada by Canadians, with the material from outside Canada melded with that produced here into a reasonably sensible pattern of broadcasting.

The real problems in television come in the production of programs in Canada. I think sometimes it is not fully understood among members of the public what a great difference there is with simply building a transmitter and putting on programs which you get, say, from outside the country, on film, or by some other means; that sort of thing is not terribly complicated, it can be done. A great many people do not know how complicated a thing the producing of programs is especially in this country. The difficult thing is that the economic factors work very strongly against producing programs in this country. It is easy to see why that is so. A program is produced in the United States, and the cost is spread over a very large population indeed. The cost is really covered one way or another from a very large population. The use of the program in Canada, the right to use it, can be acquired for a very small amount and it is often a program that is very attractive to many people.

On the other hand, in Canada, at best, no matter how it is done, by what means, the cost of a program can be spread over far fewer people. To put it another way, the cost of producing programs per head in the United States is far less than in Canada. For instance, if any person who wants to have a television program, be it the C.B.C. or a private station or an advertiser, begins to look at costs he likely finds that he can import an attractive program on film and have the right to put it on the station for say $200 or possibly less. But to produce something that will have even a fair proportion of the appeal of that program in Canada, you would probably have to start by paying out $2,000 at least. The financial differentials are in that sort of range, 20, 30 or more to 1, against production of programs in Canada. That is inevitable pressure on anybody in television in this country. It is a pressure that always worked in sound broadcasting, but in television it works much more strongly because the

costs are always much higher, and the economic differentials are much greater. It is a thing we have to face constantly, and not just we—I think Canada—has to realize this if it wants its production to be a good measure of its television programming for itself. That is the complicated, the hard, expensive, part of television—the production of a satisfactory amount of Canadian programs for ourselves.

Our third general objective, again arising from the mandate we have, is to see that the national television system is extended as widely and as quickly as possible. Key points of it now exist with the production centres in Montreal and Toronto. They have, since they were established, been exchanging some programs between themselves by means of kinescope recordings, chiefly English programs going from Toronto to Montreal. Next month the direct relay network will go into operation between Toronto and Montreal and we will have the first physical link in Canada for instantaneous transmission of programs between stations. In the latter part of next month we expect to have a station in Ottawa in operation on a temporary basis, able to take programs from the network. So, again, that will be a third station in a developing national system.

Then looking a little further ahead, as the committee knows, we are working on the establishment of stations and production centres at Vancouver, Winnipeg and Halifax. They will also be component parts of a national system, that is, of course, they will be fed national programs by means of kinescope recordings. In addition, we expect there will be established a number of private stations in different parts of the country, and also in their own way to be components of a national system. We will be supplying all of them with national program service. They will be obligated to take a certain amount of service, and we in turn obligated to supply it. In other words, we will be working in a kind of partnership with these private stations, they supplying coverage for a certain amount of national program service and we supplying some of their programming, they in turn having available time for their own programming. Now that it is started, we see the national system growing at a pretty fast rate. Certainly it is at a rate that is putting a very heavy load of work on senior C.B.C. people at the present time. It would look to us as though very likely by next year the great majority of Canadians will have, one way or another, national television service available to them.

It is going to be a complicated and in many ways a difficult business working up this national service along the lines that I have tried to outline. Success will mean a good deal of effective co-operation between the private stations and the C.B.C., which seems in the offing from the statements of the private station people themselves. It is going to require lots of hard work, hard thinking and creative effort on the part of Canadians connected with television to further develop our television programming and to see that it is distributed well across the country. It has got to develop much further in quality as well as in coverage. It has quite a long way to go. We think it can go a long way, but we are sure now there is ability in the country to produce good, effective programs. There is the skill for it. If economic factors continue to be there, we do think that the country can look forward to the development of a good, effective television system drawing some programs from outside the country but having an essential core of Canadian produced programs.

That is a brief outline, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure we thank Mr. Dunton very much for his opening statement, and in accordance with the agreement reached at the commencement of the meeting I understand we will withhold our questioning until our second meeting to be held tomorrow in this room at 3.30 p.m.

Mr. BOISVERT: Is it possible to get the new rules of the C.B.C. for the members of the committee?

Mr. FLEMING: The draft regulations.

The WITNESS: We have some in draft form and could have them at the meeting tomorrow.

Mr. HANSELL: Are there any private broadcasting stations which have briefs to present before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN: I have not yet been able to arrange a meeting of the sub-committee on agenda. I hope to do so tomorrow. There already have been some requests made for permission to appear.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Seventh Session—Twenty-first Parliament

1952-53

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. Robinson

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 2

THURSDAY, APRIL 9, 1953

FRIDAY, APRIL 10, 1953

WITNESS:

A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1953

ORDER OF REFERENCE

FRIDAY, April 10, 1953.

Ordered—That the said Committee be empowered to meet in Toronto, Ontario, on Monday, April 20, 1953.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

REPORT TO THE HOUSE

FRIDAY, April 10th, 1953.

The special Committee on Broadcasting begs leave to present the following as its

SECOND REPORT

Your Committee recommends that it be empowered to meet in Toronto, Ontario, on Monday, April 20, 1953.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

W. A. ROBINSON,
Chairman.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, April 9, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Beaudry, Boisvert, Breton, Carter, Coldwell, Dinsdale, Fleming, Fulton, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), McCann, Mutch, Richard (*Ottawa East*), Robinson, Smith (*Moose Mountain*).

In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, Donald Manson, Special Consultant, Dean Adrien Pouliot, Governor, J. Alphonse Ouimet, General Manager, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, H. Bramah, Treasurer, George Young, Director of Station Relations, R. C. Fraser, Director of Press and Information, P. E. Meggs, Supervisor of Information, J. P. Gilmore, Assistant to Coordinator of Television, R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors and J. A. Halbert.

The Chairman presented the First Report of the Sub-Committee on Agenda and Procedure as follows:

> The Sub-Committee on Agenda and Procedure is comprised of Messrs. Boisvert, Coldwell, Decore, Fleming, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Hansell and the Chairman.
>
> Your Sub-Committee Recommends:
>
> 1. That the Committee visit the Toronto Establishment of the C.B.C.;
> 2. That the Committee hear representations from the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, possibly on April 28 and 29;
> 3. That the Committee hear the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association and the Canadian Congress of Labour at times to be set later;
> 4. That the Committee meet at 11.00 o'clock a.m. Friday, April 10 and a minimum of twice weekly thereafter preferably on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons;
> 5. That the annual report of the C.B.C. be considered under the various headings as they appear; and
> 6. That consideration of sound broadcasting precede that of television.

On motion to Mr. Mutch,

Resolved,—That the First Report of the Sub-Committee on Agenda be adopted.

On motion of Mr. Coldwell,

Resolved,—That permission be sought from the House to sit in Toronto, Ontario, on Monday, April 20th, 1953.

The Committee considered the 1951-52 annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Mr. Dunton answering questions thereon.

73476—1½

The following sections of the report were considered and adopted: NATIONAL SERVICE:—RADIO: The Crown, The Royal Tour, C.B.C. Wednesday Night, News, Music, Plays, Public Affairs Features.

At 5.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 11.00 o'clock a.m. Friday, April 10.

FRIDAY, April 10, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 11.00 o'clock a.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Coldwell, Dinsdale, Fleming, Fulton, Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Richard (*Ottawa East*), Robinson, Smith (*Moose Mountain*) and Whitman.

In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, Donald Manson, Special Consultant, J. Alphonse Ouimet, General Manager, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, H. Bramah, Treasurer, George Young, Director of Station Relations, R. C. Fraser, Director of Press and Information, P. E. Meggs, Supervisor of Information, J. P. Gilmore, Assistant to Coordinator of Television, R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors, and J. A. Halbert.

On motion of Mr. Kirk,

Resolved,—That the Clerk of the Committee accompany the Committee to Toronto on Monday, April 20.

The Committee further considered the 1951-52 annual report of the C.B.C., Mr. Dunton being questioned thereon.

The following sections of the report were considered and adopted: NATIONAL SERVICE—RADIO: Talks Programs, School Broadcasts, Radio-Collège, Farm, Fisheries and Gardening, Religious Programs, Children's Programs, Variety and Comedy, Sports, Special Events, Use of Talent, Special Programs, International Radio Relations, Technical Development, Commercial Operations, Station Relations.

"Broadcast Regulations" were considered, the witness explaining proposed changes in the regulations.

Copies of the existing and proposed Canadian sound broadcast regulations were distributed to Committee members.

At 12.45 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m., Tuesday, April 14.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

APRIL 9, 1953.

3.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum. Your sub-committee on agenda met just previous to this meeting and considered our work for subsequent weeks. We have before us requests to be heard from the following organizations: The Canadian Association of Broadcasters, the Canadian Weekly Newspaper Association through its parliamentary committee, the Canadian Congress of Labour, and the British Columbia Association of Broadcasters, who have presented a written brief, but who will not appear personally.

Your sub-committee recommends that the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association, and the Canadian Congress of Labour be heard and suggests that for the Canadian Association of Broadcasters the dates of April 28 and April 29 be presently allocated.

For the others, it is difficult at this time to set a definite date and it was suggested that that might be left to the chair, as we see how our work is progressing.

We also considered a suggestion which was made by the minister in his statement in the House, and also by Mr. Dunton yesterday, that it would be desirable for the committee to visit the C.B.C. installations at either Toronto or Montreal, and your sub-committee recommends that we might ask permission to visit the Toronto installation on Friday, the 17th day of April.

As to the progress of our work with the C.B.C. report which we have just started, the sub-committee suggests that we proceed this afternoon with consideration of the annual report, and that it be called heading by heading.

In the matter of future meetings, the sub-committee suggests that we meet tomorrow morning at 11.00, and that in subsequent weeks we meet a minimum of twice weekly, preferably on Tuesday and Thursday afternoon.

In the progress of our work with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation it was suggested that we should first deal with sound broadcasting and then proceed to our work on television. I think that covers the recommendations which your sub-committee has made and we invite discussion from the committee. Is that generally satisfactory, gentlemen?

Mr. MUTCH: I move the adoption of the report.

The CHAIRMAN: That seems to be agreeable. I think we perhaps should have a formal motion to seek the approval of the House for our visit to Toronto.

Mr. COLDWELL: I move that the committee visit the Toronto establishment of the C.B.C., and that permission be sought from the House to sit in Toronto on Friday, April 17, 1953.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion.

Mr. FLEMING: There is just one point about that. Having regard to the programming on Monday, are you satisfied with Friday?

Mr. COLDWELL: What is that?

The CHAIRMAN: We might ask Mr. Bushnell to comment on it.

Mr. BUSHNELL: It is not for me to suggest to the committee when you should go. We will try to put on a good show for you any time, but I think it would meet our requirements better and you would enjoy yourselves better

if you were there on a Monday night to see a show which we call "The Big Review", which is one of our bigger and more costly efforts. Friday night is taken up with some smaller shows and a considerable number of film shows. Therefore I would recommend Monday night.

Mr. FLEMING: I thought that we would have an opportunity to see some rehearsals and that sort of thing. Does it mean being there in the evening, no matter which day we go?

Mr. BUSHNELL: I think that would be desirable, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dunton indicated yesterday that we should see some rehearsals.

Mr. COLDWELL: That would mean leaving here on Sunday night and leaving Toronto on Monday night.

Mr. BUSHNELL: Yes.

Mr. COLDWELL: Well, as far as I am concerned, it would not matter which day it was.

The CHAIRMAN: That would be Monday, April 20.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, I am ready to amend my motion, if that is satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

Mr. COLDWELL: So that it would read: "Permission be sought from the House to sit on Monday, April 20, 1953."

The CHAIRMAN: In Toronto?

Mr. COLDWELL: In Toronto.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion?

Carried.

I take it that the report of the sub-committee has been agreed to?

Agreed.

I now call on Mr. Dunton.

Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation called:

Mr. CARTER: Could we have some of these annual reports distributed to the committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we heard Mr. Dunton's preliminary statement yesterday and it was agreed that the questioning should start today. It has now been agreed that we deal with the annual report by headings. It appears that we should start on page 6 with the heading "National Service: Radio, the Crown."

Are there any questions?

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. In connection with radio generally, not specifically with the coverage of the Royal Tour, I should like to ask one or two questions. Mr. Dunton, I have received letters in connection with this problem which comment on the fact that in the opinion of the writers, at any rate, the standard of radio broadcasting in the United States is deteriorating as a result of much greater attention and greater popularity with respect to television broadcasting. I do not want to get into the field of television, but is it your thought that the same tendency will be observed in Canada, or have you seen anything or observed anything which would lead you to believe that it is already operating?—A. To deal with your last part first, I should like to say that I see no evidence of it

so far. It is our policy so far as national broadcasting goes not only to extend but to improve the sound broadcasting services. We think it is extremely important and is going to continue to be extremely important.

Q. I do not want to suggest anything which would give rise to an international incident, but would you comment on the earlier part of the statement with respect to conditions in the United States?—A. I would prefer not to comment, but I will do so if you like.

Q. May I ask you whether you would contradict the assertions which had been made to me?—A. No, I would not contradict them. I think some of the factors are very well known, and that while advertising money has been going into television broadcasting, I think it is true with most stations last year that they showed an increase in sound broadcasting in their station revenues.

Mr. FLEMING: You are speaking of the United States?

The WITNESS: Yes, I am speaking of the United States, and I think it is pretty common knowledge. Therefore it is a hard thing to say whether the standards have gone down or not. It would appear that so far still more money is going into and is available for sound broadcasting, but under the American system that might change in the future.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. You indicated it would be your intention, and you thought it would be possible to carry on both radio broadcasting and television broadcasting actively and to further improve radio even at the same time you are developing television.—A. Yes.

Q. Do you foresee any eventual tendency that the radio broadcasting services, both nationally owned and privately owned, will be of more interest to the remote areas which are not covered by television, or do you see the two actually continuing as co-existent for the whole country from coast to coast? —A. That will be one of the main reasons for trying to keep high standards in sound broadcasting in the remote regions which for a long time at least won't have television service. I think in general there is plenty of room for the two services.

As television progresses, it may to some extent affect the pattern of sound broadcasting, and the programs may vary to a certain extent, but there is a basis for both. I believe and the United States authorities think the same thing, that sound broadcasting may be affected in what it does, but there is still a very big place for it. For example, in some homes which have television as well as sound receivers, while there is a great deal of television viewing, there are still some people who are listening to sound broadcasting, and therefore it will continue to have a very big place.

Q. May I ask you this: do you anticipate being able to continue the two types of broadcasting at the same level, which your statement seems to contemplate, without asking parliament for more money from time to time for radio broadcasting than you have in the past? Do you think that the doing of these two things together will involve extra requirements for money over and above what you would undoubtedly have for television in any event?— A. Taking sound broadcasting by itself, last year there was a re-arrangement of the financial basis with the inauguration of the statutory grant. At that time, as we told the last committee, we thought we were well set for five years ahead at least. Beyond that it was pretty difficult to proceed, and we still think that, provided this new system as indicated in the budget speech produces as much revenue as the license fees would, and if it lives up to the expectations as indicated by the estimates of what it would produce, then we think that no matter what happens in the television field, we will be able to maintain and effect some improvements in the sound broadcasting service for at least until the end of that five-year period.

Q. Your sound service broadcasting which you say you consider to be pretty well financed now on a grant basis is to some fairly considerable extent financed also on the basis of commercial revenue?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you then not foresee any appreciable—I know I am asking you to look into the future—do you not foresee any appreciable decline in commercial revenues on sound broadcasting?—A. There may be a decline, but as you will notice now, there will be some small decline before 1952-53, a small drop off, but not in any way attributable to television. There may be a certain drop, but you will notice now that under this present financial basis, the actual commercial revenue is under 20 per cent, a good deal under, so naturally a drop in that would have some effect, though I do not necessarily think a drastic effect.

Q. What is your present policy and intention with regard to frequency modulation broadcasting. I think you told us some time in the past that it was your intention to extend F.M. broadcasting.—A. I do not think quite that Mr. Fulton. As you know, F.M. broadcasting was a thing which, after the war, was very widely thought would develop to a very great extent both in the United States and here. We in the corporation hoped it would, because it would bring many advantages to broadcasting in general, it would make, for instance, for more clear reception and many low power private stations would benefit from it, but on the whole it simply has not caught on. As you know, its chief advantage is that it brings a higher fidelity reception and reduces interference, and usually cuts it out pretty well entirely. But it seems to me in general, with television coming more and more into the offing, people on the whole were simply not interested enough in that degree of high fidelity and the lessening of interference. There have not been enough sets sold in either country to make it worth while. It might have some revival, but at the moment the situation is not too encouraging. I think the thing is that television has come to the States, and is coming here, and people are not interested in buying a set for some improvement in sound reception.

Q. You did say I think there had not been enough sets sold in either country. Do you mean Canada and the United States?—A. Yes.

Q. Is the experience in F.M. which you outlined also the experience in the United States?—A. In general, except there are a fair number of F.M. stations down there and I think some get along fairly well. I think others have had a good deal of difficulty.

Q. Then you do not have a plan for a complete F.M. network?—A. No. As we have told other committees, we put in F.M. stations in several areas, and put out much the same programs on F.M. as on A.M. We are keeping these transmitters in operation, but at the moment we have not plans to put in any more. There will not be a network of F.M. I think perhaps what we are talking about was improving the quality of transmission by wire lines, so you would get a higher frequency of overtones which F.M. in turn could carry, and I think in technical terms we might have a network of lines carrying up to 5,000 cycles and F.M. would carry—what would it carry?

Mr. J. ALPHONSE OUIMET (General Manager, C.B.C.): Up to the limit of audibility—about 14,000 to 18,000, depending on the age of the listener.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Have you had any applications for more private stations for F.M. outlets?—A. I cannot remember any requests for an increase in power. F.M. of course is more like television. Its coverage depends on height and radiated power, not necessarily on the power of the transmitting unit.

Q. One other general question, Mr. Chairman. Is it your intention to keep separate books on sound broadcasting and television operations?—A. It has been and is our intention to keep the accounts of the finances quite separate.

Q. Will that be reflected?—A. I think you will see it reflected in last year and again reflected in the statement for the year just ended. Our whole accounting system is organized to keep the accounts separately.

Q. Are you going to be able to keep the receipts from excise tax which is turned over to you, those receipts which are derived from the purchase of radio equipment, that is sound broadcasting equipment, separate from those receipts derived from the purchase of television equipment.—A. We hope so. It will depend on what information the Department of Revenue gives us. We hope we will get—

Mr. H. BRAMAH (Treasurer, C.B.C.): It is expected the excise division will keep them entirely separate, and make returns accordingly.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. And you intend to apply one to radio and one to the separate field of television.—A. It is our intention to apply the revenue in respect of one to that form of broadcasting. It has been all along our intention, as the Massey Commission recommended, to keep the accounts separately.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. When this committee last sat in the Fall of 1951, we were much concerned then about the expansion program of the C.B.C. for which at that time a request was being made to parliament to provide an annual grant of $6¼ million for a five-year period. You mentioned the French network in your statement yesterday. Could you tell us, apart from the French network, whether there have been any stations added to the C.B.C. networks?—A. The major capital undertakings that have gone ahead are a new studio centre in Winnipeg and a station in Moncton which will be going ahead shortly and we have a number of projects which we hope to go ahead with this year for which we now have the money to go ahead with from the surplus of the last two years. At the last committee we gave a list of a number of things we thought desirable, and a good deal of study has been made of the things we can make a start on this year.

Q. Can you tell us in a word what the Winnipeg and Moncton projects cost?—A. The Winnipeg sound broadcasting project altogether runs to a bit over $1,100,000.

Q. And Moncton?

Mr. BRAMAH: $450,000.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. You were going on to speak about the next stage in your expansion program.—A. There has been some expansion in terms of new facilities, but a good deal will be the replacing of older facilities to improve the coverage in outlying areas. One of the most urgent things now is the replacement of the transmitter in St. John's, Newfoundland. It is an old transmitter which has deteriorated rather badly, and we are going to put in a new 10 kilowatt transmitter in order to bring the service to the outlying areas of Newfoundland.

Q. Have you been able to do anything with two areas that were regarded as blind spots to some extent. At previous meetings of the committee you were asked about the Gaspé and an area in northern Ontario, Kenora and north of it.—A. A good deal of study has been done in the Gaspe area. We had to see if it was possible to establish a station somewhere in the Gaspé peninsula to serve a good part of that peninsula and also parts along the gulf

of St. Lawrence, mostly across the gulf, where a good deal of development has been going on. Engineers found it almost impossible to get a frequency under which to operate a station successfully so that it would serve the eastern end of the peninsula. The project now is to establish a relay transmitter to cover the area around Gaspé and to be connected with the network. We have been unable to find a way of establishing a high power station to serve that area.

Q. So there is no change so far as that area is concerned?—A. Not yet, except a decision to go ahead with a low power station to serve the Gaspé area.

Q. When can that be expected?—A. We intend to start this year.

Q. When is it expected to be in operation?

Mr. OUIMET: It will depend on the availability of the lines. We have to extend the lines to Gaspé. If there is no trouble there, it should be done during the fiscal year, but I am not sure we will be able to get the lines.

Mr. FLEMING: Before March 31, 1954?

Mr. OUIMET: That is right.

Mr. FLEMING: Can you tell us about the Kenora area.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. Did I understand the witness to say they were expanding the station at St. John's.—A. Yes, we are planning to replace the transmitting plant at St. John's.

Q. And what range do you expect to get from that?—A. It will be a very wide range, though not an ideal service as in a big city, but it is expected that it will go well up into the northern arm of the peninsula, and to some extent along the south soast. It will be a modern 10-kilowatt transmitter. As you know the service of the C.B.N. has deteriorated a little, and this service should be better.

Q. I am interested in this question because about half my riding is served by the C.B.C. and we cannot get C.B.C. reception for two reasons. The signals fade, and then it is jammed by signals from a South American station, and so we have no service at all in the western part of my riding, and I have made several representations about this.—A. That would be the western part of the south coast.

Q. Yes.—A. We hope the new transmitting plant for the C.B.N. will adequately cover a good way along the coast from east to west, but what we would like to do is to get the new transmitter in and see how far west it goes, and then consider the matter. Also, I would like to explain that we are going to put in a new transmitter near Sydney, Cape Breton, and we will see if the western part of the south coast of Newfoundland is covered. If not, we will have to consider some relay transmitters.

Q. Well, you know you have a station at Corner Brook?—A. Yes.

Q. And that station cannot be heard in Port aux Basques?—A. We are not counting on Corner Brook to cover Port aux Basques, and if the new station at Sydney does not cover it adequately, the only way—

Q. But the station at Sydney does not carry the programs we want.—A That is another thing. We realize that. It would mean we have to arrange to feed the programs if particular interest to people in Newfoundland, back to Sydney and have them go out of the Sydney transmitter.

Q. But you are not considering any expansion until you see the results?—A. We would like first to see how well we can do with this new transmitting plant at St. John's, which should be a very considerable improvement over anything that C.B.N. ever had before.

Q. And when do you expect to complete that?—A. That is the first project we will be working on. I think by the end of the fiscal year.

Q. By the end of March, 1954?—A. Yes, in other words within a year.

Q. Is it more economical to erect stations that you can run telegraph lines to?—A. For these network stations we would have to have a line wire service. The service goes through Port aux Basques and there should not be any extra line, because if we found we had to have other low power feeders along the coast we would just have to find out if service was available. If there is no service, the communication companies would have to put the service in.

Q. Well, if the new circuit is not adequate then you would consider a station either somewhere on the Burin peninsula or in the vicinity of the Port aux Basques?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. What about the British Columbia blind spots?—A. I was asked about Kenora—

Q. Yes, after Kenora.—A. I think the Kenora question raised in the committee before was largely a service for the Fort Frances station. That has been added to the network. It is getting full network line service.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. When did it go into operation?—A. About a year ago. In addition, the board has authorized work going ahead on a number of low power relay transmitters at different points, some in Ontario and some in British Columbia, and one in New Brunswick. Would you like to have a list of them?

Q. Yes, could you give us the list?—A. Yes, of course, in addition to the ones already in operation: Jamestown, Ontario; Geraldton, Ontario; Golden, British Columbia; Greenwood, British Columbia; McBride, British Columbia; Jasper, Alberta; Banff, Alberta; Blairmore, Alberta; Grand Forks, British Columbia; Red Rock, Ontario; Lytton, British Columbia; Chapleau, Ontario; Beardmore, Ontario; Grand Falls, New Brunswick; Longlac, Ontario; Megantic, Quebec; Coleman, Alberta; and Natal, British Columbia. That involves a certain capital expenditure and also a very considerable wire line expenditure to bring the service to these low power stations to be established at these places.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. Is the Cariboo country in British Columbia now covered pretty well?—A. I think pretty well.

Q. There were several blind spots there.—A. There are a string of repeaters up there and I do not think we had many representations from there recently.

Q. Is a place like Ocean Falls covered now?—A. No, Ocean Falls has been a difficult problem. There is no line service in there now. We hope to solve that in some way. I know the local company has been very interested in doing something and suggested they might establish a station if we could arrange to feed the network, and we are trying to find suitable ways of feeding the network. That is quite a problem. We have been working on the interior of British Columbia, but it is difficult and expensive to cover.

Mr. JONES: Have you received a report yet regarding the Okanagan valley, the interior around there?

The WITNESS: Yes, a good deal of work has been done on that, in that we gave consideration to a 10-kilowatt station serving the Okanagan valley which would have cost about $450,000, but which, at the best, could have hardly more than duplicated the coverage of the present private stations in the area, Vernon, Kelowna and Penticton, and so far the board has decided we would not be justified in an expenditure of that magnitude to, on the whole, duplicate the

service of the present private stations, even though it would bring some additional programs to that area. What we are doing is making further survey work around the Okanagan and the Kootenays to see if we could not add more listeners not now served, or covered, by installing more relay stations.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Since we met in the fall of 1951, how many new private stations have come into operation and are therefore available for your network?—A. I do not know that any have come into operation, because the government had a general stop on any new licences for any broadcasting stations for two years, until the beginning of this year. I do not think any have actually come into operation in the period.

Q. What was the basis of that stop order on further stations?—A. It was a government matter. We understood it had to do with the shortage of steel that arose after the Korean war.

Q. That was my impression, too. Is that stop order still in effect?—A. No, it was lifted as of the beginning of this year.

Q. This calendar year?—A. Yes. Several applications have gone through since and several have been recommended by our board.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Arising out of your answer to Mr. Jones, did I understand you to say that you or your board have pretty well turned down the idea of a C.B.C. station for the Okanagan?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember that you and I had correspondence in December of last year as the result of a request from the Salmon Arm and District Chamber of Commerce, which is in the Shuswap valley, adjacent to the Okanagan valley. They were protesting against the fact they could not get any C.B.C. coverage—and you told me in your letter of December 4, 1952 that you had written to them to the effect that their problem might be solved if this new station were to be installed, but you went on to say: "If on completion of our site survey, we find that the northern end of the Okanagan, including Salmon Arm, would not be satisfactorily serviced by a station of higher power, we shall of course have to reconsider the question of establishing a low power station in the Salmon Arm district."—A. That is just the sort of thing that came out in the studies that we made, that a station in the middle of the Okanagan would not bring very good service to a place like Salmon Arm, and for that reason we thought it would be better to go back to the relay transmitter and serve places like Salmon Arm and the surrounding valleys with a lower power transmitter.

Q. I realize it is only four months since you wrote me, and perhaps only two months since you finally decided against the bigger station.—A. It is only 10 days ago; it was decided at the last board meeting.

Q. Can I ask you, then, to press forward your installation of the low power transmitter at Salmon Arm?

By Mr. Jones:

Q. Some time ago one of the stations referred to—that is, Kelowna—applied to increase its power from 1,000 watts to 5,000 watts. The application was turned down on the supposition you were going ahead to remedy the situation. In view of what you said, would their application be reconsidered, or that of other stations?—A. I do not remember that being turned down, offhand.

Q. CKOV—two years ago.—A. Perhaps, the secretary of the board will be looking that up and we will have an answer in a minute.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other general questions? Mr. Carter?

By Mr. Carter:

Q. Further to what Mr. Dunton just said. Does the C.B.C. have data on this new station in St. John's, CJON? Are you familiar with that station? It is a fairly modern station.—A. We get the usual reports that we get from all stations, their program logs and that sort of thing.

Q. The extension, this new improvement you plan to make to the C.B.C. station at St. John's, how will it compare with that station?—A. It will be of higher power and more effective coverage than CJON now.

Q. Do you follow any fixed rule when you allocate, say, wave lengths to your various stations? Is there any fixed rule governing what frequency will travel best in certain areas?—A. That is a serious and a very complicated technical question. There are a great many limitations under international treaties as to what frequencies can be used and what protection has to be given to existing stations. Therefore, the first thing an applicant for a new station has to do is to get engineers to find out what frequency he can use in a certain area and under what limitations. In other words, we are not setting any rules about it. There are a great many restrictions laid down and applicants have to try to find a usable frequency and conditions under which it can be used.

Q. If you have a certain wave length, you could only use that wave length in a certain area?—A. You could only use it in an area, a certain area, and depending on the wave length for the station, a certain power even to radiating power in a certain direction.

Q. How far away would you have to go before you could use that wave length again?—A. It would depend on the wave length. It can be repeated at a very great distance, all depending on the regulations under international agreements.

Q. Have you made any experiments with interchanging wave lengths of your various stations?—A. There is not much interchangeability. Our high power stations are on clear channels allocated to Canada and just about all are being used.

Q. You have a station in Charlottetown which some times jams stations at St. John's. Why is that?—A. It should not be blacking out St. John's.

Q. It does. There are times when it overlaps and cuts it out. Charlottetown will come in and blot it out.—A. Our station is not at Charlottetown. That would be CFCY.

Q. That is not a C.B.C. station?—A. No. Ours is CBA at Sackville, which is on a Canadian clear channel.

Mr. COLDWELL: But you would have some control over that situation, though?

The WITNESS: Yes, but it would depend on the restrictions under the international agreements. If you are listening in an area, say somewhat removed from St. John's, where you can hear the St. John's station, and sometimes Charlottetown blots it out, perhaps where you are is an area which an international agreement protects neither one from the other.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. There is one thing I wanted to clear up on that matter of the expansion program. Did you give us, Mr. Dunton, all that you planned for the coming year?—A. No.

Q. Would you mind just completing your answer, then, please?—A. I added that we also want a new transmitter at Sydney, Cape Breton. We had been using a transmitter there under an arrangement with a private station and the coverage is unsatisfactory for the Cape Breton area. Also, I think it might under special arrangements help some of the nearby areas of Newfoundland.

We want to go ahead with the establishment of studios in Saskatchewan, and again we would hope to work this out on a basis that capital cost would not be too high.

Mr. COLDWELL: Where are you going to place that studio?

Mr. FLEMING: In Rosetown-Biggar!

Mr. COLDWELL: I did not suggest that, but I know that Outlook is a very good spot. Then of course Davidson is midway between Regina and Saskatoon.

The WITNESS: We should like to have some arrangement whereby we could have the facilities available in Regina and Saskatoon.

The CHAIRMAN: The questions are going from the general to the specific.

The WITNESS: We have had a great many representations and arguments from both areas as to which place the studio should be located in and each has advantages for us. We would like to have some facilities in Regina, but also at least a standby in Saskatoon. These possibilities are being investigated without going into any great capital cost.

Mr. MUTCH: You should make it conditional on Saskatchewan that they should stop broadcasting that dogfight in Regina!

Mr. RICHARD: There is some criticism around Ottawa that the reception of CBO is not too good.

The CHAIRMAN: Had you finished?

The WITNESS: I had not, but Mr. Richard's questioning was going to lead to it.

By Mr. Richard:

Q. I was wondering if there are any plans to fix the transmitter, or change it or boost the power. I might say that there are four stations in this area and CKOY is hard to get because the United States stations are blocking them. CBO is not too clear either. There has been quite a bit of criticism and I was wondering what steps have been taken to improve the situation here?—A. The reply I was going to give concerns a new transmitter for the Ottawa area to improve the coverage in the surrounding district, going from one kilowatt to five; and a similar thing in Quebec to remedy a similar situation. We are still operating on one kilowatt and the service in the area outside the city is poor, and we are planning to establish a 5-kilowatt transmitter there. We are just now starting to experiment with low power transmitters for the urban areas of Calgary and Edmonton where there have been complaints about local interference and we hope, if the experiment works out, we will put relatively low power transmitting stations in those areas.

Q. It is true we can get CBO pretty well and even the private stations. I always thought that our wave lengths were more or less protected, but it is clear in some cases like CKOY it is hard to get good reception with the American stations having closed wave lengths.—A. It should be protected within that area, but at night outside that area there will be interference.

Q. I am talking about right in the city here.—A. Here in the city there should be interference free reception unless there is something wrong with the transmitter or receiver or someone is violating the International Agreement and if so that should be taken up.

Mr. DINSDALE: Coming back to this question of frequency modulation, does the F.M. help this?

The WITNESS: Yes, and after the war we hoped it would do away with just the complaints that are being made now and that you would have ensured reception to good distances. But there simply are not very many F.M. sets and no one is very interested in concentrating their broadcasting on F.M. We had thought that after the war it might be the answer to a great many of these problems.

Mr. DINSDALE: The advantage gained would be worthwhile.

WITNESS: We had hoped so, but a lot of it becomes outside of our hands because the public are not buying the sets.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Which comes first, the chicken or the egg; do you have to put in the F. M. stations or the public buy the sets?—A. In several cases we put them in. We have one at Ottawa and there are five in all, the others being at Montreal, two Toronto and Vancouver. We put them all in when there were practically no F. M. sets in the areas. There is only one F. M. Station in Canada on a commercial basis which is operating at Hamilton. One was established at Kitchener but dropped out of operation. There is an educational one in Toronto.

Q. In connection with your program of development, I notice in this report in one passage you say consideration was being given to using the old channel C.B.R., the former station CBU in Vancouver as an additional outlet, you having left that channel and gone to CBU on 690. What is the decision on that now?—A. We do not know. The decision not to do anything is just very recent. We want to look further into the question of coverage in the province and see if that frequency could be used economically in the interior or in the north; if not it will be open to someone else.

Q. Did you get any formal request by American Stations against the adoption by CBU of operation on the 690 kilocycle frequency? There was great controversy in Vancouver at one time.—A. I do not think there could be any possible grounds for complaint about it. It was a channel available to Canada for use in that way.

Q. Had an American station perhaps either occupied or come near it without there being a channel available to them? I know there was a very great outcry in the American papers because American stations that were formerly being received were blocked out by CBU.—A. The CBU wave length was within 20 kilocycles of Seattle and on some people's receivers did interfere with reception of Seattle; but the operation of CBU was far within the international restrictions, the International Agreement, and I am sure a well-adjusted set can make a separation between those two stations.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Would you give us the amounts of these additional items in your program for the fiscal year? Would you put the amounts opposite these different things that have been mentioned.—A. These are all only tentative amounts: CBN, St. John's, Newfoundland, $420,000; new transmitting plant at Sydney, Nova Scotia, $300,000; tentative Saskatchewan studios for capital cost, $75,000; new transmitting plant at Ottawa $325,000; new transmitter at Quebec $300,000; two low power transmitters for Edmonton and Calgary, $97,000.

Q. The total?—A. $1,800,000.

Q. That is the program that has been approved by the Board of Governors for the fiscal year just commenced?—A. Yes, we would not expect to spend all that cash before the end of the fiscal year.

Q. You would be committing that amount?—A. Yes. Our plans are to start on these projects during this coming year. Could I just say, in addition to that, there is a list of various other capital items that are needed for the system amounting to $260,000 besides that.

Q. Of what nature?—A. To supplement existing sound effects reproducers at Toronto, Montreal, Newfoundland and Winnipeg, and to provide specialized sound effect equipment for various locations to improve and replace portable R.F. equipment.

Q. This is all for equipment?—A. Yes.

Q. Would the figure you gave us include those 15 odd places where you are building relay transmitters?—A. No. That was already approved previously.

Q. What was the amount involved there?—A. About a capital cost of sixty odd thousand dollars. Of course those little stations will have quite a high annual line charge in addition to that.

Q. You are only speaking of capital cost at the moment?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Are you expecting to go over all these projects this year including the relay stations you mentioned?—A. It is hoped to at least start them. The Newfoundland one is particularly urgent. The Edmonton relay experiment is due to start—it is actually under way—and if it is successful we will put one in in Calgary. The small relay transmitter equipment has been ordered now and is nearly ready. In many cases the wireline companies have not been able to provide the facilities and there is still consideration of rates to be charged in connection with the wire lines.

Q. You mentioned Coleman and Blairmore. Would you amplify that?—A. The equipment is ordered for them and we will have them in as soon as the wireline service is available and as soon as we have completed negotiations with the wireline companies.

Q. Have you any idea of the amount involved in this connection?—A. No. I could get that for the next meeting.

Q. It is not too important. That is a mountainous area and it has been needed for some considerable time and I have taken it up with officials on previous occasions and I am glad to know that something is expected there shortly. Coleman and Blairmore are not too far apart and in some of those regions that are mountainous you do not have to get too far apart.—A. We had thought of economizing to have one to serve the two, but our engineers decided it might end up with not too good service to either. It is not much extra line cost to have one to each.

Q. Have you any idea of the annual cost?—A. I am sorry. I have not got those figures with me, but we will have them for you at the next meeting.

By Mr. Richard:

Q. You spoke about a new transmitter for Ottawa. I suppose that is to be installed within the current year.—A. We will start on that project but our engineering department is so loaded at the present time that I would not guarantee that it would be in during the current year. However, while there is a great deal of work on these various projects to be done, we plan to start it in the present year.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jones asked a question and we now have the answer.

The WITNESS: Kelowna did apply for an increase in power and the board considered its recommendation on the application when it met in Vancouver in September, 1950 and I can read to you the board's note on it. They recommended adversely. The board is of the opinion that this increase in power would not be advantageous to the general broadcasting service and to the various stations in the Okanagan Valley.

The issue was not a C.B.C. question. There was quite an active hearing before the board, with representations made by other private broadcasting stations in the area. It was felt that if CKOV went up to that sort of power, it would hurt their ability to carry on properly.

By Mr. Jones:

Q. Would it not pay you to allow them to go up to that power in view of the fact that you were going to pull out?—A. I do not think that anything

the corporation was doing or thinking of doing would affect our decision about this. It was thinking more of the situation among the private stations.

Q. Was it your judgment that it would have blanketed all three stations?—A. No, not blanketed them. We would have covered approximately the same area served by the three of them although with some overlapping, but of course with a different program service.

Q. Have you dropped the idea of low power little stations to the border?—A. No. We have dropped the idea of one high-powered station, preferring to wait to see what can be done with low-powered stations in outlying areas.

Q. And that is proceeding now?—A. Yes, and it will be going ahead.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. In order that such a low-powered repeater station be installed this year, does it require an item in your capital budget this year?—A. Yes, but the capital part will be a small amount.

Q. Since it is obvious with respect to Salmon Arm that they have been pressing for a repeater station, should we urge you now to include in your capital budget the necessary sum for such an installation, if you find it would be desirable?—A. I have read of the project, but in our general plans for financing, we have an allowance for smaller expenditures such as this as they become desirable during the year.

Q. Might I say also that my information on that point is that the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is the only railway serving Salmon Arm, as I understand it has improved its wireline facilities so that there are no longer any technical obstacles in the way of your putting in such a station. Does your information confirm that?—A. I do not know about Salmon Arm but I know the matter has received quite a lot of discussion with the railways as well as some of those other points which we thought ought to be serviced very quickly and which, it appeared, could not be. Therefore I could not answer you.

Q. I can only repeat the information which I have given you in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Has there been any increase in power in any existing private station since the fall of 1951?—A. Yes. Perhaps we could look that up for you.

Q. And have it at a later meeting?—A. It would be fairly a matter for the Department of Transport, but we can see that it is produced for you.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. What is the position with regard to the high-powered channels now? Are we occupying all of them which are available to us under the Havana and other treaties, or have some of the private stations occupied them?—A. I do not think there are private stations occupying them as the dominant station in any place.

Q. What stations have 50,000 watt power?—A. CFRB, Toronto, and CKLW, Windsor; but those stations are not clear-channel stations. They are, I think on class II channels; they are not clear-channel stations. They have highly directional antennae which is cut down by interference at night to a much greater degree.

Q. What is the Windsor station now? Is it one of your stations or is it an American outlet?—A. The Windsor station is a privately owned station, and it is affiliated with an American network.

Q. It is really an American station on Canadian soil?—A. A very high proportion of its programming is of American origin.

Q. How are we fixed for stations in Windsor?—A. We have a station operating pretty effectively, although it is not of course high-powered.

Q. What power have you?—A. 10,000 watts.

Q. Are there any other stations in Canada now which are outlets for American broadcasting systems, the Mutual, for example?—A. CFRB in Toronto still is affiliated with Columbia, and CKWX in Vancouver is affiliated with Mutual. But I do not think it takes very many programs from Mutual. Also with Mutual is CKLW in Windsor, and CFCF in Montreal is affiliated with ABC and also with our Dominion network, which is on the whole its dominant affiliation. CKAC is an approved affiliate of Columbia and it is to some extent shared in a way with CJAD Montreal which is allowed to take certain programs from Columbia.

Q. Is CFRB, for example, affiliated with either of our networks, the Trans-Canada and the Dominion?—A. No. It is only an affiliate of Columbia.

Q. So it really is an American station on Canadian soil?—A. It is a Columbia affiliate. They carry quite a measure of local broadcasts from Toronto, but their main affiliation is with Columbia.

Q. Their main affiliation is with an American broadcasting system?—A. Yes sir.

Mr. FLEMING: That does not make them an American station.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think it is pretty well dominated by an American radio system. I would regard it as just one of the stations that is an American outlet on Canadian soil, very much like the Windsor station.

Mr. FLEMING: I would not want to reach that conclusion.

Mr. FULTON: What about the CBC television station which has a direct wire channel connection with Buffalo?

The CHAIRMAN: We are still on the question, not on the arguing.

Mr. DINSDALE: I am interested in the new tower at Carman. Has the power output been increased, I refer to the CBW power?

Mr. OUIMET: The power has not been increased. The tower collapsed and it has been rebuilt, so it is now operating as it did before with the same power and with the same antennae system.

Mr. DINSDALE: The reason I ask is that there is difficulty in receiving CBW at night in the Brandon area. It was explained before that it was due to the Carberry sand hills, and their exhaustive properties, that there was such a lot of interference. Now this leads to the question perhaps of radio interference and the detection part of your operations in Manitoba. I understand there are three, but they are all located in Winnipeg?

The WITNESS: That of course is a matter for the Department of Transport, not ourselves. They deal with interference.

Mr. DINSDALE: In regard to that problem and the Carberry sand hills having an effect on reception in the Brandon area, we are quite close to that old lake bottom.

Mr. OUIMET: The nature of the soil has a great deal of effect. It may mean a coverage which is very good or very bad. In this particular case I am afraid that I do not know the topography well enough specifically to answer your question.

Mr. DINSDALE: It is the old bottom of Lake Agassiz.

Mr. OUIMET: I know that part of the prairie provinces is very good from the standpoint of conductivity, while certain parts are not as good. But I do not know that any part is particularly bad from the standpoint of conductivity.

Mr. DINSDALE: Then I shall have to take my enquiry to the Department of Transport.

Mr. FULTON: I take it that Mr. Browne will be here later?

The CHAIRMAN: We did not discuss that in the sub-committee on agenda. May we leave that to a later meeting, and I will bring it up in the sub-committee on agenda.

Mr. FULTON: Yes. I imagine there would be some questions in regard to the licensing policy in connection with the Department of Transport.

The CHAIRMAN: I will be glad to take that up with the sub-committee on agenda. Are there any further general questions?

Then may we proceed to "The Crown" on page 6. Are there any questions on the "Royal Tour" on page 8? Or on "CBC Wednesday Night" on page 11?

Mr. HANSELL: Before you go that far, you made a statement the other day with respect to televizing the coronation, that it will not be direct from the coronation; so how long do you thing it will be from the actual ceremony? A few hours, a few days or what?

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we not leave that until we reach television?

Mr. HANSELL: I saw it in bold type, "The Crown".

The CHAIRMAN: Or do you want to ask your questions about the coronation under sound broadcasting?

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Dunton might care to say a word there.

The WITNESS: Very careful arrangements are being made for the sound broadcasting of the coronation. That will start at 5.30 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. FLEMING: Are you taking the BBC broadcast or making an independent one?

The WITNESS: We are taking the BBC broadcast; but there will be our commentating people with the BBC team during the whole broadcast.

Mr. HANSELL: And that will be done on shortwave?

The WITNESS: It will be done on shortwave and it will be broadcast later on in the day as well as in the evening. It begins at 5.00 in the morning.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that answer your question?

Is "Royal Tour" completed?

"CBC Wednesday Night"?

Mr. COLDWELL: I think that is one of the best things that the CBC has attempted, I mean the manner in which the programming is carried out. It reflects very great credit on those who are producing it. I think it has done a great deal to bring to our people Canadian talent in opera, in drama, and so on, and I know that whenever I have the opportunity to spend a Wednesday evening at home, I usually listen to it. I know it is generally appreciated not only by the people on this side of the line, but I have visited on the other side of the line where they can get our stations, even as far south as places in Connecticut, and in Springfield, Mass. For example, in the colleges around there such as Amherst, and Smith College and so on, I have found that those people listen to two programmes from Canada. One is the news broadcast at 10.00 o'clock at night, and the other is the Wednesday Night program. I have heard them very favourably commented upon.

Mr. FLEMING: What reports have you had in connection with the listener surveys with respect to the Wednesday night programs?

The WITNESS: In general it has been lower than other nights. On the other hand it is encouraging, even if the ratings may not be so high, that so many tens of thousands, perhaps several hundred thousands of Canadians are

listening. But no matter what the percentage is, we do not expect to have the same number listening to it as listen to the Dominion network on the same evening, which has some very popular programs.

Mr. COLDWELL: Have you found the number to be increasing as the years go on?

The WITNESS: On the whole we think the number is increasing as general understanding increases. From the number of letters we get from the United States, understanding is growing both there and in Canada. We know of a number of people who make it a practice to stay in on Wednesday night for that purpose.

Mr. FULTON: Have you won prizes for your Wednesday night productions? I see you have won other prizes.

The WITNESS: We did, but I have not got the list. I think there are one or two Wednesday night programs which got prizes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Then we may perhaps proceed to "News" on page 12. Are there any questions?

Mr. HANSELL: There is just one question I should like to ask. I think I can anticipate the answer and I do not want any unfair inference to be taken out of my question because, if there is any inference at all, it does not apply to Canada. I notice here in the report it states that:

> Whatever the news, at home or abroad, the intent has been to present it with the greatest possible accuracy and without sensationalism.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you mind giving us the page?

Mr. HANSELL: It is the second paragraph on page 12 under the heading "News".

Mr. FLEMING: The first column, the second paragraph under "News".

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Has there ever been any time to your knowledge when factual news has ever been purposely withheld?—A. On our system?

Q. Well, yes. I would not expect you to be able to answer it for the other stations?—A. No, not to my knowledge.

Q. I am glad of that answer for the record.

By Mr. Jones:

Q. Could you tell us what the rule is regarding the release of news? I notice that some of the news which is broadcast has also appeared in the previous day's broadcasts.—A. I would imagine that sometimes happens. But on the other hand, sometimes we are ahead of the daily newspapers.

Q. Very seldom!—A. I would not admit that, Mr. Jones. We have certain news policies which are designed in general to see that our newscasts give the news as accurately as possible.

Q. I am not questioning the accuracy, I am only questioning the timing of it.

The CHAIRMAN: As quickly as possible.

By Mr. Jones:

Q. Do you have the same access to the same sources that the newspapers have?—A. We have the same news agencies which serve most of the major newspapers of the country. I do not think they hold back news from us and give it to the newspapers in advance.

In the National News Bulletin we try to recapitulate the same news which has happened earlier in the day or perhaps the previous night, in order to give

a balanced picture. And for that reason you might hear news that was given a little earlier because we are trying to give a thorough summary of it.

Mr. FULTON: Last year I asked you about the time available for the morning news broadcast in British Columbia where I have always had the impression that the announcer was racing against time. You said you would look into it to see if perhaps there was too short a time allowed for it. I refer to the 8 a.m. newscast.

The WITNESS: I saw it was brought to the attention of officials in British Columbia, and I hope it has proved better since.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. Why was the news roundup shifted from 10.15 to 7.00?—A. The news roundup?

Q. Yes.—A. That was done because of careful study by our people who had been working on surveys of listeners' habits. One reason was we found that a great many people listened to the news, and then cut off during the news roundup, and it seemed to be that they were simply getting too long a stretch of talk, and the news type of thing, and a number of people were questioned, and a sample test done, and a number of people expressed a preference for a separate time. The news roundup has been put on earlier in the evening with music before and after.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. You still have contracts with the major news agencies?—A. Yes, the same as we have had in other years.

Q. You are still carrying on with that policy?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. What do you pay for these services. I suppose it is more economic to do it that way?—A. We have thought so. I do not think there has been any change since the last committee. I have not the figures, but it is still on the same basis.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? If not, we will proceed to plays on page 14.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. I enjoyed the Glencannon shows very much. I thought them one of the most delightful series we have had on the radio. Some of the plays on Sunday and Wednesday nights tend to be a bit heavy and morbid. I think we get an over-dose of morbidity on the drama of the C.B.C.—A. We did have a few complaints about the Glencannon series, and I am glad to have your support.

Mr. COLDWELL: I cannot understand anybody complaining about Glencannon. Only those who are teetotalers or near teetotalers can fully appreciate Mr. Glencannon's humour.

Mr. FULTON: Was it Mr. Mulrooney's—

Mr. COLDWELL: I think Mr. Glencannon is lively and acceptable. Personnally I did not like the Mulrooney monologue.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. What was the popularity of the Glencannon series reported by listeners' surveys?—A. I do not remember what the listeners' figures were, but they were pretty good.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think they were very popular. I know people who do not listen to that kind of thing, but who thoroughly enjoyed all the Glencannon

series. They were hot drinkers but they liked to know what sort of a befuddled fellow a drinker might be occasionally. I would like to see them repeated.

Mr. FLEMING: I was just interested in measuring the popularity of Mr. Coldwell's tastes according to listener surveys.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions on plays? If not, public affairs features on page 16.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. These features, Mr. Chairman, I believe operate very closely with various community groups. For example, such things as citizen forum and farm forum. It may be that one reason for their success is the fact that there is a close community co-operation.—A. These programs are deliberately planned with that idea in mind so that there will be response from listeners in the vicinity in which they are based.

Q. I do not know whether I can ask this question under this heading, but is it a general policy to try to have some sort of advisory council on programming?—A. In general I think it would be far too unwieldly a body. There is for the citizens forum a national advisory council, and one for the farm forum and we have other advisory councils on different aspects of broadcasting which seems to us much more satisfactory; that is to get people particularly interested in one field of broadcasting.

Q. If we could revert to drama. For example, who determines drama policy. Has that anything to do with a group of drama experts?—A. Everybody in the corporation from the board down. There is no one advisory group, but it is part of a general programming pattern. I would suggest that an outside advisory council on drama would not be terribly helpful, because there are so many different individual tastes in drama, and we are trying to meet these different types of taste. Some people like variety, and Stage 53 which is followed by a lot of people, and then there are Wednesday Night, and things like Mr. Glencannon and soap operas.

Mr. COLDWELL: Did you say somebody liked soap operas?

Mr. RICHARD: I do.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Do you regard the C.B.C. news as a good point of contact with the public?—A. A great many listen to it.

Q. What do they call it?—A. The C.B.C. Times.

Q. Yes.—A. We have a point of contact with those who—

Q. Has it a large circulation?—A. I think it is about 15,000 paid, and we would like to see it bigger, but we do not feel we can afford to distribute it free, and we have to charge for it and that cuts down the circulation.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. Has it increased?—A. It has gone up quite a bit, and we hope it will go up still further.

Mr. COLDWELL: It is very useful.

Mr. DINSDALE: Will there be general questions on programming?

The CHAIRMAN: It is all part of it, so go ahead please.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Just another question along that line. Would it be possiblle if there was a good program that was developed in a local community and was being featured on a private station, would it be possible for such a program to

have access to a C.B.C. outlet?—A. Certainly. That happens, and we have a standing invitation to all the stations on the Dominion network to make suggestions, and if there is something which seems to work out satisfactorily, we will pay the cost, and put it on the network. Very satisfactory programs have developed in that way. Some come from London, Ontario, and some from Vancouver and other stations. That has happened quite often, and we pay out-of-pocket costs—program costs.

Q. There has been a suggestion that the four main centers for the C.B.C. program outlets tend to have an urban flavour which is not necessarily typical of Canadianism, but is more typical of Americanism.—A. Programs in general?

Q. Yes.—A. I think there is always a possibility of that. I do not think it occurs and we try to see it does not. We try to keep officials from getting too much interested in what is going on in just Montreal and Toronto, and they do travel quite a good deal, and such things as the farm broadcasts help to bring the corporation into touch with the people outside the main centers. We realize the importance of it, and try in all sorts of ways to try to get a national outlook on problems and not from one or two main centers. One interesting thing is that quite a number of officials in the corporation have come up through the farm department, and, of course, have a rural background.

Q. Farm Forum is very much appreciated in rural sections.—A. We know that.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. I think all discussion programs are.—A. A very large proportion of serious comment comes from rural areas and smaller towns. People seem to take more time to think and consider programs. A lot of reaction on Wednesday Night comes from smaller places in outlying areas.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Would you underwrite the cost of a program having merit?—A. When it goes on the network.

Q. What about talent?—A. That is what I mean.

Q. I guess they eventually gravitate towards Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver?—A. To a certain extent although a lot of talent stays fixed. For years we have had Don Messer from Charlottetown and there are a lot of people who listen to him.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. To what extent do you lose people to the United States and the United Kingdom. Several outstanding people have gone.—A. Your mean artists?

Q. Yes.—A. There has been a certain number of well-known people who have gone—you may be thinking of the Bradens who have gone to England. Perhaps some day they will come back, I hope so. Others have gone to the States. Where talent has been developed, I think there will always be some who will go. It is a healthy thing. They go on to try themselves in other fields, and sometimes they come back.

Q. I notice in the last issue of the C.B.C. news that the lady who played the kid in the play "Jake and the Kid" is going to England. I was amazed to read the kid was played by a married woman with three children, and an extraordinarily good program it is. When I heard the first broadcast, I thought it was just slandering Saskatchewan, and then I became interested and amused.—A. It is an interesting reflection on Canadian life that you find people here, good competent radio actors, and when they go to another country they reach the headlines, get promoted and become great names,

and get a reputation that their own countrymen never gave them in Canada. For that reason they come back with a reputation. It is also, I think, a sign of the standards in Canadian broadcasting in many things that so many of our performers can go to other places and automatically get very good roles.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I have several questions of a general nature in regard to programming. Since you received this parliamentary grant beginning a year and a half ago, what steps have you taken to reduce the commercial element in your programs?—A. In the first place we dropped just about all the local business that we were taking. You will remember that the Massey Commission recommended that we do that, and as soon as we got the new finance we did, with a certain amount of monetary reluctance, simply drop the local business we were carrying in areas where private stations were also in operation. That was the most drastic step. The other is that we have been more selective in the acceptance of commercial programs.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. In regard to selectivity, you have on the C.B.C. a program called "Suspense" and another one "Father Knows Best". I am wondering how on earth either of them ever got on the radio network. Do they pay well?—A. "Suspense" is an extremely popular program.

Mr. RICHARD: It is a very good program. I would not listen to "Stage 53". but I would listen to "Suspense".

Mr. COLDWELL: I had a greater respect for your taste than that.

Mr. RICHARD: Well, you come from the west.

The WITNESS: We are always trying to get a reasonable balance. We carry "Suspense" and one or two other detective type shows. We do not carry nearly as many as the American networks do. Mr. Richard's tastes have to be given a chance, but there should be other things on as well.

Mr. FLEMING: I notice your income from commercial contracts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1952 was $2,456,000 odd. How does your income from commercial contracts in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1953 compare with that?

The CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to take that up at this time?

Mr. FLEMING: It relates to programming, Mr. Chairman.

The WITNESS: We are over $200,000 down.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. You have dropped about a twelfth of your revenue as compared with the previous year?—A. Yes, but I might say Mr. Fleming—I am sorry, I have the wrong figures in my head. It is probably close to the same figure as in the year just finished. You must consider other factors which we are working on. For instance, raised rates on some of our stations and private stations on the networks. You have other things coming in. The French network is operating, and it carries commercial shows, and you have new sources of revenue to add to that figure and we are turning away business in other directions.

Q. I can appreciate the difficulties of getting an absolute basis of measurement. I was wondering if you could give any form of measure to show the extent to which you have effected a reduction of the commercial element in programs. Is that possible?—A. We could try to do it, but I am just trying to think how to get it into a tabular figure form. In these things, of course, we are dealing not just with revenue or figures but also on the quality of the program, and any judgment must be based, not in trying to reach any

percentage increase or decrease in figures, but to try to meet, within reason, programming balance. That is the way we have worked. For instance, there has been quite a considerable number of programs which have been offered and not accepted because we did not feel—especially now that we had some more money—that they would fit well into the pattern. But how to measure all that in a statement, I do not know.

Q. I can appreciate the difficulty. In any event, your approach to the problem of reducing the commercial element in your broadcasting in line with the recommendations of the Massey Commission, I take it, is not directed particularly at revenue, then?—A. No, and I think the commission said that we should be more selective or should drop some of the less desirable programs, and that is the way we have gone at it—not trying to reduce our amount, but to try and make for better quality in the commercial programs we have accepted as a whole.

Q. You have spoken now of the fiscal year which has just closed. What plans, if any, have you in view in that respect for the future? Is this a process that is going to continue or may we expect that your commercial operations, at least as far as they are reflected in revenue, are more or less stabilized now?—A. We have no defined plan such as the dropping of the local commercial business. Our management are under instructions to continue to be selective in accepting commercial programs. In other words, that figure will be quite a lot affected by the kind of commercial programs that are being offered. It might possibly rise if more good ones were being offered. That, probably, is doubtful, so we think likely this figure will remain about the same or drop some.

Q. I see, but we need not except any great change this coming year as compared with the year past?—A. No, we expect a small drop in this coming year.

Q. What about advertising of programs? Are you increasing or reducing your methods of and expenditures on advertising of programs?—A. We have done very little, say, newspaper advertising. The Massey commission recommended we do more informational work about C.B.C. activities in general, and I think one or two parliamentary committees have recommended the same thing. We have tried to improve news of all kinds about the corporation's programs and activities, but we do very little direct advertising, trying to do it through such things as the C.B.C. Times, trying to put more information on the air, trying to improve the printed matter related to programs, say the Citizens Forum and that sort of thing, trying to give better service to journalists who want to write about the programs.

Q. Rather than by direct methods? No more of those match boxes issued by C.T.B.C., I hope?—A. No, no more match boxes.

Q. On the question of United States programs, what about your arrangements in regard to taking these programs, and your contractual relations with the networks from whom you take them, including the financial arrangements in regard to them, and what is the trend, if there has been any during the past 1½ years, with reference to the extent of the content of American programs on the networks?—A. First, there has been no change in our relations in sound broadcasting with the American networks. As you are aware, we have dealings with all four of them.

Q. You are still getting those programs on the same favourable financial arrangements as previously?—A. The same financial arrangements, yes.

Q. I do not want to get into the subject of television, but I imagine that the sound broadcasting arrangements seemed to look more favourable when you commenced dealing with the American networks and making arrangements with them for television programs?—A. I am just not admitting anything. I think the proportion of American programs in general has dropped a little recently, and the proportion of American programs in commercial programs

in general has also dropped, not to a large extent, since we had the extra money and are able to be more selective. There has been a slight drop in the non-Canadian content on general broadcasting and in commercial broadcasting.

Q. Is that reflected in the amounts you pay them, or have you some other measure for determining that, like time logged on your networks?—A. No, they are paid specifically a percentage of what the advertiser pays for the network.

Q. So you could measure that in terms of revenue precisely then?—A. Yes.

Q. Could you give us that at a later meeting?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. What about these giveaway programs? You have several programs on the air where prizes are given in guessing competitions, and programs of the type of Treasure Trail. How many programs of that type have you? I think they are quite popular?—A. Yes, most of them are very popular. We have several at the moment. We have turned down quite a considerable number of that type of giveaway or prize-giving programs.

Q. They come pretty close to the law, don't they?—A. That is very carefully watched by us. Anything we do take, in the first place we are very sure about it, but even then there are a number of programs we have not thought desirable to take.

Q. You use a lot of recordings? You import those recordings, do you, from the United States or from the United Kingdom?—A. I cannot think of any American recorded programs.

Q. You use discs, though?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you pay duty on them?—A. I am not sure. I imagine most of them are bought here.

Q. You do not import them yourselves?—A. I do not think so. I think most of them are bought through local dealers of various kinds.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Has there been any change in the last 1½ years in respect to the policy on liquor advertising?—A. No, the same regulations, the same situation exists.

Q. There was some discussion of a change in that respect, a change of policy, about a year ago, was there not? I heard something about it at the time.—A. Some people must have thought there was a change. We suddenly began to get all kinds of letters saying, "Please do not change your policy." I do not know what started it.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. Have you some programs now sponsored by breweries?—A. We have a longstanding regulation regarding advertising or any program sponsored by beer, wine or hard liquor companies, except that in provinces where such advertising is allowed, we will permit brewing and wine companies to sponsor a program under certain conditions and all they can say is to identify themselves. They cannot push their product.

Q. That is the kind of program I had in mind. I thought that was a change in the last two or three years.—A. No, that has been there for years.

Mr. HANSELL: Is this only done in provinces that have provincial laws covering advertising?

The WITNESS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? Mr. Beaudry?

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. During the last 1½ years have your costs of programming increased? —A. Yes.

Q. Have you any idea in what proportion as against, let us say, the years 1950 and 1951?—A. You mean the unit cost, the cost of doing the same thing?

Q. Percentagwise, yes.—A. It is always hard to work out because you get changes in what we are doing as well as in the rates of what we are paying. I do know the cost of just about everything we do or pay for has gone up again in this past year. Everything from salaries, telephone rates, artists' fees, and so on.

Q. I was more specifically thinking of artists' fees in various ways. Have they gone up in the last few years?—A. Yes, they have, considerably.

Mr. BRETON: Mr. Dunton, may I ask a question about the French television program in Montreal, from Station CBFT. In Montreal where 90 per cent of the population is French we should be receiving French programs in a bigger proportion than English programs, and I receive complaints from any constituents that now we receive more than 50 per cent of the programs in English only. Could I have an answer to that question, please?

The CHAIRMAN: Your question, Mr. Breton, is directed to television stations?

Mr. BRETON: Yes, CBFT.

The CHAIRMAN: We agreed earlier to leave the television discussion until a later meeting and deal with sound broadcasting first.

Any further questions under public affairs features? I am very glad the committee has allowed me to call headings instead of subheadings. I see on this page reference to a French network program *Les idées en marche.* Well, at the last committee when I called that program in what I thought was my very best French, it appeared in the evidence as Lazy Days on the march. So, can we pass public affairs features?

Talks programs.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. On talks programs—could we have, if it is not available now, then later on, a list of persons who took part in the Capital Report series, say over the past year?—A. From all points?

Q. I was thinking more of Ottawa particularly. Would that be much of a chore?—A. No, that can be done quite quickly.

Q. At a previous meeting we had a report, perhaps not over as long a period, indicating the persons who had taken part in your broadcasts from the United Kingdom. We had some means of measuring participation. We had some evidence; at one time I think we agreed that one man was on the air for quite a disproportionate number of appearances compared with others. If it is difficult to prepare that, I am not suggesting you go over a long period, but a sufficiently representative period to give us an idea as to what you are showing in achieving balance of opinion in the matter of these talks programs. I think we agree that we do not wish now to review those old talks on balance, but rather to be given some idea of what you have done to achieve balance in the presentation of these talks programs.

By Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf):

Q. I see a number of portraits on page 17, and one interests me particularly, that of Bertrand Russell. It says on page 18:

> Another series which attracted considerable attention was Bertrand Russell's "Living in an Atomic Age", broadcast originally by the B.B.C.

Would you tell me how many broadcasts he gave on that, and do you think I could have a copy of those scripts?—A. I think the last committee had copies of that series.

Q. Are those the ones that we had?—A. I think so.

Q. But he has been on the air since that time?—A. No, he gave a series of talks that took place before the last committee met.

Q. And he has not been on the air since?—A. I do not think so.

Q. You are sure?—A. I am not sure, but I do not think so, not on the C.B.C.

Q. I hope so.—A. I am reminded he has been on once.

Q. What program was that—A. I am told that is was "Reflections on Being Eighty".

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I do not think it was your intention to skip public affairs features, but we did not ask many questions on it. I notice on page 16, the last paragraph of the first column, which reads:

> Differing program techniques were used. "Time out to Think" was a dramatized survey, in two parts, of the problem of communication in modern industry and business. This dramatized treatment was typical of a number of broadcasts, including programs on the status of women, labour-management co-operation, and the stock market.

I believe that there is a regulation governing dramatized political broadcasts and I am wondering if you could give us your impression as to where political broadcasts end and an economic broadcast begins. That is a tough question. Perhaps I will put it this way. Would an independent station be permitted to give dramatized broadcasts on such subjects as you have mentioned here, on labour-management co-operation, on the stock market, or, let us say, economics?—A. Yes, certainly, Mr. Hansell. I should say that the Department of Justice in giving opinions on the interpretation of that section of the Act which prohibits dramatized political broadcasts has said the political broadcast is one done on behalf of a political party or which has some direct application to political affairs and party political differences and conflicts. In other words, as we understand it there is nothing in the Act that prevents dealing with all sorts of questions in a forum or dramatized way but not by or on behalf of a political party or not taking a direct part in political controversy in so doing.

Q. Would it be possible to get a transcript of the interpretation by the Justice Department on that?—A. We could get a summary of it. Over a period of years we have had various opinions from them.

Q. Would it be too much trouble to get something on that within the next few days or in a week or so?

CHAIRMAN: That would be a matter of progressive opinion from time to time.

WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. COLDWELL: I agree with Mr. Hansell. As a matter of fact, there have been broadcasts that have been sponsored ostensibly by non-political organizations that have been frankly political. I know I have brought it to the attention of the C.B.C. in past years. There is a general election coming and I would not be surprised to see the same people doing the same thing. I am thinking of broadcasts before the last general election by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. They were political broadcasts directed to the Social Credit Party and the C.C.F. Party and were unmistakably partisan in the material they put out but were not classified as political broadcasts because they were not sponsored by a political party.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): The Canadian Chamber of Commerce, not the Quebec Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not object to it altogether. I do not agree with the ruling entirely, but whether it is on behalf of a political party or not I do not see that it makes a great deal of difference. Suppose, for instance, a group of men should decide to dramatize something on the subject of socialism, would that be interpreted as being a political broadcast because of the socialist party? On the other hand, suppose a number of men should broadcast a dramatized program on money. Would that be interpreted as being a political broadcast put on by the Social Crediters?

WITNESS: Questions very much like this have come up in the past. There was one dramatized program which did refer to socialism. We obtained legal opinions on it and the opinion was it was not dealing directly with Canadian politcal questions and I think it was indicated that if it talked about the C.C.F. it should not be allowed, but since it dealt in a general way with socialism it should not be counted as political.

Mr. HANSELL: If it was on socialism it should be allowed. I do not have any objection to that.

Mr. COLDWELL: I would have no objection if an opportunity is given to broadcast the opposite views; and we would be prepared to sponsor something like that but have not been given the opportunity.

Mr. FLEMING: If you say "we would sponsor it" you mean the party. That would be political.

Mr. COLDWELL: If someone else broadcasts something directly attributable to our party in Canada we should have a similar opportunity to put the opposite view.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): Suppose it is an objective discussion on socialism, there is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. COLDWELL: Have you ever heard members of the chamber of commerce discuss socialism and say it is objective?

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have made a great deal of progress this afternoon and it is 5.30. Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

EVIDENCE

April 10, 1953.
11:00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum. In connection with our proposed visit to Toronto, I am sure it would be the wish of the committee to have the clerk accompany us and I understand it is usual to have a motion to that effect. Do I hear a motion?

Mr. KIRK: I would be very happy to move that our clerk accompany us to Toronto.

Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: Yesterday we had reached public affairs features, on page 16 of the annual report of the C.B.C., and at that point had entered on a general discussion of programming. Mr. Dunton.

Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman, Board of Governors, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, called:

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further general questions on programming?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I suppose there has not been time to prepare any of that material which we asked for yesterday?—A. No. Work is going ahead on it. I have here a list of the stations that had increases in power, which information was asked for. The formal information on this comes from the Department of Transport, but I can give the board's recommendations on it.

Q. When you say the board's recommendations, I presume you would know whether the recommendations had been carried out?—A. As far as we know, they have all been carried out.

Q. We can assume that these have all been carried out?—A. One or two of them have been very recent recommendations. One is an increase in the power for station CKRS, Jonquiere, Quebec, change of AM frequency from 1240 kilocycles to 590 kilocycles and increase in power from 250 watts to 1000 watts. That was recommended in November, 1952. There was another recommendation for an increase in power of CKCW, Moncton, New Brunswick, from 5000 watts on 1220 kilocycles to 10000 watts on 1220 kilocycles. That recommendation was made in January of this year. A very recent recommendation, on which we have not any information as yet, was one for an increase in power for CFRA, Ottawa, from 1000 to 5000 watts on 560 kilocycles. Yesterday I did not think there were any recommendations for increases in power of FM stations. I was not right on that. There was in 1950. The board recommended for CJSH-FM, of Hamilton, an increase in power from 745 watts E.R.P. on 102·9 megacycles to 9200 watts E.R.P. on 102·9 megacycles. That is all we have had.

Q. Were there any applications for increased power that were rejected?—A. There was one I mentioned yesterday that we recommended against, for Kelowna in 1950. I think we have the information here. The other programming information is being worked on and I hope to have it next week. Perhaps we could bring the information up about Kelowna later on in the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further general questions on programming?

By Mr. Boisvert:

Q. I would like to know from Mr. Dunton if there is a difference between political broadcasts and the broadcasts on your program called Capital Report. —A. Yes, Mr. Boisvert.

Q. Did you get any complaints about some of the statements which were made on the broadcasts of this Capital Report during the past six months, complaints based on the ground that they were really political broadcasts?— A. Yes, there have been criticisms of it made public. We have received at least one which also was given publicity. There were several comments and they were given publicity.

Q. Are the comments made in these broadcasts on the program Capital Hill censored before they go on the air?—A. No, our whole policy in such commentary broadcasts is to try to pick experienced observers, usually journalists, who make an activity of reporting and commenting on public affairs, commissioning them to make the broadcast, and then we make no effort to influence what they say. We expect that they will try and interpret and analyze what has happened. We know that in that analysis the man and the woman's opinion may be reflected to some extent and we do not try to censor the opinions given, but we do try to achieve fairness and balance in an over-all way in such commentaries by having different people go on at different times and in succession, choosing them from various journalistic connections, background and so on, and so we hope in that way to get good informed analyses and comment on public affairs freely given by the people who make it their business.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. The instructions you issue to them are simply to bring a report on something that has recently happened in the House?—A. Not even necessarily in the House.

Q. I mean, on the national scene.—A. Yes, to give what their analysis or comment is on public affairs as seen by them that week, in this case in Ottawa.

Q. It is designed to be a comment on the news of the week from the national scene?—A. Yes.

Q. Of a political nature—I do not mean in a narrow sense, but the political events of the week?—A. Yes, public affairs events of the week.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions of a general nature, we can proceed beyond public affairs features. Any more questions?

Talks programs, on page 17.

Mr. FLEMING: I presume we will come back to that when we are given that further information that Mr. Dunton is going to bring in.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

School broadcasts, on page 19.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I should like to ask about the school broadcasts. I expressed the opinion before that this is one of the best activities that the CBC carries on; it may not be the most publicized, but it is a very excellent one. Is this work tending to grow in scope or has it been pretty well stabilized?—A. It is not intended that school broadcasting will grow in time of broadcasts. I think that both we and the educational authorities across the country agree that a good amount of time now is being given on the networks for the purpose, but I think it has been developing all the time through the years in terms of content and what it accomplishes. There has been improvement, too, because the school authorities have been equipping schools better with receivers. Therefore, the effectiveness of the broadcasting has been growing steadily and I think the programs have been improving steadily. The national programs which CBC produces are

entirely under the National School Advisory Council on Broadcasting, and also on the provincial broadcasts where the out-of-pocket costs of which are paid by the provincial authorities, and for which they provide the content and we provide the production and the broadcasting side of it. I think both those aspects of school broadcasts have been very considerably improved. Then we have the kindergarten broadcast as an offshoot of that, which is for children of pre-school age. Then we have more recent developments, such as the series last year entitled "The World's Biggest Classroom", so that some of the parents could hear what was being done in the classroom. The series was done in the evening and the school broadcast was all that went into them, and also in recent years we always do a Shakespeare play on a series of the national weekly school broadcasts and we have been putting that on in one piece in the evening so that the parents can listen to it and find out what their children are doing in the morning. That has proven very interesting.

Q. You are continuing the work in close co-operation with provincial educational authorities?—A. Yes, and it serves as a very active example of very, very effective co-operation between the provincial bodies and ourselves. It is real work; the work of the national advisory council is very fascinating when you have opinions from the different bodies, the teachers' federation, the home and school federation, and then our own broadcasting people do hammer things out with a good deal of work.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. Who is in charge of the school broadcast?—A. R. S. Lambert is head of our department.

Q. I was rather critical of his appointment at the time, but I think he has done a particularly good job. I think I should say that.—A. We feel he has. He is widely respected by educational people in the country.

Q. A surprising number of parents and mothers listen to the Kindergarten of the Air and other school broadcasts.—A. Yes. It is quite interesting and has a good rating across the country, especially the Kindergarten of the Air.

Q. I try to listen to it in the morning and enjoy it; maybe I have not grown up.

By Mr. Jones:

Q. Mr. Phil Kitley of Vancouver, is he working under the department?—A. For several years he has been entirely with the provincial department. He is the officer with whom we deal and who looks after the school broadcasting in British Columbia.

Q. He is making a good job of it?—A. I think it is very effective.

Mr. BOISVERT: Did you increase the hours allowed to education over the last year?

The WITNESS: Apart from the school broadcasts we do not usually use the label educational broadcasts. We think a large part of our broadcasting in one way or another could be said to have some educational content of some sort in it. We have changed the hours and I think extended them for Radio-Collège in the French Network. We are broadcasting some of the programs in the evening because some of the grown-ups want to hear them at a more convenient time.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. I notice there are 604 hours under the classification of Network Programs devoted to educational programs. That refers only to the school

broadcasts; is that correct?—A. That is just the school broadcasts, the broadcasting coming under the headings I have mentioned under the School Broadcasting Department.

Q. That would mean programs like Citizen's Forum and so forth would be classified under informative talks?—A. Yes. That would be under informative talks.

Q. The Canadian Association for Adult Education takes a very active interest in that program. Do they not try to carry on their educational work through Citizen's Forum?—A. Put it this way. They co-operate and in fact play the largest part in the organization of the listening group side of it. It is an advisory council on the building up of the program and I think it is a good example of co-operation between two bodies, us on the broadcasting side and they stimulating the attention of the listeners in the forum.

Q. If they were to classify these broadcasts as educational broadcasts are they afraid the adults would shy away from them?—A. We sometimes think there are dangers in these labels and we have had lots of discussion about what sort of a label should be put on this thing. This is the code our people have used—informative talks. It is a question of what word you would use.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. In the chart on page 21 under "music" you show 199 hours devoted to sacred music. I presume those are programs devoted entirely to sacred music?—A. Yes.

Q. It would not include any programs classified as religious spoken programs?—A. No. These would be special programs of religious music, things like "The Messiah" which are not classified under religious music but are definitely of a sacred nature.

Q. Like the rendering of the great cantatas?—A. Yes. That kind of thing.

Q. What goes into the religious spoken classification apart from church services and religious talks on Sunday nights?—A. I think Eventide and Morning Devotions when on a network basis. These are only network programs.

Q. The Church of the Air is on Sunday?—A. Sunday afternoon. And Religious Period and Church of the Air are on Sunday, and National Sunday Evening Hour is also on Sunday evening. Eventide is on Thursday. And there would be things like the Report of World Church Activities which I imagine would be under this classification.

Q. Does your correspondence indicate the public expresses satisfaction with the way you are handling religious programs?—A. It varies.

The CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. Do I understand we have finished with the heading School Broadcasts?

Mr. FLEMING: If I am getting a little ahead I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions under the heading School Broadcasts? If not, then Radio-College. Farm, Fisheries and Gardening. Now we come to religious programs.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Farm, Fisheries and Gardening. Is there any information that would indicate what percentage of CBC listening audience is urban and what percentage rural?—A. It would be a very hard thing to work out in detail. I think at the present the studies that we have been able to do would indicate that our proportion tends to be higher in rural areas; therefore if you took the population of Canada and divided it into urban and rural and worked

out the arithmetic you would decide there seems to be a higher proportion listening to us in the rural areas.

Q. The network carries most of the rural programs?—A. Trans-Canada carries most of it in connection with daily regional farm broadcasts and Farm Forum.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on Farm, Fisheries and Gardening?

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. On the Farm Forum Broadcast is there any indication as to the number of listening groups? Are they growing?—A. It is about 1300, which we understand is the largest listening group organization in the world.

Q. There was a slight change in emphasis this year. You dramatize some of the programs.—A. Every year, of course, Farm Forum organization asks for suggestions from the listening groups and they have asked us for more of the dramatic kind of presentation.

Q. I imagine there would probably be increased popularity which would arise from an attempt to dramatize the thing.—A. It seems so. There are some subjects which we feel are dangerous to try to handle in a dramatized way, and on the other hand there are some which are easier. But it puts more work on our people and it is much harder to build up a dramatized broadcast than to have three or four people discuss it. However, the listening groups are anxious to have this kind of thing, and that is why this type of programming has been increasing in the last 2 or 3 years.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. Is this a type of programming which has been studied and copied in other countries?—A. Yes. I understand that UNESCO is just completing a very thorough study of the whole project and I presume they wish to study and analyse it and make the information available to other countries. It is one of the outstanding listening group broadcasts in the world.

Q. And who is in charge of it?—A. Keith Morrow, who is the head of our farm broadcasting department, is in charge of it. It comes under him.

Mr. DINSDALE: I would imagine that Citizens Forum and Farm Forum are top level group programs?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. COLDWELL: And Press Conference too.

The WITNESS: Yes. It gets very good listening. I imagine Mr. Dinsdale referred to listening groups, and we know that Press Conference has a very wide range of audience and seems to get a great deal of interest across the country.

By Mr. Kirk:

Q. In my area particularly I hear a great many favourable comments about the Fisherman's Broadcast, from both the fishermen themselves and their wives. They like not only the facts which are given, but the interesting way in which they are presented.—A. We have only last year started a Fisherman's Broadcast in British Columbia as well, and it is proving very satisfactory. The fishing people want an increased coverage for the stations in order to get it further out at sea.

Q. It is very popular in western Nova Scotia particularly where we have so many small boats going out all the time. They are interested in prices and in the weather reports.—A. And it is also of special interest to the Newfoundland fishing people.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions under "Farm, Fisheries, and Gardening"?

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Before you turn the page, I see there is an interesting chart on page 21 entitled "Classification of network programs". I notice the amount of time which is given to light music is almost as much as all the other types of music put together. What method do you have of determining why 5,708 hours should be given to light music, and the other amount of hours given to the other types? Do you have any formula, or is it done by popular demand, or what? —A. There is no exact formula. We often wish there was a formula to which we could go and which would tell us what kind of programming to put on. It arises out of the sum total of the judgment of our programming people in the corporation. Some people criticize the corporation for having what they call too much high brow music.

Q. I can understand that.—A. I think it is natural that pretty light music in any country suits a pretty large proportion of the broadcasting time, and quite reasonably however. I think that our proportion of the more serious type of music is pretty high.

Q. Yes. I am not criticizing it one way or another, but I was just wondering whether it was done purposely or by popular demand.—A. It is based on a sense of what the larger section of the public wants to have a good deal of the time.

Q. I suppose you would base it on surveys or on letters which you receive?—A. It is based on all the means which broadcasting people have to try to sense what the public wants. Those means are not too good or too accurate, or things upon which you can rely too much. A good deal of it has to come out of the assumptions of the people doing it based on a sense of what different sections of the public want to hear.

Q. I am not an expert on this, but I know what I like, personally. Could you give us an example of what would be classified as light music as compared with, let us say, variety or semi classical music?—A. I wish I had gone over the details of this more. What would The Happy Gang be? Perhaps I might ask Mr. Young. That would be variety.

Q. That would be variety?—A. Light music would be some of the programs such as Prairie Schooner. That would certainly be light.

Mr. COLDWELL: How would you classify the Gilbert and Sullivan operettas?

The WITNESS: I imagine that they would be light music or semi classical. In some of these things the divisions are not too definite. But I imagine that Gilbert and Sullivan would be semi classical.

Mr. FLEMING: Then you would classify operettas as semi classical or light music?

The WITNESS: There is a category for semi classical, and I thing that the operettas would come into that category.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. Some nights are good on the radio and some are very poor. On Saturday night, when many people are at home, the programs on both the Dominion and the Trans-Canada I think are generally very poor. You have the hockey match, of course, which many people like, and it is liked in my own home. I am not criticizing that. But generally speaking, if you want to get a good program on Saturday night, you find that both the Trans-Canada and the Dominion networks have programs which really are not worth listening to. Saturday night is the worst night of the week in that respect, and I think that Thursday is not very much better.—A. On Thursday night our

rating on the Trans-Canada is pretty high. It is even better when the hockey comes on, and with such classes of program as Share the Wealth and some of the other things which I know you do not like, Mr. Coldwell, but which a great many other people do like. But generally speaking the ratings for those two nights, Saturday and Thursday, are pretty high. Again, on Thursday night there is the Wayne and Shuster show which has a high rating, but which some people do not like.

Mr. COLDWELL: Some people like noisy programs.

Mr. FLEMING: People's tastes on Saturday night usually are lighter than they are on any other night of the week. Certain programs which might have an appeal on Saturday night might not have that appeal on other nights in the week, and vice versa.

The WITNESS: That is why people thought that Saturday night was not perhaps a good time to do some of the better programming.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think that the programs on Sunday are excellent.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on "Classification of network programs", on page 21?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. There is just one question about that classification between music and spoken; the proportion is 51.1 per cent for music compared with 48.9 per cent for spoken. Has that been arrived at consciously, Mr. Dunton, to meet some particular aim such as a fifty-fifty division?—A. No. As is so often the case with our work in broadcasting, it is a pattern which is constantly being worked out and varied through all the activities of our programming department. But for some years it has worked out that the proportion is about that. There is no attempt to say it shall be half music and half spoken.

Q. Does it not change then from year to year over a period of years?—A. I do not think so. It is about the same, but there is no conscious effort to do that. Our programming officials are constantly looking at the schedules to see how they balance, one with the other.

By Mr. Jones:

Q. How does that compare with private stations?—A. I think the spoken word proportion would be a great deal higher in the case of private stations.

Q. On commecial as well as non-commercial programs?—A. The commercial is much higher in the case of the private stations. The private stations do carry a good many of our programs.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. How does your own division between commercial and non-commercial compare with last year. Have you the figures?—A. The previous year non-commercial was 78·2 and this year it was 76·3. That is a slight drop.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. This chart is for the fiscal year April 1, 1951 to March 31, 1952.—A. Yes.

Q. Can you give us the corresponding figures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1953?—A. They are not compiled yet. I would guess there is likely to be again a small drop.

Q. A small drop in non-commercial?—A. Yes, in the non-commercial.

Q. You indicated yesterday you did not have them put on the basis of percentage. I presume this chart is going to be a feature of your later reports. —A. This particular information takes a great deal of time to get, but I will ask Mr. Young if we can have the same chart although it must be remembered this is a compilation of over 70,000 programs. I do not see how this could be done.

Mr. FLEMING: I am not pressing it if it is difficult. I do not wish to spoil Mr. Young's summer vacation.

Mr. COLDWELL: In these commercial programs, have you any figures to show what amount of time is sold for the advertising of soap, tooth paste and similar products.

Mr. RICHARD: They are very useful.

The WITNESS: That would be taken off our records. We could get that information for you.

Mr. COLDWELL: It must be rather high.

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. Many of these special programs are very morbid and depressing. They deal very largely with family quarrels and that kind of thing. Do you think that is the kind of thing that should go into the homes of the Canadian people? —A. This is a subject that has been debated in public and by the corporation for many years and the situation as we see it adds up to this. A great many people do not like soap operas, and dislike them quite actively. On the other hand a great many people do like them. As a whole, surveys indicated that of all daytime programs—the so-called daytime serials—attract the greatest number of listeners, and the four daytime serials we run attract more listeners than almost any other type of program. Follow them with, say, light music and the number of the listening audience will drop heavily, often to half. I think that, in a general way, it seems to be that about half the women in the country, perhaps more, like soap operas very much, perhaps a number are neutral, and a certain number do not like them at all. But a great many people like them very much, and therefore, over the years, we thought the sensible thing to do was to act as we do. We run quite a number of serials, but not as many as are carried by the U.S. networks.

Q. I suppose no survey has been made of the effect of these programs on married life and that kind of thing. Are they putting ideas into people's heads?

Mr. RICHARD: Perhaps they feel their lot is not so bad after listening to them, so it has its value.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is very true Mr. Richard, I had never thought of that.

The WITNESS: We have discussed that with different authorities Mr. Coldwell, and the view of psychologists and sociologists is that they feel that on the whole they are not a bad emotional safety valve. It has been suggested that there would be a good many more divorces in the country if it were not for the daytime serials, though I would not stand behind that view.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. How do you measure listener-interest? Are you using the Elliott-Haynes survey or any other kind of surveys? How do you arrive at these conclusions?—A. As I have told previous committees, we have felt that our means of estimating and surveying listener interest and listener's taste were very inadequate. We felt we could not afford to do the work. We have had to rely on mail response and telephone response and so on, and the various commercial rating services and then try to evaluate them, but we are planning this year to start a small listener's survey department of our own which, of course, will not have employees across the country doing major surveys, but will simply be a nucleus of trained people who will organize and decide and recommend on special types of field survey work to be done for us. We feel our information has been quite inadequate about listener's preferences, and in this respect we are away behind the B.B.C. They have a very good department, and spend a great deal of money on various forms of listener survey.

Q. The B.B.C. has a simpler problem in that respect?—A. Yes, much simpler, although they still go to a good deal of trouble and expense to do their survey. We would like to do a survey on our own and we would like to do it both on the number of people listening to programs, at different times, and also why people listen, and why they like some things and do not like others, and how they feel that programs can be improved. There are two aspects. There is the qualitative part which does not exist in Canada now and the quantitative part which is being done to some extent, but which we feel could be done better and on which a good deal better work could be done for our purposes.

Q. I take it from what you have said that the set-up you are contemplating will not be large enough to enable you to undertake direct surveys, but rather to advise you as to what surveys should be made by those retained for that purpose.—A. Yes, and we use other organizations working to our specification, all of whom are trained people in the methods to be used and that sort of thing, but we will not be employing our own field team.

Q. What other commercial survey groups are you using at the present time? —A. We get some material from the International Surveys. We had some work done by the Gruneau Surveys. We get some material from Penn-McLeod Surveys on television, and of course the B.B.M. which both private stations and ours, as well as advertising agencies participate and subscribe to. We are active partners in building that up.

Q. Some of these are not simply Canadian groups?—A. Yes, I think they are.

Q. Are they all strictly Canadian?—A. They may have some American connections, but they are all Canadian organizations, though there is a big difference between survey work worked out carefully by trained people for our purpose, and something done more for general commercial purposes which we have found not adequate.

Q. A lot of the information you want would be of a more specialized nature?—A. Yes. We have Mr. E. A. Weir, who was our commercial manager, and he is now specializing in this work at the present time. We are not too satisfied with some of the commercial methods or the commercial ratings. We feel they could be improved a good deal, and a lot of people in the commercial side feel the same thing, and one thing we would like to do is to develop better and more accurate methods of surveying. There are all sorts of discussions and schools of thought on the development of surveys going on in the United States, and we would like to develop some new and better methods here in Canada.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I noticed that in this little chart opera has 166 hours which is the lowest and which perhaps is to be expected, but do you find that there has been any gain in interest by the listening public in opera, compared with what there has been before.—A. My impression is, and I think it is that of our program people, that there is quite a marked interest which comes partly from Metropolitan Opera which we have carried for years on Saturdays, but also from our development of the C.B.C. Opera Company, using Canadian talent, and from some operas in Montreal. I think we are really developing in Canada a real school of opera production. I think that is a great help to stimulate the interest in opera. It has been helped by the development in Toronto of the Graduate School of Music, and I think there has been a good combination of work between that and our program department. I would think the interest is increasing. You notice the ratings on many opera shows seem to be going up. We often get ratings on our own productions and on those of Metropolitan, and we find out that we have a higher rating than we used to have.

Q. I got into the habit of listening to these opera productions and I find that it is something that can become quite fascinating to the listener, but I did notice that the Metropolitan Opera are apparently going in the red all the time. What would your ideas be about the state subsidizing operas such as they do in some European countries? I was in France a year ago and I think about every night I had free I went to the opera.—A. It gets a little out of our field going into the field of subsidizing producing opera companies. I do think, though, that we as a public body have been of very real assistance in developing opera production in Canada by organizing opera companies, which gives young Canadian talent a chance to perform and to take part in thoroughly professional broadcasting performances. I think we can match anything in the world, perhaps not always in the individual quality of the stars, but in the quality of the performance as a whole. Therefore, as a public body, we have been able to do a good deal in that way and I hope we can continue to do so. In this last year there have been some excellent productions of operas. I am afraid I would not feel competent to discuss the non-broadcasting aspect.

Mr. RICHARD: In any event, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Dunton realizes, I suppose, that the production of operas in a place like Paris would be much less costly than if produced in Canada. In Paris they have all the singers that they want. I think it is the same with the production of discs. In places where you have many good orchestras you can probably get a disc produced for $35, but when you have, like we have here, union rates, you cannot produce a disc for $300.

The WITNESS: I don't think you can get an orchestra to record a disc in Canada, or most other countries for that matter, Mr. Richard, for that amount of money. I do think, though, that we should not be too modest at all about what Canadians can do in this field. Right now in Canada we can match anything in the world.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not think talent is low in Canada at all. For instance, take these Singing Stars. There is some pretty good material on that program.

The WITNESS: I suppose you know that some stars have graduated from that program to opera work here and in the United States?

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. What kind of ratings does that Singing Stars program get?—A. A pretty good rating. It is sponsored by Canadian Industries Limited. Ourselves, we have Nos futures Etoiles on the French network.

Q. Do you give similar prizes on the French network—scholarships?—A. Yes, the same kind of thing.

Q. I thought the C.I.L. did that on the French network.—A. I do not think they have, as yet.

Q. I thought they were doing it.—A. We are naturally extremely happy to have the program regarded so excellently in which we share and do a lot of the production.

Q. That is really good advertising. I mean, no one can object to that.

Mr. DINSDALE: Would the Metropolitan Opera broadcast come under the commercial category?

The WITNESS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. The Metropolitan Opera is sponsored in Canada as well as in the States?—A. Yes.

Q. But on your chart the Metropolitan Opera would not be shown in the 23.7 per cent commercial?—A. Yes.

Q. I thought you told us at the last meeting that although you paid for it, it was carried by you as a sustaining program and not classed as commercial. —A. I do not think so. You are probably thinking of the New York Symphony, which is carried on that basis.

Q. I think I was.—A. Sometimes we carry it on a sustaining program.

Q. Is it sponsored in Canada now, or do you carry it on a sustaining program in Canada; I mean the New York Symphony?—A. I think it is sponsored in the States, but we carry it as a sustaining program.

Q. The Metropolitan Opera is sponsored in Canada as well as in the States.—A. Yes.

Q. The McColl-Frontenac Company sponsors it in Canada?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions on page 21?

We will turn to religious programs, on page 22.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Dunton, I got a little ahead of the report a few minutes ago when I was asking about the extent to which you find your present religious programming is giving satisfaction generally, and you just began to tell us about the difficulties.—A. I think in a general way it is giving satisfaction and a lot of very good work is being done about it. I think some people, both ourselves and many religious people, think it could be improved at times, and of course a lot of the responsibility is not just ours, it is on the church people themselves, and we are working with the National Religious Advisory Council all the time trying to improve the technical standards of religious broadcasts, the actual broadcasting technique to be effected, but I believe that, on the whole, it is a very good standard.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

Children's programs.

Mr. HANSELL: Were we not on religious programs?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I have a question, Mr. Dunton. I asked the question on the order paper some weeks ago, which I think perhaps you are aware of, in respect to the National Religious Advisory Council. I was given the names of those on that council and the church bodies which they represented. I notice at the bottom of page 22, first column, you say that this National Religious Advisory Council is composed of ministers from all the main Canadian denominations, and I think that is very well, as far as it goes, and I notice that there are those denominations represented here, although in Canada there are a great many of smaller church bodies that would have no representation in the personnel of this council. Have you considered—this is no reflection on the council—but have you considered at all the advisability of the Canadian Council of Churches as an advisory council? The Canadian Council of Churches I think embodies a much larger number of religious bodies than your advisory council would.—A. We have not thought of that particularly, Mr. Hansell. Our people are in close touch with the Canadian Council of Churches and work with them in a number of things including the Saturday broadcast and often discuss things with them. But the National Religious Advisory Council itself is a working body, a fairly small group, and I point out that while it contains members from only the larger groups, the main ones, I think it has good liberal advice to give on the broadcasting of other

groups which may not be actually represented on the Council. I think the difficulty in having the Canadian Council of Churches as an advisory board is that it is such a large body.

Q. I was not suggesting each and every religious group should be on the advisory council, but the Canadian Council of Churches is representative of a much larger body. It might even mean that you could reduce the number of personnel. They have an executive and so forth.—A. I would say, Mr. Hansell, that through the council over the years very effective co-operation has been built up, and to tell the truth I do not think the council would like to take steps to break that down.

Q. I understand that and I think the Religious Advisory Council have been doing a remarkably good job, but I am informed some of the small groups are not asked to take part in the religious broadcasts.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

Children's Programs on page 22.

Variety and Comedy on page 23.

Sports on page 26.

Special Events on page 26.

Use of Talent on page 27.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. On that point, Mr. Chairman, is the CBC relying more on permanent employees for talent or do they use casual people?—A. Practically none at all are permanent staff. Almost entirely all the talent used is non staff, just taken on for the occasion, for the series. That is our whole method of operation.

Q. Members of operatic groups, orchestras and so forth, would they be permanent employees of the CBC?—A. No. We have just now started this year a CBC symphony series and the members of that have a contract. They are not permanent employees but have a guarantee for a season, and in a few other instances we have similar kinds of guarantees or contracts, but on the whole there are no artists on the payroll at all.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Have you had any difficulties at all over adjusting wage rates with unions in the last year or so?—A. Well, management have had very long negotiations and some are going on at the present time—very long negotiations.

Q. Do you attempt to work this out always on a national basis or is there any scope for local negotiation?—A. It is the unions who have been trying to get it on a national basis more than ourselves.

Q. You cover a lot of ground when it comes to the employment of local artists, musical and otherwise.—A. We are very anxious to keep up the fight to keep our hands as free as possible in the commissioning of artists any place in the country, but to some extent our hands have been tied to a certain degree by union agreements.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. You draw attention here again to a matter you discussed verbally I think on the first day: station CFPL, London, running a talent program. And you say "thus establishing a pattern which might be followed by the development of local talent to talent of network calibre." In the time since this report was made in June of last year has any other station taken similar steps, do you know?—A. I think CKOY in Ottawa did something along this line too. I would say that in the last year or two a number of private stations

have been using a good deal more local talent and developing local talent and ideas for programs, but I have to check on that to find out more definitely if they have run special contests of this kind with the idea of the winner going on Opportunity Knocks. I think CKVL Verdun also did the same thing.

Q. Have you made a point of it in any circulars or suggestions given to private stations to plug this idea? It seems to be a very sound one.—A. I think it has been pointed out to the stations and talked about at the network meetings we have every year.

Q. You have at least two other stations that have taken it up, making three you know of?—A. Yes. There may be more. I think also the station at Saint John, New Brunswick. I would say there has been quite a lot more local talent activity and some of these people go on to Opportunity Knocks.

Q. You mentioned earlier I think if they did develop a program using local talent of network calibre you paid out of pocket expenses. Can you indicate that you are prepared to apply that principle of meeting expenses of individual talent not taking part in such contests?—A. I think we pay their expenses once they come to the national network contest. In other words, we do not pay the expenses in a local contest. But if a man wins locally and decides to come on the national contest, we pay his expenses to take part in it.

Q. I do not know what you have done previously to publicize this, but I might express a personal opinion that if you would give it all the publicity you can I believe it would be an excellent idea.—A. Yes. Thank you. It can be a very practical form of co-operation.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Special Programs on page 27.

By Mr. Whitman:

Q. On this Northern Messenger Service, that service is given free to those persons residing in the north, is it not?—A. Yes.

Q. Does that go on twice a week or once a week?—A. I think it is one program but from a number of different stations.

Q. We have a daughter living up in Baffin Island and she is very keen on this thing. If we do not get messages to her every time there is a broadcast we hear about it. It is very much appreciated in that part of the country and we can listen to these stations on Saturday nights from Sackville. There is an American station which comes in and drowns it out quite often, in Montreal, and then we curse them all. But that is a very fine service that you are giving to these people up there and I know that they appreciate it very much.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. This is not suggested by the question which Mr. Whitman asked, and it is not suggested by "special programs"; but when a number of us were up at Fort Churchill a year and a half ago we were disappointed to be told that while they were getting Russian programs there regularly every day,—and a lot of them were propaganda programs,—they said Canadian programs were virtually impossible to obtain.—A. We have known that for some time and we have had discussions with the Department of National Defence with a view to operating stations at Churchill and other points up there. We have finally come to an arrangement which started several months ago, to provide regular program service to those northern stations, starting with records. It starts this month with a regular six hour daily service.

Q. You say it will be a regular six-hour daily service?—A. Yes sir. And the RCAF will fly it around to the various stations. It is a quite carefully worked out scheme and we are very happy at last to be serving those stations. In effect they are joining our networks by means of recordings.

Q. How many stations will you use for that purpose?—A. Whitehorse, Aklavik—there are six.

Q. Do they cover a broad area, or are they scattered?—A. Whitehorse, Aklavik, Yellowknife, Churchill, Goose Bay; and it is estimated it will cover a population in the north of about 30,000, which is a high proportion of the northern population, I think.

Q. I suppose it is natural to expect that it would be the people around Whitehorse, Churchill, and Yellowknife who will be most of those reached? —A. Yes sir. There are people at Aklavik, and Goose Bay, and one or two other points.

Q. How big an area are you going to extend to?—A. It will be at centres where there is some community life around.

Q. These will not be strong or high-powered stations?—A. They will be about 250 watts, I think; but there are still big expanses in the north without good radio service, and that is a question which has exercised us for some years. But we have not been able to work out a coverage of those wide areas at anything like a possible cost. In order to cover them with a really adequate and sure service it would mean an enormous cost with respect to transmitters, land lines, and so on. Shortwave service is not too satisfactory to them, although sometimes they can hear Sackville. So far we have not been able to achieve a complete solution, but I think this will be a step forward in getting a service to them through the Department of National Defence.

Q. And those are all private stations?—A. They are all operated by the Department of National Defence.

Q. You say they are all operated by the Department of National Defence? —A. I think actually the people who are living there take a hand in running them, but they are not running on a commercial basis.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions, shall we go now to "International Radio Relations".

By Mr. Boisvert:

Q. I should like to commend the C.B.C. for having cut down to 15·9 per cent the productions originating with the United States networks. I am not prejudiced against our friends from the United States, but on the contrary I think it is worth while to mention before this committee that in 1948 and 1949 the productions originating with United States networks amounted to 40 per cent but now the figure is reduced to 15·9 per cent. As a Canadian I think that is an achievement worth while mentioning before this committee. —A. It has dropped, but I do not think it was quite up to 40 per cent.

Q. Yes. In your reports in 1948 and 1949 it is said that 60 per cent of the sponsored network programs were of Canadian origin and that the rest originated with the United States, I think.—A. Those were the commercial ones.

Q. Yes.—A. These would include all. While they have dropped, I think that the 40 per cent included only commercial programs, and it will not be 15·9 per cent of all programs, commercial and non-commercial. This figure is down but not quite in the proportion which you mention it as dropped.

Q. I know that, but it is still quite a drop.

Mr. FLEMING: Can you give us the actual figures so that we may have that comparison?

The WITNESS: I wonder if we can check back on that and let you have it at the next meeting.

By Mr. Boisvert:

Q. I knew that it was your policy to reduce as much as possible the production coming from the United States networks.—A. We put our policy rather in reverse to try to develop as much good Canadian broadcasting as possible.

Q. That is what I meant when I said that was your policy, because you stated last year that it was the intention of the C.B.C. to go to Canadian programming as much as possible.—A. Yes.

Q. And I should like to know if it was realized because I thought from this year's report that there was an indication that it had been cut down to a certain extent.—A. It has dropped, although, as I said the other day, we still hope and intend to keep on bringing in a reasonable amount of United States programs.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. In that statement which you are going to prepare, Mr. Dunton, will you bring it to us over a period of years, year by year, rather than for just the two years mentioned?—A. Yes, I shall do it that way and sort it out between commercial and non-commercial.

Q. That figure of 15·9 per cent was not only composed of United States networks, but it also included the BBC. Do you have that broken down as between the United States and the BBC?—A. Yes, we could get that.

Q. Would you make your table cover that as well, and let us have the two separately, as well as between the United States and the BBC?

The CHAIRMAN: How many years do you suggest, Mr. Fleming? From 1948?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes. Five or six years, I suppose. Is that going to be an arduous task?

The WITNESS: Not particularly, because the tabulations are there and it is just a question of putting them in a definite form.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Could you give us an example of the type of program originating in a privately owned station which you carry on a network basis?—A. The Don Wright Chorus from London; Don Messer and His Islanders, from Charlottetown; Sleepy Time Stories from Campbellton; they are all regular programs which have been going on for some time.

There are casual originations, and there have been series. I cannot think of any at the moment from the west, but there has been a series from Saskatoon. We have had some good series from Vancouver in other years but I do not think they are doing any this year.

Q. What is the trend of that, is this 2·4 per cent up, or down, or about the same?—A. I think it is about the same. I know there were 1700 odd programs which we had which originated in private stations in this country, different programs.

Q. On what basis? I was wondering if you were getting the figures on that last question. Did you say it was about stationary? If you are satisfied with it, then I won't press it any further unless you want to check it.—A. Could we check it and include it with these other items?

Q. On what basis do you pay the private stations. I imagine that you do pay them, or do you pay them?—A. It depends on the program. If they are doing something at our request, and it is really our program which is being done, there is a scale of payments. But if it is a thing coming on the network, a regular program, then we cover all the artists fees and so on and the main program expense.

Q. I am talking only of those you carry on a network basis within this 2·4 per cent. Do I understand then that you pay the out of pocket costs?—A. As a rule yes, which is of course the greatest cost, and we do contribute to the overhead. We pay the cost of the artists and so on, and usually there is a small fee paid for any origination which is a contribution to overhead.

Q. You do not in any sense attempt to make it profitable for stations to originate, or work out programs which will be of such quality as to be carried

on your own network?—A. Except in this sense. Say it is a program they have developed as happened in the case of London, Ontario, which attains great popularity there, and which is a good asset as a program to them. If we take it over, we pay the talent cost in the program which is pretty high, and they still get credit locally, and get it free and we take over the cost, and it is of very considerable advantage to them for the program is still on their station.

Q. And yet all the expenses are paid?—A. Yes, the expenses are paid.

Q. You do not go beyond that and pay them over and above a sizeable fee as a measure of encouragement to such stations?—A. There is a good deal of encouragement in that now, and after all, these are our network stations which are partners with us in the network, and they have always accepted this. If they originate something, they still get the credit, and it is taken over by a network of which they are a member, and I do not remember any suggestion that we pay them a further inducement to originate. I think there is a pretty big inducement held out now. If it is a satisfactory program, we take it on, and pay the costs.

Q. If you are satisfied that the inducement is sufficient to encourage them to originate, I do not want to suggest that you do anything in addition, but I am wondering if you are really satisfied that all appropriate inducements are now being held out to them?—A. I think appropriate inducements are held out to them.

Q. You say it is a fact that you have not had any really positive suggestion that you should give them something over and above?—A. No, because there has not been very many regular programs. There have been requests for adjustment on single origination, and I think we are paying a higher scale for it now, but there has not been any positive suggestion about bigger inducements for developing series.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further question. If not, we will turn to technical development on page 29. Commercial operations page 30. Station relations.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. You spoke about subsidiary hook-ups. Has any consideration been given to the matter of networks, apart from the CBC network hook-ups?—A. As you know, there have been a great many applications for subsidiary hook-ups, and a great many are approved and set up each year. There are a great many subsidiary hook-ups among private stations.

Q. What is the trend?—A. To increase in number.

Q. Is there any question of policy on the part of the CBC in this regard that indicates anything different from what was discussed the last time we were on this subject?—A. Not particularly.

The CHAIRMAN: Station relations.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. I have a question on a similar point. In British Columbia the B.C. section of the medical association wanted to put on the air a series called, I think, "The Doctor's Viewpoint" and they applied to the CBC station, and the C.B.U., I think it was, or anyway they applied to your management in Vancouver for permission to put it over your stations, and initially, my recollection is, they received a complete refusal on the grounds that it was not a type of broadcast for which you made CBC facilities available, and that I think left them with the only alternative of hiring a number of privately owned stations. They had to hire quite a number to give a comparable coverage, and I am sure that was allowed. I believe some adjustment has been worked out, though I understand they are not completely satisfied. I wonder if you would care to say a word about that.—A. The story I know,

Mr. Fulton, is rather different. It is this. The medical association developed this program by transcription, and then were having it carried by a number of private stations in the province, but wished to cover the Prince Rupert area, where we operate the only station, and they asked if we would carry the program there. At first our officials turned it down because we have a general policy not to carry a series of programs promoting the particular point of view of any organization. Then, on re-consideration and review, since we had to make a number of exceptions for the station at Prince Rupert because there is no private station there, we carried the program for that reason because there was no private station in that area.

Q. My understanding is that the controversy, if such it was, did not relate only to Prince Rupert.—A. That was my understanding. The only thing I heard about was Prince Rupert.

Q. I may have mis-read the letter, and I will have to pause at that point because I do not seem able to find it.

The CHAIRMAN: Station relations, page 31. Broadcast regulations, page 32.

Mr. FLEMING: On regulations, I think a request was made earlier that Mr. Dunton place in the hands of members copies of the draft regulations now under discussion.

The WITNESS: We have them here.

Mr. FLEMING: Would it not be as well for us to look them over and deal with them at another meeting or do you wish to take them up now?

The CHAIRMAN: Well, are they available for distribution? Perhaps this might be the best point to rise. The draft regulations can now be distributed.

Mr. FLEMING: Could I raise a point about the international service? We come to that on page 37. It is about our method of handling it. There will be questions I suppose as to whether we are going into this international service at any length by hearing Mr. Desy, the director. I might just mention that the standing committee on external affairs had a couple of meetings on this about a month ago. There are some members of this committee who sit on that other committee, but I do not suppose that should prevent this committee proceeding to hear Mr. Desy if they so wish.

The other point is, that the last time this committee was set up in 1951, we had, if I remember correctly, referred to us for review, and a report back to the House two items in the estimates on the international short wave service. I was wondering if that would not be the proper procedure again this year, so there will not be any duplication. The last time we went into this, and then made a report to the House, and it saved time in the House, and made for a more effective review of these two items.

The CHAIRMAN: We are of course bound by our terms of reference.

Mr. FLEMING: It would mean raising it in the House and asking that it be referred to the committee. The government offered no objection the last time.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps that might be another matter which should be considered by the sub-committee on agenda.

Mr. FULTON: I would just like to say in connection with the matter I raised last, that I thank Mr. Dunton for having explained the full situation. My understanding—and I want to make this clear on the record—was that I thought the matter referred to the whole of the C.B.C. network. I had one letter from the regional representative in British Columbia, in which he discussed the

matter of getting time for this type of broadcast on the C.B.C. network, and that gave me the impression he was referring to the whole of the C.B.C., but I see on reading some of the other letters, and in the light of what Mr. Dunton has said, that it refers only to Prince Rupert, and I think in fairness I should make that explanation.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Fulton.

Mr. FLEMING: I wonder if the witness could explain the principal changes in the regulations to help us in reading the draft.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you a question Mr. Hansell?

Mr. HANSELL: I did not quite get Mr. Fleming's question. It might be the same. But I was going to ask this. This release here is dated October 8. Do I understand there has been some revision since that time?

The WITNESS: Perhaps I could outline the situation. The Massey Commission recommended we review and go over all our regulations in a general way, as we were intending to do in any case. We started to do that under our regular procedure, but, as is suggested in the Canadian Broadcasting Act, before making changes in the regulations we wish to provide for public discussion of them. We thought that discussion could be best carried on if we made public some form of draft, which we did. That is the draft for discussion and consideration and was put out in October, and then the Canadian Association of Broadcasters thought it was too soon to take it up at our November meeting and we left it over to the January meeting of the board, when we held a public meeting to discuss these various regulations. The board has since studied them and there have been discussions of wording and technical matters with private stations and other people interested, but there are still no firm decisions on any of these regulations, and the regulations in force at this time are still the other sheet which you have.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Could Mr. Dunton point out the principal differences made in the draft as compared with the present regulations? I do not mean you to go into it in great detail, but just to say a word in general about the principal changes.—A. There were not very many. In regulation 5, several things are dropped. That was the former regulation 7. Several prohibitions are dropped. There is an important change in the former regulation 9, which would be the new regulation 7, regarding advertising content, and including the number and duration of spot announcements. The old regulation 13 is dropped. Old regulation 14 is dropped. Former regulation 18 (1), setting limits on the number of transcriptions or transcribed programs or records which can be used in the evening hours, was dropped and in place of it, or with the dropping of that, is to be included a new regulation 13 (1), on which there has been a great deal of public discussion, about the Canadian content of programs. I think those are the chief changes, although you will find quite a few amendments and dropping of former wording all the way through. It is an attempt, really, to streamline the regulations, to bring them up to date.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. You have not got a copy of the revised ones?—A. There is no revision beyond this, Mr. Hansell. The memorandum dated October 8 is still the draft from which we are working.

Q. I know the decisions have not been made, but you do have some proposed changes which you indicated now?—A. But I have just been indicating changes from the old regulations, which are on the sheet of October 8, which you have.

Q. Oh, I see.

Mr. BOISVERT: Mr. Chairman, would Mr. Dunton have any regulations with respect to television?

The WITNESS: No. What the board intends to do is, first, to get the sound regulations worked out and then go on to work on television regulations. The intention is that the television regulations will be parallel to the sound, but modified to the extent to which it is thought desirable and sensible for that different form of broadcasting.

Mr. Fleming asked about network policy, subsidiary networks and so on, a few minutes ago. We are not contemplating any major change in policy. We have made studies of possible changes in procedures and charging methods for subsidiary networks.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I was wondering if in general you are loosening up in this respect or carrying on the same policy?—A. Our idea perhaps, again, is to streamline things and consider making subsidiary hook-up operations simpler from the point of view of private stations and ourselves.

Q. And in that way, I suppose, to facilitate them?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

Agreed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Seventh Session—Twenty-first Parliament
1952-53

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. ROBINSON

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 3

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1953

WITNESS:

A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1953

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, April 14, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Carter, Coldwell, Decore, Dinsdale, Fleming, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Gauthier (*Sudbury*), Goode, Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), McCann, Mutch, Riley, Robinson and Smith (*Moose Mountain*).

In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, Governor, Donald Manson, Special Consultant, J. Alphonse Ouimet, General Manager, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, H. Bramah, Treasurer, George Young, Director of Station Relations, R. C. Fraser, Director of Press and Information, P. E. Meggs, Supervisor of Information, J. P. Gilmore, Assistant to Co-ordinator of Television, R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors, and J. A. Halbert.

The Chairman outlined briefly the plans for the trip to Toronto on April 20.

The Committee further considered the 1951-52 annual report of the C.B.C., the witness, Mr. Dunton, answering questions thereon.

The witness tabled a "Statistical Summary of Network Program Operations" for 1948-52 and a list of the Speakers on "Capital Report" since January, 1952.

Copies of the above-mentioned papers were distributed to Committee members and the witness was questioned thereon.

The following sections of the report were considered and adopted: NATIONAL SERVICE—RADIO: Broadcast regulations, Press and Information Services; POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION: Board of Governors, Executive, Personnel.

At 5.25 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m., Thursday, April 16.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

73597—1½

EVIDENCE

April 14, 1953
3:30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum. Now, when we rose at our last meeting we had reached page 32 of the annual report, broadcast regulations. Mr. Dunton.

Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman, Board of Governors, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, called:

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions under this heading? Are there any members of the committee who do not have the mimeographed sheets which were distributed at our last meeting? One is entitled C.B.C. Regulations for Broadcasting Stations, and the other is entitled Press Release, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Mr. FLEMING: Before you go into that, Mr. Chairman, is there not some information forthcoming on subjects which we asked about, information which was not previously available?

The WITNESS: Yes, we have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FLEMING: Would we not wish to take this now, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, we will take those matters if you wish, while this material is being distributed.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, we were asked at the last meeting to pool together in one sheet some of the percentages of total network operations which were mentioned in the annual report and which we discussed at the last meeting. We have a sheet that summarizes those over-all figures for the last few years. Do you want me to hand that around to the members?

The CHAIRMAN: Is it in shape for distribution?

The WITNESS: Yes, sir.

We also have, Mr. Chairman, a list of all the speakers on Capital Report program for the last year and a quarter. I think this was in response to a request by Mr. Fleming. I thought perhaps this could serve as answers to two requests. It shows all the speakers on the Capital Report programs from Ottawa, London and Washington as well. Perhaps this covers two or three inquiries along this line.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that also in shape for distribution?

The WITNESS: Yes, sir. There is some other information asked for which, perhaps, I could give to the committee verbally if that is agreeable.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, you have had distributed a statement entitled Statistical Summary of Network Program Operations. This arises out of a previous question. Are there any further questions on this subject at this time?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I notice, Mr. Dunton, that in the first breakdown between the sustaining and the commercial programs in 1952 your sustaining percentage dropped about two per cent and the commercial rose about two per cent as compared with 1951.—A. That is the year ending March 31, 1952.

Q. Yes, I realize you cannot take 1952 as a complete year anyway because your increased statutory revenue was made available to you during only a portion of that particular fiscal year.—A. Just the last part, yes.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. When you add up the commercial programs on the private stations, you get a much higher percentage than appears at first glance. There is the C.B.C. commercial, there is the private station commercial, there is United States organizations commercial, three different categories.—A. Of course, Mr. Chairman, it says private stations here. That only refers to C.B.C. programs which happen to originate at private stations.

Q. Is that all?—A. Yes, this is simply a statistical over-all of our C.B.C. networks operations. It is a summary of all the programs that go on a network. In other words, any time there is a traffic order for a program, anything on a network, it is an item in this over-all compilation.

Q. Now, you took a log of these stations between November 25 and December 1, of the private stations?—A. Yes, we asked them for what we call a report of performance on that sample week.

Q. Could we get a copy, statistical, something like this?—A. It would not be broken down in the same way. I should emphasize that, as the annual report points out, those figures are a compilation of all network originations to whatever kind of network they go, a full network, to a partial network, to a regional network, and include recorded and delayed programs. That is really a different basis from what any private station or what we ourselves put out in the course of the week. We have compilations from that sample week from private stations, but I do not think they would be comparable because they are dealing with different things. This is over-all network operation.

Q. Would there be any possibility of getting a few sample stations put before the committee, showing how much they are doing in the way of encouraging local talent in broadcasting?—A. If you wish, Mr. Chairman, we have some original reports on this, sample weeks, and we could do that.

Q. Would it not be a good idea to give the committee an indication of what is being done in this respect by private stations? Some years ago we had something like that placed before us, and if we could have some sample stations from sample regions, say a dozen of them or something of that sort prepared?—A. Yes, I think we could give some summary figures from those reports.

Mr. FLEMING: Is there such a thing as a sample station, a fair sample of all the stations?

The WITNESS: I think we could do it for all stations in some form or another. I wonder if that could be left with us so that we could study it and give either sample stations or a summary of all the stations.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Broadly speaking, in reference to the network programs there has been very little change in the period covered by this statement, which is 5½ years, as to the source of programs?—A. There is not any very great change. As I say, like any over-all statistics these may not give an exact picture of, say, the programming of any particular part, of any particular network at a time. They can be affected by changes in methods of operation.

Q. It is a very uniform pattern over that 5½-year period.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for not being here before, but I had duties to attend to in other places. I am going to ask Mr. Dunton to take this list which I am giving him and perhaps at the next meeting he might give me his remarks on it. This is a log of the listening audience in British Columbia and I would like to have Mr. Dunton's comments on it, and perhaps he could give it some thought before our next meeting. I have further information on that matter if you desire it. I am going to ask some questions on it, but I think it is only fair you should have a chance to look at it first.—A. If you wish, Mr. Chairman, I will try to answer questions on this now.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it on this same subject?

Mr. GOODE: This, Mr. Chairman, to bring the committee up to date, is the consolidated program ratings put out by a reputable company in British Columbia, and gives the listening ratings of all stations on the lower mainland of British Columbia, including CBR, our local C.B.C. station in Vancouver. It gives an interesting story, but I think Mr. Dunton, because of the questions I intend to ask him at a later date, might wish to give this a little study.

The CHAIRMAN: I might point out, Mr. Goode, that we have passed programming. Is it the wish of the committee that Mr. Dunton comment on this?

Mr. COLDWELL: I think so, since Mr. Goode was not here.

Mr. HANSELL: Since Mr. Goode was not here—

Agreed.

Mr. GOODE: I should perhaps preface my remarks by again apologizing for not being here; I do not want to hold the committee up at all, but I think this is a most important matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to comment now, Mr. Dunton?

The WITNESS: I have in my hand a document entitled Consolidated Program Ratings, dated April 1, 1951. It shows consolidated ratings computed on latest Elliott-Haynes reports for each area shown above and is put out by the International Broadcasting Co. Ltd., Research division. Then it shows the various ratings for four particular stations, CKNW, CKWX, CJOR and CBR. I could try to answer questions now.

The CHAIRMAN: What were your questions, Mr. Goode?

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Let us look for a moment at 1952, which I have also supplied Mr. Dunton a copy of. An interesting story in regard to CBU is told in these ratings. I do not wish to infer for a moment that I am criticizing the C.B.C. in regard to their local radio programs, but this has something to do with television, a subject that the committee is going into further, I understand, and it shows here that all of the ratings on the local stations—at most of the times in 1952, for instance, the listening audience of CBU was the smallest of any station on the lower mainland of British Columbia. I understand that the local ratings carried through that same story.—A. In 1952, for most periods of the day.

Q. And you think so, according to this?—A. Just looking at the chart, I see periods where CBU is high.

Q. But for the majority of times, you will agree that my statement is correct. I thing you will find that, if you check that 1952 story.—A. I would like to check it more.

Q. That is why I wondered you wanted to answer it today.—A. I was just offering to try to comment or to see what you wish us to study further.

Q. I am going to proceed to ask some questions when the committee is discussing TV in British Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN: It was agreed, Mr. Goode, that we would proceed with our study of sound broadcasting and complete it, and then proceed to a study of television matters at a later date.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of policy of the C.B.C. that I wish to discuss, and I think Mr. Dunton will want to take time to study it. That is why I gave him this information today. I wanted to discuss the two points together.

The CHAIRMAN: You have no further questions you want to ask at the present time, then?

Mr. GOODE: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on the Statistical Summary of Network Program Operations?

If not, are there any questions under Capital Report speakers?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. It is hard to go through this summary in the time available at the meeting since the sheet was distributed, but I just picked out one point, namely, London, and I find that the broadcasters from London were as follows: Legum, one; Shulman, four; Grey, one; Steinhouse, three; Stenton, four; McKenzie, two; Cowan, one; Boyd, one; Kent, one; Allison, one; LaChance, one; Halton, twenty-five. That is a total of 46, of which Mr. Halton did more than half. Now, I would be the first to say that Mr. Halton is a very competent and interesting broadcaster, but I just wonder how this reflects on the policy of balance in commentaries.—A. My counting was that Mr. Halton spoke 25 times out of 66.

Q. From London?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you a breakdown of the others? I was doing the best I could with this tabulation.—A. I think this covers about 66 occasions from January 1, 1952 to April 5, 1953, which I think numbers about 66 occasions, and I think your own count says that Mr. Halton was there 25 times.

Q. This is London only, and I counted a total of 46.—A. There are 66 broadcasts here, I think.

Q. Perhaps we should not take time to work it out now—it is a matter of arithmetic—unless there is a breakdown available.—A. Perhaps the difference is that on some occasions the overseas item came from some other place, but I think Mr. Halton talked 25 times in the overseas item in the 66 different Capital Reports.

Q. I make it 25 out of 46, from London, and nobody else comes close to him. I said that I think he is a very competent and interesting broadcaster, but I wonder if this is balance.

Mr. COLDWELL: What do you mean by "balance", Mr. Fleming?

Mr. FLEMING: I was coming back to C.B.C. ideas. The policy has been described to us as one of balance, balance in the points of view, and as between commentators. That means balancing up by drawing the commentators from different points of view.

Mr. COLDWELL: Are not Mr. Halton's broadcasts descriptive rather than commentaries?

Mr. FLEMING: I do not know you can say it is not descriptive, but it comes under the name of commentary.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could let Mr. Dunton comment on it.

The WITNESS: In the first place, my score would be 25 out of 66 items from the other side. In any case, I would think this is quite a representative and a fair balance this year. Mr. Halton has a special contract with the C.B.C. and he is used a lot on that account.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. Is he full time with the C.B.C.?—A. No. There is an arrangement by which he gets a regular annual payment. He is free to do other writing work, but not other broadcasting work.

Q. He is the man who is always available under contract with the C.B.C. to do this broadcasting?—A. Exactly, and we find in these areas we need to have one person available whom we can call on as a good broadcaster. We deliberately, as a matter of policy, use other people, even at greater expense, to see that there is a certain balance, and I would suggest the balance this year has been pretty fair. There is that added factor that although this is a commentary, very often Halton's broadcasting is more descriptive than interpretative. I would suggest this year that it is a pretty good balance.

Q. A lot of this broadcasting that Mr. Fleming speaks about may be commentary, but it is special events description, and things like that?—A. Some of that gets in. It depends on what happens in the week in London.

Mr. COLDWELL: For instance, there was the death of the King last year, and the floods this year, Matthew Halton described those things and commented on them.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. There is a certain amount of comment in it and impressions.—A. Yes. That is a problem we have had on several of those points, namely, to maintain a good service, we found that we had to have some permanent arrangement, or someone under a permanent arrangement and we had to spend extra money to try to get it.

Q. What about Washington?—A. The same situation has faced us there with James Minnifee. He comes under the same arrangement there. But we are careful to see that other people are used as well.

Q. You do make an effort to maintain a good balance?—A. Yes, very deliberately. It would be our desire to use Matthew Halton or James Minnifee every week.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions under "Capital Report Speakers"?

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, I take it that if any of us wish to make an analysis of this, we might come back to it again. It would take up too much time now.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that the committee would be agreeable.

We now turn to "Broadcast Regulations" on page 32 of the report. Are there any questions?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I would like to ask Mr. Dunton how far it is desirable that we go into this question now in view of the fact that these particular regulations are under study. I understand that at a meeting of the Board of Governors which was held three months ago representations were heard by the board and arrangements were made for further conferences, and that those conferences are not fully concluded yet.—A. We did open hearings at our meeting in January and we heard very wide representations. The board wished to consider what has been put before it more carefully and it also took up certain suggestions made on behalf of the C.A.B. and, I think, others, that there be informal discussions on the wording and on the technical things involved. There have been such discussions and we expect there will be more. The board has not taken any firm decision. Those discussions are still going ahead.

Q. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if under those circumstances it might be wiser for us to forego going deeply into this question while conversations are still pending.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a matter for the committee. We have before us the regulations which are actually in force and we also have a proposed draft. I suppose the committee is quite free to ask any questions it wishes, with respect to it.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I agree with Mr. Fleming, that there may not be a great deal of purpose served if the matter is still under review. But I should like to have a further comment, if Mr. Dunton cares to make it, with respect to whether or not he feels that the corporation will go forward with the proposed new regulations?—A. I think I can say this: from the discussions which the board has had since—I mean the further ones—we certainly would not put them into effect in the form or wording they are now in, in the proposed draft. There will certainly be some modifications, but just what, I do not yet know.

Q. The regulations you refer to are the ones in the press release of October 8?—A. That is right.

Q. Considering there is to be a new review, it might be helpful if a few questions were asked, just the same, because it might influence those who are reviewing the regulations. Do you not think so, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: I would think that is perfectly in order, Mr. Hansell.

Mr. HANSELL: In that case, there are one or two of these regulations I would like to draw to your attention, Mr. Dunton, simply to get a little further clarification.

Mr. RILEY: These are the new ones?

Mr. HANSELL: Yes, the new ones that have been proposed according to the press release of October 8. I suppose that you did give some considerable consideration to the wording of the regulations. Even at that, no one is perfect, and I have a suggestion or two to make. You may have overlooked one or two little matters. I refer particularly now to page 3 "Broadcasting Generally", paragraph 5:

5. No station shall broadcast
   (*a*) anything contrary to law,
   (*b*) any abusive comment on any race, religion or creed,
   (*c*) any obscene, indecent or profane language,
   (*d*) any false or misleading news with the knowledge that it is false or misleading,
   (*e*) any program on the subject of birth control, venereal disease, or any subject dealing with public health that may from time to time be designated by the Corporation, unless such program is presented in a manner and at a time approved by a representative of the Corporation as appropriate to the medium of broadcasting,
   (*f*) any program presenting a character analyst, crystal gazer, fortune teller, graphologist, hypnotist or the like, claiming supernatural or psychic powers, or any program that leads or is likely to lead the audience to believe that the person presented possesses or claims to possess supernatural or psychic powers,
   (*g*) any program presenting a person who solves or purports to solve personal, moral or social problems or questions submitted by listeners or members of the public, unless the program format has been approved in writing by a representative of the Corporation,

(*h*) any advertising content in the body of a news broadcast,

(*i*) except with the consent in writing of a representative of the Corporation, any appeal for donations or subscriptions in money or kind on behalf of any person or organization other than

(i) recognized charitable institutions or organizations,

(ii) universities, or

(iii) musical or art groups or organizations whose principal aim or object is other than that of monetary gain,

(*j*) any program involving a lottery, gift enterprise or similar scheme in which the contestant or competitor pays any sum of money in order to be eligible for a prize,

(*k*) any sports or other event through a description prepared from wired or cabled reports or other indirect sources of information unless the broadcast of such event is clearly identified at the beginning and end thereof as having been so prepared, and in a broadcast of more than fifteen minutes duration is clearly identified at the end of each fifteen minutes as having been so prepared.

In the case of paragraph (*b*) "Any abusive comment on any race, religion or creed," I do not know whether you have given consideration to a differentiation between the term "religion" and the term "creed". It may not appear to be of very much importance, but I wonder if that might have slipped somebody's mind. It is an expression which is generally used "race, religion and creed".

Mr. RILEY: Does not a creed mean a belief?

Mr. HANSELL: Yes, but religion is based upon a belief.

Mr. RILEY: Creed would embrace religion, in any event.

Mr. HANSELL: There may be a difference of opinion there, and if there is, perhaps it may serve but little purpose. I will suggest, if I may, that the word "creed" refers to a theological doctrine or a dogma. Am I right in that?

The WITNESS: I think that the board has really never given careful consideration to this regulation as to form. It has been in the regulations for many years. I think that the intention was to cover religion as usually understood, and perhaps a religious form of belief was included.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. Is not the governing word "abusive"?—A. Yes, that is the important word.

Q. The rest is not important so long as it is not abusive. Take the Catholic Hour on Sunday evening. Very often the priest who is speaking gives the catholic point of view from the point of view of the catholic creed in certain respects. And the thing you would object to, or the idea you have in doing that would be if he were abusive in relation to some other creed, or if somebody should say something which was abusive in relation to his creed.

Mr. HANSELL: The interpretation might involve what would be abusive.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is right.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Suppose the same priest which Mr. Coldwell indicated should say that an opposing belief was not true. Would that be considered abusive?—A. No, it is not. I think there have been very few instances which have come up in this respect. As has been suggested, the key to this is the word "abusive", but we have never tried in any way to check argument or discussion on religious

beliefs. It is simply designed to prevent abusive talk about races, religions and creeds. There is nothing to stop anybody from taking issue with other people.

Q. You would not take issue with a public discussion. I mean in the form of a person discussing the differences of belief as between Baptists and Anglicans, and so on?—A. None at all.

Q. Just so long as he did not bring ridicule and abuse upon that doctrine and those persons or bodies who held it?—A. That is right.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is right.

Mr. RILEY: If it were otherwise, you would have banned all argument.

The WITNESS: That is right.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. That is my point. I think we all want to have freedom of speech and we do not want anything written into the regulations which would be a negation of that principle.—A. The board is entirely in agreement with this, and it has been in there for years.

Q. May I now come to clause (*d*):

> No station shall broadcast any false or misleading news with the knowledge that it is false or misleading.

I think that is a good regulation, but how you are going to enforce it, I do not know. I should like to ask you this question which is partially perhaps born out of curiosity. Are you familiar with the Alberta News Act which was passed some years ago by the Alberta government?

Mr. COLDWELL: In 1937, I think it was.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Yes, in 1937.—A. No, I do not think so. I have not got it in my mind.

Q. I thought perhaps you might, because you were a journalist yourself at one time.—A. Yes, and at that time I knew quite a lot about it, but I have forgotten it since.

Q. As far as I can see there is no difference between these regulations and the Alberta News Act, but that Act was declared to be unconstitutional.

Mr. COLDWELL: I think there is quite a difference. If you read the Act, you will find that something could not be published except under supervision.

Mr. HANSELL: No, no.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is the way it was, if I remember it correctly.

Mr. HANSELL: The purpose of the Act was that should false information be published concerning the Government of Alberta, it should be corrected, and the law made it compulsory to correct it.

Mr. SMITH: Who was to say whether or not it was false?

Mr. HANSELL: Well, the government who would know the facts.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is what I meant when I said that something could not be published except under supervision.

Mr. RILEY: There was an Act such as that passed in the United States right after the Revolution.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not remember that.

Mr. HANSELL: I simply say that it was declared unconstitutional. I do not say whether I think it was right or wrong. But I cannot see any difference between this clause and that act. Have you any comment to make?

The WITNESS: No.

Mr. HANSELL: Let us go down to clause (*f*). Was there any reason for including graphologists in there?

Mr. COLDWELL: They are just as bad as the rest.

The CHAIRMAN: What is graphology?

Mr. HANSELL: I happen to have dabbled in that myself. I am not going on the radio, but I do not see that a graphologist, who is engaged in reading hand writing, is in the same class as a fortune teller.

Mr. FLEMING: They used to have a graphologist on the air, I remember, a few years ago. There were broadcasts by some lady who represented herself to be a graphologist and she would give comments based on her reading of particular hand writing. Some of her subjects were leading figures of the House of Commons at that time. Perhaps this regulation arose out of that experience.

Mr. COLDWELL: Does a graphologist attempt to tell young people what they should do in the future? If so, is not that a form of fortune telling, just as phrenology is a form of fortune telling when they read your bumps.

Mr. HANSELL: No. I think what they do is to indicate character.

Mr. FLEMING: You have a reference to character analysis in the previous line. I heard this lady of whom I speak some years ago and she purported to analyse character as she saw it in the hand writing of her subjects. She gave a character analysis of many people who are prominent in public life in this country. Has the regulation been changed since? I think this was about 10 or 20 years ago.

The WITNESS: I think the regulation dates from about that time.

Mr. HANSELL: Then perhaps I was right in my conjecture about the origin of this particular regulation.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. There has been a series on graphology running in the *Journal* lately, which was quite interesting. If anyone wants to have his character analysed, he can come to me afterwards. Let us go down to paragraph (*g*).

> No station shall broadcast any program presenting a person who solves or purports to solve personal, moral or social problems or questions submitted by listeners or members of the public, unless the program format has been approved in writing by a representative of the corporation.

Notwithstanding the fact that these regulations may not have been enforced, would that not preclude any clergyman from discussing a solution to social or moral problems?—A. This particular regulation was discussed at considerable length at our public hearings, and I think it became more and more clear, as we said at the time, that it was a question of either attempting to make more exact legal wording which led to misunderstanding, or having a regulation along these lines. The intention was to try to stop a kind of programming of which there had been some unfortunate examples, of people giving personal advice to people, such as to the lovelorn, or to the worried, or to the disturbed, and that sort of thing. This draft was an attempt to check that and I think the board, possibly after hearing representations, thought it was a pretty poor attempt. There was of course no desire or attempt to stop any discussions of public affairs or moral and social problems in that sense.

Q. Such as juvenile delinquency, prison reform or Sunday sports and the liquor question?—A. Not at all.

Mr. FLEMING: Would this rule out Eleanor Glyn and Dorothy Dix?

The CHAIRMAN: Is your question not answered by the subsequent words:

. . . or questions submitted by listeners or members of the public . . .?

The WITNESS: That was part of it.

The CHAIRMAN: There must have been solicitation of comments.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Of course, there is many a church or clergyman who might invite questions on moral issues. That might carry on quite an interesting program along that line.—A. I am not trying to defend this particular wording, but I would point out the word "solves". Anyone who gives an opinion with a view to "solving" is taking on a pretty wide power unto himself, in attempting to solve personal problems submitted to him by his listeners.

Q. They might help me a little bit.—A. Most clergymen would say that they were giving advice rather than holding out a particular solution.

Q. In any event, there is some re-wording to be done with this?—A. Yes.

Q. In clause (*i*) you say:

> No station shall broadcast except with the consent in writing of a representative of the corporation, any appeal for donations or subscriptions in money or kind on behalf of any person or organization other than
>
> (i) recognized charitable institutions or organizations,
>
> (ii) universites, or
>
> (iii) musical or art groups or organizations whose principal aim or object is other than that of monetary gain.

I spoke about that in the House when the debate on the setting up of the committee was in progress and I fancy you have read my speech. Or was it worth reading? I indicated that there was some objection to this. Have you any comments to make in that respect?—A. Yes. I heard your speech, Mr. Hansell. You pointed out that religious bodies are not included among those who could have an automatic right to make appeals. Religious bodies or churches would still have to get permission, or a body of that sort, and that has been the situation for many years. Of course it has been the case that any recognized church or church body almost invariably has got permission. But it was thought desirable to get in some form of check or at least a limitation on a certain type of program coming into Canada possibly by transcription, which might put forth a very appealing religious or bible program, and which might also appeal for funds. We had information that some of the organizers of these programs were making very good incomes out of them. There were programs on religion which went to many hundreds of stations, and which did not seem to help the cause of religion very much. It was felt that there ought to be a check on that kind of thing, and so the regulation was put in. The board has not checked any established church bodies or religious associations in Canada from making an appeal. But it feels it should have some sort of check on appeals in connection with those rather undesirable programs originating from outside the country, more or less.

Q. I can understand there may be some that are undesirable, but that may be a matter of opinion. I am not a radio fan who sits by his radio all day. In fact I marvel sometimes that Mr. Coldwell has so much time to listen to the radio.

Mr. COLDWELL: I must admit that I stay at home. I do not run around, you know.

Mr. HANSELL: I trust the inference is not that I do. Perhaps Mr. Coldwell has the happy faculty of being able to read a book while the radio is on.

Mr. COLDWELL: I can.

Mr. HANSELL: He is one ahead of me. I cannot read and listen at the same time.

Mr. COLDWELL: That may be the explanation.

Mr. HANSELL: We shall strike an agreement on that. But I should like to ask how you determine what you think is desirable or undesirable. I do not listen to a great many of these programs, although I sit through them once in a while. What way do you have of judging what is good and what is not? Do you have any advisory council?

The WITNESS: No. That is, we would not try to judge the value of the truth of a religious message. But the intent would be, as it has been now for some years, to give permission automatically in respect to any appeal for funds in this country, on behalf of any recognized religious body operating in the community.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you allow Father Devine to broadcast an appeal for funds?

The WITNESS: Our idea was that of any body which was permanently established in an area. That is the way it has been operating for some years and we felt it should continue that way.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I can understand that, if you conclude that a certain organization is carrying on a racket, but there are others that are honest.—A. That is what we are sure of in some of these cases.

Q. Let us take for instance the old fashioned revival hour of Charles E. Fuller. That is a very popular broadcast throughout the world. Would it be included in a regulation of that kind?

Mr. COLDWELL: Where is that from?

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. It originates in Long Beach, California.—A. I do not think it has been appealing for funds. It could be broadcast in Canada, but I do not think it has been making a direct appeal for funds.

Q. I do not know. I do not listen to it enough. It is broadcast in Canada, and I understand that it has reached such proportions that it does take a tremendous amount of money to carry it. But it all comes in through voluntary contributions. I asked about that program particularly because Dr. Fuller is a personal friend of mine, having been a classmate with me in college. I know for a fact that he would not countenance any such thing as a racket.

Mr. COLDWELL: When does it come on?

Mr. HANSELL: I cannot say when it comes on here but it comes in by electrical transcription, and it comes over quite a number of stations.

Mr. COLDWELL: Some get by the regulation by suggesting that you write in for a free course on something or other. When the free course comes, they invite you to subscribe.

The WITNESS: I do not think we have ever had a request from that program to appeal for funds.

Mr. COLDWELL: Would you allow an appeal from the United States? You said something about it being of interest to a local community. Would you allow an appeal, let us say, from Los Angeles?

The WITNESS: Not normally. It has not been working that way.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. There is another program, the Lutheran Hour. It is a very powerful program and I think, generally speaking, it is the equivalent to the old-fashioned revival hour in its popular appeal, and it is heard in many stations around the world. It is very powerful and I am wondering—such a program as this is not a racket, and if they appeal for funds at all, it is for funds to carry on further broadcasts.—A. In the case of the Lutheran Hour, the Lutheran church is established in many parts of Canada.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. What about religious services such as the Sunday morning service from St. John's Anglican Church here in Ottawa? There is no appeal made for funds, but could they appeal for funds?—A. Certainly, but permission has to be requested. That is the first thing.

Q. Would it not be rather difficult for them to appeal for funds in a service of that description?—A. We do not get many requests. There are a certain number, but it is more of a question of religious bodies or churches finding from time to time that their funds are running short and they may wish to appeal, although most of them do not want to appeal all the time.

Q. Some of this broadcasting time may be donated by the station?—A. Some stations do donate the time.

Q. I think they do.—A. I know that an increasing number are doing it on a free basis.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. What about some of those religious broadcasts which are designed or at least published with the view to promoting a political slant, although no politics are necessarily mentioned? Is there anything in the regulations about that, assuming that this kind of broadcasting exists in Canada?—A. I do not think that question has come up in any way.

Q. Is there anything in the regulations which deals with that type of broadcast?—A. According to the way these regulations are drafted, any appeal for funds would have to be checked.

Q. I am dealing with the regulations, generally.—A. It would stop such a broadcast.

Q. You say it would stop that type of broadcast?—A. If it is a religious broadcast, it is very freaky, but there is nothing in our regulations referring to political broadcasts.

Q. I am not referring to political broadcasts, but to broadcasts which may take place in the future, and which the public feel are designed to promote politics.—A. It is a pretty difficult question there, I think.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, you have to get at the intention of those people who are preaching the sermons.

Mr. RILEY: You would have to establish connections.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I would like to ask a question on subsection (*e*) of section 5:

> No station shall broadcast (*e*) any program on the subject of birth control, venereal disease, or any subject dealing with public health that may from time to time be designated by the Corporation, unless such program is presented in a manner and at a time approved by a representative of the Corporation as appropriate to the medium of broadcasting.

Who would approve of a program of that kind? Would it be a doctor?—A. No, what would happen, it would go to our regulations division, who in turn would consult with the appropriate public health authorities.

Q. How long a time would that take? If you have to submit a program of that kind through those channels before you put it on the air, how long would that procedure take?—A. I think it could be done in a very short time. I would point out that "that may from time to time be designated by the corporation". That is only in special fields.

Q. It does not change my point of who would approve of it, and if you were checking on a program of this kind, the checking would be done by a medical man?—A. Yes, it would be by a medical man. The board is inclined to loosen up on this regulation in any case.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. Section 5, subsection (*d*): "No station shall broadcast any false or misleading news with the knowledge that it is false or misleading." If erroneous news is broadcast, either by a station or somebody who has engaged time at that station, and it is clearly established afterwards that it is erroneous, is there any regulation of the C.B.C. requiring the station to retract the news or the statement or correct any impression that may have been given to the listening audience?—A. No, there is not, apart from this.

Q. That is, any broadcast which gives out false or misleading news does not fall within this section unless the intent, or unless it can be established that the person who gave out the news had knowledge that it was false?—A. Yes. I might say the board has thought a good deal and still wishes to do some more thinking about this regulation. There has been an old straight prohibition on false or misleading news broadcasting which we feel is not suitable now. We feel that another station, or ourselves, should not be put in a position to decide what is false and what is not false, but we thought it would be wise to keep some kind of safeguard against deliberate misrepresentation of something on the air.

Mr. COLDWELL: Have you ever had occasion to enforce this regulation?

The WITNESS: I don't think there has been. That is one reason we thought of dropping it, but it was thought that we should keep some safeguard so that pressure could be put on a station if the station did go out to deliberately mislead the public, such as a description of atom bombs, thus there would be a check if they did that sort of thing.

Mr. FLEMING: Or germ warfare?

The WITNESS: Yes. I do not think it is terribly important and nothing may ever come of it for years.

By Mr. Boisvert:

Q. Mr. Dunton, what means has the C.B.C. to check on the observance of these regulations by private stations?—A. We get copies of their logs. Under the regulations and the Act, we get copies of their logs, but apart from that a good deal depends on the activities of our regulations division, and complaints that come in from listeners and members of the stations, and so on. At the present time we have rather inadequate means for doing any monitoring or air-checking, but we prefer to let them go on the honour system. We do not go out deliberately to try to catch them violating a regulation.

Q. I ask that question, because I see regulation 5, subsection (*h*), says: "No station shall broadcast any advertising content in the body of a news broadcast". I have been listening to a station and this regulation was violated ten times during the evening.—A. Perhaps our regulation manager could speak to you later, Mr. Boisvert.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

Mr. HANSELL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on subsection (*i*), which we were dealing with a little while ago, subclause (ii), "universities". Would there be any objection, Mr. Dunton, to adding to "universities" such other schools as theological and Bible colleges?

Mr. COLDWELL: Would universities not cover theological colleges?

Mr. HANSELL: Not necessarily.

Mr. FLEMING: I would not think they would.

Mr. HANSELL: Many theological colleges are thought to be parts of universities. I brought the matter up with respect to income tax. In their regulations governing exemption of income tax for students going to universities, I asked if they could not elaborate or extend that to Bible colleges, theological institutions, which the Minister of Finance did. I happen to be one of the trustees of a theological college. They have done a little broadcasting at times and they are purely and entirely dependent upon donations coming from local congregations affiliated with the theological institution. They are really faith organizations. I am wondering if that has been considered, or if you will consider it?

Mr. RILEY: Or other established institutions of learning.

The WITNESS: Certainly, something like that can be considered to make it wider, and through emphasizing that most of these organizations would, of course, get permission if they applied and the stations would do it. There has not been a great deal of objection. It simply means that a check would have to be made and I think consideration could be given to widening it.

Mr. HANSELL: Of course, I don't think that a Canadian institution should have to ask for permission.

The WITNESS: That certainly will be considered.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Now we come down to subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (*i*) of section 5:

> No station shall broadcast except with the consent in writing of a representative of the corporation, any appeal for donations or subscriptions in money or kind on behalf of any person or organization other than . . . (iii) musical or art groups or organizations whose principal aim or object is other than that of monetary gain.

Q. How would political parties come in there?—A. They do not, I do not think.

Q. They should. They are organizations whose principal aim is other than that of monetary gain.

Mr. COLDWELL: There is an 'or' there. I agree with Mr. Hansell in this respect.

The WITNESS: I think it was meant to read "art groups or organizations". The draft of this could be looked at again.

Mr. HANSELL: I think political parties should be able to appeal for funds.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): They do it indirectly in my province; some of them, not all.

The CHAIRMAN: Then your comment, Mr. Dunton, is that this needs further consideration?

The WITNESS: I would say that this section as drafted was intended to cover musical or art organizations.

Mr. HANSELL: Maybe I should have kept my mouth closed!

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. With reference to 7(*i*). Seven minutes is a lot of advertising in an hour, isn't it? It is equivalent to five minutes in 40 minutes.—A. I suggest it would depend quite a lot on how it is done, Mr. Coldwell. A lot of consideration was given to these regulations, and we tried to get something that would be reasonable, and would fit in with station practice, that was enforceable, and that is the final way the figures worked out.

Q. Is this supervised carefully though?—A. This has not been supervised too carefully. That is part of the object of revising, so as to put in something that could be well supervised, and for which there would be a figure on which we had agreement, and which would become effective. It has not been effective, and it has not been properly enforced.

Q. There is some indirect advertising?—A. Yes.

Q. And it is not at all bad as a matter of fact. It is when you get something blurbed out four or five times during the program that you want to turn it off, and you do not buy the product.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? If there are no further questions under regulations—

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Thirteen is the one that is under discussion at the present time?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions under broadcasting regulations.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. On page 8, section 15, clause 3:

> Except with the consent of a representative of the corporation no station shall broadcast any reproduced program or speech which would have the effect of simulating a network of stations not authorized on behalf of the corporation.

I do not know if I understand exactly what the term "simulating" means. —A. Fake perhaps would be another word.

Q. Let me give you an example. If Mr. Low, or Mr. Coldwell or Mr. Drew or—

Mr. COLDWELL: Or Mr. Hansell.

Mr. HANSELL: ...broadcasts in Winnipeg and it is recorded, does this regulation prevent that recording from being used on another station at a subsequent time?

The WITNESS: Not at a subsequent time, but not in a way to make people believe there was a communication between them, or as to allow them to believe it was going to be used the next night in Regina or Edmonton.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. They could do that throughout the country?—A. Yes. The objection would be taken if someone announced they were speaking on a network of stations on one given night, and did it all by records.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. I imagine you could make a record and have it broadcast we will say—using the cities you mentioned, Regina and Saskatoon—at the same time providing it was said that it was a delayed broadcast, and there was no reference to a network.—A. Actually not very many things have come up in this connection.

Q. What I am getting at is that these regulations would not prohibit that, but only if you pretended that it was a network.—A. It would be a matter of interpretation of the instance I think. It has been designed to stop giving the effect of a network, when there has not been permission.

Q. But under these regulations I think it would be possible when it is not said to be a network, but is said to be a delayed broadcast or transcribed or a recording.—A. I would not like to give an opinion on that.

Q. I think the regulation would allow it as it now reads.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I can only speak for British Columbia, but there are some stations that finish up giving a program by saying "this is the Northern Broadcasting Company." That is simulated. It is giving the impression that it comes from a network, and that happens all the time. I know two or three stations in British Columbia that consistently do that. Does not that give the impression of coming from a network? That has been going on for a long time, and I mention that name because it is not used in British Columbia, but there are some that are.

Mr. RILEY: Not necessarily.

The WITNESS: I do not know what you are referring to.

Mr. GOODE: They will finish a program by saying "this is station QXZ and this is the Northern Broadcasting Company" which sounds like a broadcasting network. Do you not think so?

Mr. RILEY: People in the area usually know.

Mr. GOODE: I am talking about the regulation, not what we understand in British Columbia.

Mr. RILEY: It does not sound as though it was a simulated network. All they give out is the name of the body corporate that may own the station. I do not think I can see any objection to that.

The WITNESS: That sounds all right.

Mr. DINSDALE: Can we refer to section 11?

The CHAIRMAN: Agreed.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Section 11, (1) "The periods to be reserved by a private station for the broadcast of programs of the corporation from time to time designates". What is the present situation in that regard?—A. There is a schedule of reserved time for each of our networks the Trans-Canada, the Dominion and the French network. They are worked out to take into account the needs of the service, and the more important programs are put on Nationally, taking into account some of the problems of the private stations, and they form part of the general arrangement between the affiliated stations and ourselves. We supply the service to them both sustaining and commercial, and one of the obligations they undertake is to carry at least the reserved time.

Q. I suppose a good deal of evening time is allotted to network programs? —A. I could give you some examples. It varies by regions. For instance, Ontario and Quebec region trans-Canada has the reserved time on Sunday of 4.30 to 5, 5.30 to 6, 6.15 to 6.30, 9 to 10 and 10 to 10.30. It varies a bit. The national news is always in reserved times. On Mondays 7.45 to 8, is "provincial affairs"—a political broadcast, another period is 8.30 to 9. Then there is 10.15 to 11. On Tuesday it is 7.45 to 8, is Nation's Business and 10.15 to 10.30. On Wednesday night, the whole evening is always reserved. On Thursday 7.45 to 8.30, and 10.15 to 10.30. On Friday, 7.45 to 8 and 10.15 to 10.30. That is a picture of reserved time in one area.

Q. I presume the dominion schedule is the same?—A. It varies because it operates on a different basis. I can give some examples. On Monday on the dominion network there are three half hours in the evening, and on Tuesday, there are three half hours again. That is the night we are carrying symphony concerts. There is nothing on Wednesday, but a half hour on Thursday, and there is nothing on Friday, and a quarter of an hour on Saturday.

Q. I imagine sub-section 2 of section 11 would cover possible emergencies if local stations have something important to broadcast locally?—A. Yes.

Q. Have they any difficulty in getting permission?—A. No, they constantly ask for release from reserved time both for sustaining and commercial programs, and it is very often given. Sometimes it is not given, because there are two sides to the problem. They have a local problem, and we have the overall network problem which includes the interests of that station which along with others is keeping the network working as an entity. Sometimes a local station has a frantic time problem in the hockey play-off situation, and many stations want a release, and advertisers do not want the network broken up.

Q. What do they do in the case of spring hockey fever?—A. Now, after several years of argument and discussion, we give release for all play-off games.

Q. That is pretty well an established policy?—A. Yes, after a lot of battling and discussion.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Have you any difficulty in working out the financial arrangements with the private stations?—A. Not particularly. They have been pretty well settled for some years, on a general pattern, and I think naturally we want more and they would always like more, but I think the arrangement is pretty well accepted on both sides. It has not changed for a long time.

Q. Have you many complaints from private stations?—A. No, not many.

Q. Say within the last year.—A. I think rather fewer. It has been accepted for a number of years, that is, that they get half and we take the other half, and out of that half we have to pay all commissions and discounts. I think there was discussions about the network rates applying to the stations which they want to see higher, and which we would also like to see higher,

because we would get more commision, but we have to consider the overall position of the network. If network prices are too high, the advertiser will not pay, and everybody will lose including the affiliated stations. There is a difference of opinion about these rates. There was some adjustment last year, and I think the situation is not too bad considering that there are two sets of interests and considerations involved.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. When there are political broadcasts—the ordinary five or ten minute political broadcasts on a local level—do you require a copy of each one of these speeches and are they monitored?—A. That is a thing that keeps cropping up every year. We require no copy of political broadcasts on any private stations.

Q. Do you suggest to the management of the station that they review a speech before it is delivered?—A. It is entirely up to the manager of the station. He is responsible for his own operations, and keeping out of libel suits, and conforming with our operations, and that is up to him.

Q. But in the free time allocated for provincial affairs do you require a copy of the speeches there to be sent to the C.B.C.?—A. In New Brunswick?

Q. Yes, say in New Brunswick.—A. We have provincial affairs broadcasts there and I think we ask for them for our own records, because that is on C.B.C. network, and we would ask for it because it is our responsibility.

Q. It is kept on the records, but you do not use it for monitoring?—A. No.

Mr. COLDWELL: They do not have to submit it beforehand?

Mr. RILEY: Mr. Decore was speaking about the danger of mixing politics and religion on some of these broadcasts. Have you ever had any complaints about any particular broadcast along these lines, that politics has been mixed up with religion?

Mr. FLEMING: Would you add "or vice versa"?

The WITNESS: I cannot recall any off hand.

Mr. RILEY: I might just cite one particular case that occurs to me. I have heard that there is criticism of Premier Manning in Bible Hour, though I have never seen any indication of criticism that he is mixing politics and religion.

The WITNESS: We have had no complaints of that.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): And the Union Nationale?

Mr. RILEY: Or the Union Nationale as Dr. Gauthier says. Has there been any request by the sponsors of Premier Manning's Bible Hour for permission to solicit funds over the air?

The WITNESS: Yes, there have been requests on that behalf, but they were not granted. I should say that particular requests were not granted.

Mr. FLEMING: Where do these requests come from?

The WITNESS: I think appeals for funds in areas where the Bible Hour organization in question is not operating.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. Have there been appeals for funds in Alberta. I think there have Mr. Hansell. I have heard acknowledgments.—A. Yes, permission is given for that, but I think in this particular instance they were appealing in other areas some distance from where the organization is located.

Mr. HANSELL: I think perhaps we misunderstand. Where the difficulty may come is that the text of the Bible Hour broadcasts state that it is supported by voluntary contributions, and they sometimes may go as far as to acknowledge that this broadcast has been sponsored by a certain person, who has perhaps covered the expense. I think perhaps here is the way the difficulty comes in. A recording is made of a broadcast, and perhaps several weeks after or next Sunday, it will go over another station, and since it is the same recording, the same voice and the same sentences will be on it when rebroadcast. I think perhaps there have been a local station or two, hearing that, that may wonder whether that station might be liable under the regulations. I think that might be the difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions under broadcasting?

By Mr. Goode:

Q. In regard to the check the C.B.C. might have on the collection of these funds, let me give an instance. I do not particularly refer to Premier Manning's broadcasts, but there is a likelihood that the money that comes in from one of these broadcasts would be more than sufficient to cover the cost of the broadcasts. Has the C.B.C. any check of what is done with these extra funds?—A. None at all.

Mr. JONES: Could you give a definition of the Canadian program—

Mr. HANSELL: I do not want to interrupt, but if I may Mr. Jones. Since Mr. Manning's broadcasts have been brought into the discussion, I wonder if I may say a word in respect to the suggestion that has come from one or two that it might be interpreted as a political broadcast. Most of you know perhaps that I have done some pinch-hitting for Mr. Manning on these broadcasts originating in Alberta, and I will say this, that Mr. Manning has leaned over backwards in order to prevent anything being said in those broadcasts that would be interpreted as political. He often asks me not to mention him as the Premier of Alberta when I am substituting for him. And on numerous occasions, he has warned me: "Do not say this or that as it might be interpreted as being political".

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): And you have never disobeyed?

Mr. HANSELL: I do not think I have ever disobeyed, not knowingly. I am positive of that, because I too recognize the feeling that there may be among some people. And I too lean over backwards to keep it from being political. Moreover, I know Premier Manning well enough to say that I am sure that he wants to prevent it from being political in any way. But here is where, may I say, the difficulty comes in.

He just happens to be the Premier of Alberta. The same thing would be said of the premier of any province, having certain religious convictions, and whose background and previous experience was that of the titular head of a theological college. If any premier were in that position and carried on a religious broadcast, the same thing would be said. It is something which perhaps is inevitable and cannot perhaps escape criticism on that account. But I do say this, and I urge, through the medium of this committee, that people should consider this principle: should a man, just because he is in public office, be penalized from carrying on what he believes to be his religious convictions respecting the Bible.

Mr. RILEY: Mr. Hansell has raised a very interesting point and I think that if any premier or any man who was in public office, held certain religious beliefs, there should be nothing to prevent him from going on the air. I am wondering. I have not heard one of those broadcasts but I have heard a lot of discussion going on about them. I wonder if Premier Manning, when he is introduced, is introduced as the Premier of Alberta or as the Reverend Mr. Manning?

Mr. HANSELL: I do not know what happens in every case. I do not have the pleasure of listening to Mr. Manning's program very often because I am busy at the time he goes on the air. I know that on one occasion when I had the opportunity of hearing his program I was surprised to hear it conclude with the announcement that it was Premier Manning.

Mr. DINSDALE: I think that is the case with the 8.00 o'clock broadcast in Ottawa on Sunday morning.

The CHAIRMAN: We have pursued this subject at some length. But actually the work before us is the questioning of Mr. Dunton. Are there any other questions on "Broadcast Regulations"?

By Mr. Jones:

Q. I started to ask a question on paragraph 13 with respect to the definition of a Canadian program at the bottom of the page. It says:

> Any live or reproduced program, the original of which was produced in Canada, . . .

Would that mean a play, let us say, by Bernard Shaw, which was imported?—A. No. It means a transcription of a play performed some place else, by Bernard Shaw, which was brought into Canada and a pressing made of it here. It would not qualify as a Canadian program.

Q. The wording is unfortunate, then. "Imported original" does not mean a Canadian program, does it?—A. The original of the program.

Q. I see.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? If not, let us proceed.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. With respect to this matter of Canadian programs, if a broadcast were made in Canada and it was recorded, let us say, in Buffalo, then under this wording it would not be possible to send that recording back into Canada or to use it here because of its not being a Canadian program?—A. Yes, it would.

Q. If it was produced in Canada?—A. If the original was produced in Canada.

Q. You say, if the original was produced in Canada. Then it does not matter where the reproduction was made?—A. That is right.

By Mr. Jones:

Q. Is the object that of seeing that we get Canadian players and talent employed, or is it that of getting the Canadian point of view placed on the air? —A. The object was simply to try to see that there would be a minimum of Canadian broadcasting of any form on the air, and a certain maximum of over-all non-Canadian broadcasting. The Canadian material was to include anything that was done by Canadians in Canada. It may be a hockey broadcast, or a newscast, or anything, the real performance of which was being done in this country. It might be music or a play, or a charity auction or anything.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I believe you have gone far enough with this proposed regulation to have encountered some difficulties in making such a draft set-up to work?—A. Yes. This is the sort of thing and it is hard to keep within the objective of it and the carrying out of it in broadcasting. Our objective is clear. It was recommended by the Massey Commission that we take definite steps to assure that there was a minimum amount of Canadian broadcasting used, and we have tried hard to make something which would be reasonable but

which would not put undue pressure or burden on the stations, to try to make sure that in Canada, broadcasting would include a minimum amount of Canadian content. But there must be some more work done on it yet.

Q. It is pretty difficult to work it out by any mathematical formula?—A. It is hard, as we know, it is not easy putting programming output into figures. Figures could often be very different from what the actual result in broadcasting turns out to be, and we know that very well.

Q. However, this is one you are discusing with the private stations, so I won't ask any more questions.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. In regard to regulation No. 15, Mr. Chairman, is there any demand for network broadcasting privileges by certain programs, demands that cannot be accommodated?—A. What sort of program have you in mind?

Q. Well, if a religious group wanted a national hook-up?—A. We normally would not sell time on any national network for religious broadcasting. We have an over-all pattern of religious broadcasting worked out, and it is all free, a balance fixed by agreement between the various denominations, and so on, and as a general rule we would not sell time for that type of broadcasting.

Q. What is the position of the Lutheran Hour? Is it on a network?—A. I think it is a transcribed program in the United States. It is coming in on private stations here.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. You changed the Sunday Evening Hour. It is entirely music now. You used to have a speaker. Why was that change made?—A. Sort of another attempt at a different kind of programming. I think there is some doubt about it. We have had comments of different kinds on it and we are trying to do some more work on it for next year to try to find out the ideal form.

Q. Some of the addresses over it were very good, I thought, Mr. Hansell! I still listen to it.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no other questions we will proceed to Press and Information Services, on page 32. Any questions, gentlemen? If not, we will then turn to page 35: Administration, Board of Governors.

Administration: Executive. I am sure the committee will be very glad to hear in Mr. Dunton's opening statement of the promotions of various gentlemen within the corporation, and we offer them our very best wishes in their work.

Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

The CHAIRMAN: Any questions under Executive?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Just one general question, Mr. Chairman. Has there been anything done in general with regard to salaries in the C.B.C. since we last met in 1951? Has there been any adjustment at all?—A. I do not think any major adjustments were made in the last year, since the committee last met. That is a subject under review by our management at the present time. It is of continuing concern to the corporation as a whole. A number of our ranges do not seem to be enough to assure our holding or attracting good people and more work is going to have to be done on it.

Q. Have you lost any of your personnel in the senior levels during the last year and a half, apart from normal retirements?—A. I think not at the very top, but we have lost good men right through the corporation. Could I ask our general manager to comment on that?

Mr. J. ALPHONSE OUIMET (General Manager): I do not believe we have lost any very senior men. It seems that very senior men consider their job in a slightly different way than simply what it brings them in salary. We have lost some important men in the specialized groups.

Mr. FLEMING: Such as?

Mr. OUIMET: Such as, for example, good engineers, but not necessarily at the supervisory level, but good specialists.

The WITNESS: A number of program people, too.

Mr. OUIMET: I cannot give other specific groups, but there have been a number of individuals in various specialized groups. I could not say whether there is a particular or marked trend in a particular group, except on the technical side, and I know that has been of particular concern because there is a shortage of technical men generally at this time.

Mr. RILEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Mr. Ouimet might tell us whether there has been a marked increase in the loss of staff generally over the past two years in comparison with what it was previously, and if there is such a marked increase would he consider that due to dissatisfaction with salary?

Mr. OUIMET: I would not say there has been a marked increase, but I must admit that I have not made a study of it in the last few months. Perhaps if I made a study I would find out that there has been an increase, but at the moment I cannot say it is a marked increase.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions under Executive?

Administration: Personnel.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, may I refer back, with your permission, to the discussion of Board of Governors for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed to by the committee?

Agreed.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. In regard to the Board of Governors, some of them, I think, are not chosen entirely on ability, but because the appointment might require somebody on a geographical basis. If that is true, is a member of the Board of Governors from British Columbia, for instance, does she represent the British Columbia point of view or does she represent the national point of view?—A. Mr. Chairman, I can say the way the board works as a whole, and I think it is provided for in a general way under the Act, that they come from different parts of Canada, from all the main regions. Naturally in our discussions a member knows rather more about his own region, but in all discussions we deal with the question and make our decisions on a national basis. It is not a question of the way we work, or of each member of the board being a delegate from a certain part of the country and speaking only for that part of Canada. All members of the board have an over-all responsibility.

Q. You would expect a governor from a particular province would represent that province's point of view?—A. I would not put it in those words. I would say he or she would likely have a more intimate knowledge of the problems and points of view in that province.

Q. I am going to be guarded in what I say, but there has been some dissatisfaction in the representation we are having in British Columbia. Some people in British Columbia feel that that province is not receiving perhaps an intimation of the province's point of view. Would you agree with that?—A. I would not agree.

Q. I would not expect you to.—A. Any decisions made are made entirely by the whole board.

Q. That is what I wanted you to say.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. On that point, selection is made among the membership of the board of governors so that every province is represented?—A. Not every province. There are 11 members scattered generally across Canada. There is a reference to geographic consideration or something of the sort.

May I read from section 3, subsection 1: "...the corporation shall consist of a board of 11 governors appointed by the Governor in Council and chosen to give representation to the principal geographical divisions of Canada."

Mr. FLEMING: That is the section as amended in 1951 with a view of carrying geographical representation a step further?

The WITNESS: I think the wording of the last part is the same.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. There is no one on the board of governors from Alberta?—A. No.

Q. I point out that the people of Alberta feel there should be one from Alberta.—A. There have been times in the past when there has been one from Alberta and has not been one from other western provinces.

By Mr. Jones:

Q. It says here: "No application for licences to establish new broadcasting stations were referred to the board for a recommendation." Were there applicants?—A. We presume so.

Q. Were they turned down by policy of the board of governors?—A. It did not reach the board of governors.

Mr. RILEY: Who represents the maritimes on the board?

The WITNESS: The member in the maritimes is Dr. Steel of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

Mr. RILEY: Is he the only one who lives east of the Quebec border?

The WITNESS: No. Mr. Winter of St. John's, Newfoundland.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Before anything is done in British Columbia is the governor from that province consulted in regard to any progressive move you might make—or may I put my question in a different form—has anything of a major policy been changed in British Columbia without consulting the governor from that province?—A. The board of governors as a whole make all the major decisions.

Q. How often would they meet?—A. About once every two months.

Q. If something came up of interest to the people of British Columbia in the period between those meetings, would you consult with the governor from the province?—A. Very possibly.

Mr. COLDWELL: Did you say the government of the province?

The CHAIRMAN: The question referred to the C.B.C. governor.

Mr. GOODE: I certainly was not mentioning the government of British Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions with relation to the board of governors?

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Has the problem of functional activity ever come up?—A. There was a recommendation from a parliamentary committee about 1942 saying more consideration should be given to different fields of activity and spheres of interest and I think you will notice now that the board does cover a pretty wide range of interests. One member is a labour executive and one member is a woman.

Q. Would that be taken into consideration with the geographical angle?—A. There are a wide range of interests represented on the board.

Mr. FLEMING: Would you run over the professional occupations of the different members? You need not mention them by name.

The WITNESS: There are two new ones. There is a trust company executive, a man who lives in Quebec who has a good many connections and is a dean of faculty of science and is a mathematician; there is a stock broker, a labour executive and a political scientist, and a woman.

Mr. RILEY: What is her occupation, housewife?

The WITNESS: I think she is a widow.

Mr. GOODE: Being a woman these days is an occupation.

Mr. COLDWELL: And there is a druggist?

The WITNESS: Yes, from the province of Saskatchewan. There is a new member, Mr. Winter, from St. John's, Newfoundland, a businessman with a wide interest, and Mr. Fry, a gentleman from Winnipeg who is retired and also has quite a wide interest.

Mr. DINSDALE: Is there any interest in having a C.A.B. representation on the board?

The WITNESS: I would suggest it would be pretty difficult now because the board is making decisions which would have an effect on member stations of the C.A.B. It seems to me it would be hardly proper to have a board making decisions when perhaps an interested party is on the board.

Mr. FLEMING: Under the Broadcasting Act no one having any connection with a radio station can sit on the board.

The WITNESS: That is right.

By Mr. Coldwell:

Q. Which of them is a farmer?—A. I do not think at the present time there is anybody who is actually a farmer. I think Mr. Fry and Mr. Tripp both have a connection with farming.

Q. The farming community is such a major part of the Canadian community and so interested in things done over the C.B.C.

Mr. DINSDALE: Mr. Fry was editor of the Country Guide?

Mr. COLDWELL: He is intimately connected with farm movements.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions under board of governors?

Are there any questions under personnel?

Gentlemen it is now 5.25 and it might be a good time to adjourn.

We will meet at 3.30 on Thursday afternoon in this same room.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Seventh Session—Twenty-first Parliament

1952-53

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. Robinson

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 4

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1953

WITNESS:

A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1953

ORDER OF REFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, April 15, 1953

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Knight be substituted for that of Mr. Coldwell on the said Committee.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, April 16, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day. The Vice-Chairman, Mr. Pierre Gauthier, presided except for a brief period during which the Chairman, Mr. Robinson, was present.

Members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Breton, Carter, Decore, Dinsdale, Fleming, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Gauthier (*Sudbury*), Goode, Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*) Knight, MacLean (*Queens, P.E.I.*), Mutch, Robinson, Smith (*Moose Mountain*), and Whitman.

In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, Donald Manson, Special Consultant, J. Alphonse Ouimet, General Manager, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, H. Bramah, Treasurer, George Young, Director of Station Relations, R. C. Fraser, Director of Press and Information, P. E. Meggs, Supervisor of Information, J. P. Gilmore, Assistant to Co-ordinator of Television, C. R. Delafield, Assistant Director General, International Service, R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors, and J. A. Halbert.

Copies of the schedule for the Committee's visit to Toronto were distributed.

The Committee considered the 1951-52 annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the witness, Mr. Dunton, answering questions thereon.

The witness tabled copies of a breakdown of the C.B.C.-I.S. Estimates 1953-54 and was questioned thereon.

The following sections of the report were adopted: INTERNATIONAL SERVICE: Voice of Canada, English Language Service, French Language Service, Latin American Service, European Service, Music, News, Press and Information; FINANCIAL: International Service.

The "Balance Sheet" was considered and, discussion continuing the Committee adjourned at 5.30 o'clock p.m., until it meets in Toronto on Monday, April 20.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

73920—1½

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

APRIL 16, 1953.
3.30 p.m.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: All right, gentlemen.

Mr. Robinson has been prevented from attending the beginning of the sitting and has asked me to take his place, and if you do not mind I am going to preside at this sitting.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I think we could start with the International Service.

Mr. GOODE: Before you do that, would you allow me to give some information I received this morning. I cannot refer to a previous report of this meeting because it is not printed but I think you will allow me to refer to the Ottawa *Citizen* of April 15 and in particular to the remarks of Mr. Hansell, when he spoke about Premier Manning's broadcast. He said at that time that Premier Manning—and I think these were his words—bent over backwards to make sure that any reference to his political position was not mentioned on the program. I talked to station owners in British Columbia this morning on the telephone and for Mr. Hansell's information—and I say this kindly, not with any unfriendly criticism whatsoever—there are no instructions to the individual stations carrying Premier Manning's program that he is not to be introduced as the Premier of Alberta. To be fair I must say there is not anything to the contrary either, but for Mr. Hansell's information no station carrying Premier Manning's program has instructions from the advertising agency that sends that program out: no station has instructions to omit the name of Premier Manning of Alberta. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HANSELL: My only comment would be, Mr. Chairman, that I do not know whether Mr. Manning writes the announcement or not; I do not think he does. It is handled through a broadcasting agency. They may be responsible for the radio station's announcement, that is "you are now about to listen to so and so" and at the end of the program "you have been listening to so and so". Whether the agency puts that announcement out or not I do not know.

Mr. GOODE: I am quite sure Mr. Hansell's statements the other day were made in good faith, but I wish to point out Premier Manning was not bending backwards to make sure his name was not mentioned as Premier of Alberta.

Mr. HANSELL: I think Mr. Goode has juggled my words around a bit. I said Mr. Manning leaned over backwards to prevent his broadcast from being interpreted as a political broadcast, and then I gave an illustration that he did on one or two occasions suggest to me that when I was referring to him in my broadcasts in speaking to the effect that this is E. G. Hansell speaking in the absence of Mr. Manning, that perhaps it would be unwise for me to say I am speaking in the absence of Premier Manning. That is all. As far as leaning over backwards that had nothing to do with the announcement. I only used that as an illustration of Mr. Manning's good intent. The content of Mr. Manning's broadcast is not political and he is bending backwards to prevent it being so.

Mr. GOODE: I never mentioned that Premier Manning's broadcasts were political. I take the view that any politician if he holds certain religious views

is allowed to express them in public or on the air. I did take a little exception to Mr. Hansell's words yesterday when he said Premier Manning is bending backwards to make sure. I do not think he is. I think if he was he would make sure in the advertising agency that his name is not mentioned in the announcement or anything else, as Mr. Hansell and I do in certain cases to make sure we are announced properly. There is no doubt he has been announced as the Premier of Alberta when his program came on in British Columbia. I am obliged to point that out.

Mr. HANSELL: It does not matter whether he is announced one way or the other because the whole country knows whom they are listening to anyway.

Mr. GOODE: Not favourably in some cases.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I have here a copy of the order of proceedings for the visit to Toronto on April 20th. Those who wish to go and would like to have this order of proceedings may obtain a copy from the clerk.

Now, gentlemen, we are going to proceed with the International Service of the C.B.C. We are proceeding on that after a common understanding with Mr. Dunton and Mr. Fleming and myself. I think it will be agreeable to all the committee that we start on that.

The External Affairs Committee heard Mr. Désy at two sittings. Those who do not belong to the External Affairs Committee could be provided with a copy of the evidence given by him if you wish to read it. We have some copies here.

Mr. FLEMING: I think it might be said for the interest of the members of this committee who are not members of the committee on External Affairs that the committee had two sessions on March 12 at which Mr. Jean Désy, the director of the International Service of the C.B.C., was examined at very great length. He submitted a long brief in which he outlined the operations of the International Service and answered all questions that were put to him. I think it is probably fair to say that the operations were very fully reviewed, but not the financial aspects of it, and I think in this case when we come to look at the estimates for this new fiscal year which I believe will be before us next Tuesday, we will have the aspect of International Service to cover which probably was not the immediate concern of the committee on External Affairs.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I think this will be agreeable to all members of the committee.

Agreed.

If any member has any question to put to Mr. Dunton on International Service he is ready to answer.

Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, called:

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Chairman, a statement was made in the House this week by Dr. McCann concerning broadcasts in the Polish language as an addition to the service already being provided through the International Service. I wonder if Mr. Dunton would outline how this is going to be operated, with what staff, and what it means with reference to the existing service?—A. Mr. Fleming, the addition of any language service involves naturally the establishment of a somewhat specialized language section to provide that service, a small establishment containing mostly people who can speak the language in question. This is an example: To start the Polish service we will have to establish a

small section with a total of nine people, including stenographers and so on, which is about the minimum size to operate a regular daily service in any language.

Q. It is the intention to operate a daily broadcast service in Polish?—A. Yes.

Q. Commencing when?—A. Well, in the first place we have to have extra funds provided—

Q. That will be by way of supplementary estimates?—A. Yes.

Q. I think you can assume that it will generally be supported.—A. Therefore our people are starting now towards organizing a section, of which of course the most important part is getting the staff. It will mean a rearrangement of the schedules. As the committee is aware all the good transmitter time for Europe is fully occupied now and it will mean reducing the schedules to fit in a service to Poland. There are plans already envisaged for a daily half-hour service fitted into the other European services, and from a scheduling point of view it could be done in about a month, but getting the staff together will take longer; to get well-qualified people will require some time. It can start within a period, say, of six weeks.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. How much time do you intend to devote to broadcasting in Polish?—A. The plan is half an hour a day.

Q. Would that mean that there will be some time taken away from the Russian program or the western European program, or how will that be arranged?—A. It has not been fully worked out yet, Mr. Decore, as to just how it will be done. It will mean probably cutting some time from some other broadcast, not necessarily Russian, juggling the minutes to fit in a half-hour.

Mr. CARTER: Will that be all commentary or will there be music and other programs intermixed?

The WITNESS: I think it will be about on the same basis as our other specialized language services which, first, include news, the first main ingredient; the second is interpretative commentary of various kinds on international affairs, or affairs of interest to the Polish people; and the third main kind of content might be called a projection of Canada, explaining descriptively how people live here and how we do things in this country. Those are the main types of material that go into any language service.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. What is, approximately, the cost of our European service? I suppose we will get it in the budget, but could we be given a rough idea here?—A. Put it this way, Mr. Knight, that the main part of our effort in the International Service is directed across the Atlantic to Europe, that is apart from the service to Latin America and the weekly service to Australasia or those which are directed in English to the continent, a program which is listened to by a number of people on the continent who speak English.

Q. I would like to ask Mr. Dunton to give us just in general terms an idea of the purpose of the European service. I am offering no criticism, but I would just like to get Mr. Dunton's own ideas of what the purpose of such European services are. I have many ideas of the purposes in my own mind, and no doubt they are outlined somewhere, but I would like to get Mr. Dunton's expression on it.—A. I can try to do it without preparation. Actually it has been done in previous committees on broadcasting, and Mr. Dési did it in the External Affairs Committee, but just speaking very quickly, for one thing it is to get Canada and Canadians better known among friends

in Europe and to help to try to give friendly countries of the western world a better understanding and better mutual knowledge. The objective, of course, is to try to get some light into the countries behind the iron curtain to which we operate, some truth and some facts and some interpretation from this side of what goes on in the world, and what the issues at stake really are. I would say it is not just a selfish thing of making Canada better known, but helping to get a friendly part of the world better known and perhaps providing opportunities for better understanding that might help in the world of the future.

Mr. FLEMING: You would not object to calling it in part "counter-propaganda"?

The WITNESS: Some aspects of it certainly are that, yes.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Do you imagine it has an effect on the desire of Europeans to come to Canada?—A. We know we have a great many letters coming to our service from people who are thinking of coming to Canada, and undoubtedly quite a number of them do come.

Q. In that connection, I imagine your fan mail, shall we call it, is keeping up? Has it been increasing?—A. It is still very high. I think the total is tending to drop a bit, though. We used to get a very great deal from Czechoslovakia, and it is still running over 40,000 a year. I think Mr. Désy gave an outline on that.

Mr. FLEMING: Yes, it is on page 144 of the External Affairs Committee report.

The WITNESS: From what we know, of other international broadcasting services, this is remarkably high mail for the number of broadcasting hours that we carry on.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. This material, Mr. Dunton, that is selected, news items, musical programs, and so forth, in selecting that material is there much emphasis placed on ideological content?—A. Yes; it depends, of course, a good deal on the country to which the service is being directed. To countries behind the iron curtain, particularly, there is a great deal of emphasis placed on counter-propaganda work or setting the facts straight and putting out our side of the story, the western side.

Q. A sort of counter interpretation?—A. No, not in a negative way. We are trying to indicate to the people in the iron curtain countries that their own services are telling them things that are not right.

Q. In other words, it is a positive plan?—A. Exactly. I think it would be very unwise to just work in a negative way to correct misrepresentation. The prime purpose is to work in a positive manner to get out the truth of our ways of working things in the world.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. I would like to make this suggestion. This matter was brought up at the External Affairs Committee particularly with reference to these broadcasts to countries behind the iron curtain. These broadcasts are being beamed from Sackville and very few people have the opportunity or facilities to listen to that program, and there is not very much in the press about it. There was a suggestion made that in order that the Canadian people may know what is going on, or what we are relating to these people behind the iron curtain, why we are spending the money for these broadcasts—that may be weekly broadcasts could be put on by the national network of the Canadian Broadcasting

Corporation here in Canada, say for half an hour each week, so that the Canadian people would know the nature and type of some of these broadcasts made to such countries. I think it would to be very educational if we were to sponsor such a program over our C.B.C. national network. As I say, this suggestion was made at the External Affairs Committee and I thought it met with the approval of most of the members of that committee—some of them are present here today—but they thought that it should be properly introduced or suggested to committee, so I am just bringing this matter up here. Have you any comments?—A. Well, I know of that suggestion and we are going to consider it. I think perhaps it is a kind of thing that is easier to suggest than to try to do. When you start thinking of what should be the content of the program and how to make it interesting to Canadian listeners, it is not quite as easy. Say you do use an hour a week, towards the end of the week. In the first place the news broadcast would not be news—that would be old news to Canadians. A good deal of the commentary about Canada would be pretty old stuff or pretty elementary, and not of very great interest to the average Canadian. Occasionally it might be of interest to somebody who is following it very closely to see exactly what is being said. And the third type of material, dealing with the ways of Canadian life and about Canadians in general, would be very obvious to Canadians.

Q. I think that Canadians would be interested in what we are sending across to those people in Europe. And naturally that would require someone who was well qualified to be able to pick out programs for Canadian listeners. But I think it would be interesting and educational for Canadians to know how we are appealing to those people who are behind the iron curtain.—A. I do not think it is that easy to make an interesting program. In the first place, a great deal of material is broadcast to Europe in a week in all those different languages, and a great deal of it would not be very interesting to Canadians. We would be going over things which would be new to the Europeans, but which would be pretty obvious to us in Canada. I think the only thing to do would be to try it and see if an interesting program could be worked out. But I am doubtful, myself. For years we have been very conscious of this difficulty; of Canadians not knowing what is going on the International Service, and we wish there was some easy way by which they could know what is going on.

Q. I feel there are many Canadians who are interested in the type of broadcasts which we are beaming across to Europe.—A. I think there are, but I am not sure you could make it interesting in a half-hour summary.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Has it ever been suggested before?

The WITNESS: I think it has been suggested by one or two individuals before, but that is the first time I have heard of it.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. When you say a half-hour program, do you think that is too long or too short a time?—A. I think it tends to be both too long and too short. A half-hour talk has to be pretty interesting stuff if you are going to hold many listeners.

The WITNESS: Yet a half-hour taken from our total broadcasting in a week, which would run into 110 hours a week—to pull out a half-hour from that I think would be far too short a thing to tackle. You see, it is a practical and a difficult problem.

Mr. DECORE: But the fact is that Canadians are not being informed.

The WITNESS: I agree, and it is unfortunate. We shall work on it and see if we can find a way to create a program which would be interesting and at the same time give our people a good idea, but I am not sure myself that it is the answer.

By Mr. Jones:

Q. Have you any idea of the extent to which reception is being given to our programs behind the iron curtain, particularly in Russia?—A. We have no definite information. Mr. Désy reviewed the evidence pretty well of what we know or do not know, and the information on it is not too free.

Q. Is it correct that they were able to block our broadcasts?—A. There is very hard jamming. The Russians use hundreds of jamming transmitters, and we know that in some areas at least our programs are pretty heavily jammed, but in other areas it is believed that the jamming is not so successful.

Q. And you continue to broadcast despite the jamming?—A. Yes, because the consensus among the broadcasting organizations, the B.B.C., the Voice of America, and ourselves, is that at least some of the material is getting through to some of the places, and therefore it is well worth while.

Q. But that is surmising, and you have no proof and no information?—A. We have a pretty definite indication that it is getting through to some places, but it cannot be precise, and we think that in some areas it is pretty well jammed most of the time.

Q. Yet you consider it is worth while continuing, in spite of the jamming?—A. We do, and so do the British, and that is one of the reasons why a number of the broadcasts to behind the iron curtain are done according to a pattern with the British and the Americans, in order to make it more difficult for the other side to jam us.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Does that mean that the broadcasts emanating from the United States and the broadcasts emanating from Canada and from Britain are staggered?—A. No, just the reverse. Of course in some cases they are arranged to be at the same time, and that means that broadcasts would be going to Russia on a great many different frequencies at the same time and that Russia would need many different transmitters to try to jam the signals on each frequency in each area.

Q. But there is some co-ordination between the broadcasters?—A. Yes, very careful co-ordination.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. Do we make any provision in our regular domestic programs for those sections of our population which are not of British or of French origin?—A. Not in the regular series, but we quite often have individual programs, let us say, dealing with Ukrainian music or with Ukrainian opera, or programs based on material from different languages. But there is no series made up specifically for different language groups.

Mr. FLEMING: Apart from opera you have no broadcasts on the national service not delivered in English or in French?

The WITNESS: No, not regularly.

By Mr. Henry:

Q. To what extent do you broadcast musical presentations to the different language groups?—A. I have no figures to give you, but I think there have been a number of instances of broadcasts of Ukrainian music, and broadcasts to Polish groups.

Q. And you do put them over the International Service?—A. Yes. At times some of that music is used on the International Service.

Q. I would have thought— —A. Of course, music is not a very good content for broadcasting to Europe because as a general rule the quality of the reception really does not justify much musical broadcasting.

Q. I would think that if you were successful in broadcasting music to Europe, that might be of interest with respect to Canadian people?—A. We would do much more if it could be really well received among the people who are interested in it; and the same thing works in reverse with regard to musical programs coming from Europe. If you try to listen to music on short-wave, it tends to be distorted and it shifts around, so that you won't listen to it as against your local music which comes in with good reception.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. Are the broadcasts in the Polish language on the International Service now being jammed by Poland along the same lines as the Russian broadcasts are being jammed?—A. It seems to me—although I am speaking from memory—that they were not until more recently, and that while they are now being jammed, it is not done as thoroughly as in the case of the broadcasts in Russian.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Are your two transmitters operating to capacity now on the International Service?—A. They are to Europe, and all our useful good broadcasting time to Europe is thoroughly taken up. They could, of course, be used to other parts of the world, possibly at different hours.

Q. What about South America?—A. South America would have more transmitting time, a good deal, because it is on a different set of time; with respect to their time zones, but that again, is a question of budgeting.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. Do you think that the two transmitters we have are adequate? We only have two transmitters?—A. That becomes a matter of policy. We are the operators and we know what the situation is, but we cannot do any more broadcasting to Europe without more transmitters. With more transmitters, however, we can not only broadcast more in the present languages, and even perhaps without extending the staff much, particularly, with a section established and without much greater expense, we could do more broadcasting, let us say, to Yugoslavia or to Poland. We could add some other sections, too, if it were thought to be desirable. At times when it was suitable for a particular country we might want to broadcast perhaps on four different frequencies at the same time or make a hook-up of transmitters in order to get really high-powered transmission.

Q. I think Mr. Désy suggested that the installation of two additional transmitters would cost around $3 million?—A. It would be of that order.

Q. If we do not have those dual transmitters installed soon, there is a possibility that we may lose some of those frequency channels?—A. There is a very grave possibility. As the committee knows, there has been quite a lot of heavy international negotiations on these things and the Canadian position as to the frequencies allotted is pretty fair.

Q. If we wanted to get them?—A. Yes, but it would not be of any use without the transmitters.

Mr. KNIGHT: Does the corporation receive any revenue from points outside of Canada?

The WITNESS: We cannot take commercial broadcasting on the International Service. Do you mean that?

Mr. KNIGHT: I think what I meant was pretty well conveyed in the question. Does it receive or has it ever received any revenue in respect of broadcasts going to some country other than Canada. The United States for example.

The WITNESS: I am trying to think of what would be covered by that. There is an exchange of programs with the United States, and usually we do not get direct cash because it is part of the general understanding we have with the American networks.

By Mr. Jones:

Q. But on some of the American programs you advertise American products.—A. Oh yes, a great many.

Q. In that case do you get paid?—A. Oh yes, we get paid for all commercial programs from the United States.

Q. From the United States?—A. Yes, but usually it is through a Canadian agency, or sometimes an American agency, operating on behalf of a Canadian parent company with an American subsidiary.

Mr. FLEMING: But you are talking of American programs and not of the International Service.

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: I thought they all originated in Canada, and were paid for by the government, or rather by the taxpayers out of the estimates.

The WITNESS: Perhaps we are getting a little mixed up.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Was your question pertaining to the International Service?

Mr. KNIGHT: It was. That was my original idea, although Mr. Jones has introduced another angle. I think my question was clear in that we were discussing International Service, and I think that, particularly in the European service, there is no revenue of any kind from any program that would be part of the European service. That was my understanding, and I simply wanted to confirm it.

The WITNESS: No. We do not get revenue.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. How many wave lengths are used by the United States in the International Service, and, two, is there any co-operation between Canada and the United States as far as the content is concerned?—A. I am afraid I have not got the figures for the Voice of America. It may even be a security figure.

Q. And can you answer the second part of the question. Is there any co-operation between the C.B.C. and the United States service as to the content of the program. Do they follow the same line or an individual line?—A. We follow our own line, and they follow theirs. There is informal co-operation and often visits are exchanged, and we, I believe, have a good idea of what they are doing, and they of what we are doing, but there is no co-ordination.

Q. Would there be a possibility of any difference of opinion being beamed to the European service at the same time from the two countries?—A. It is possible.

Mr. FLEMING: It may not do any harm.

The WITNESS: That is the democratic way.

Mr. GOODE: I am wondering how much harm it would do if it occurred.

The WITNESS: It may be an illustration that people have an opinion of their own in the free world.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions on the English language service.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. I have a sort of general question. Is Mr. Désy on loan to the C.B.C. at present, or is he employed by the C.B.C. or what are the terms of his employment?—A. I think it could be called a secondment. He is appointed by the corporation as an official of the corporation.

Q. And paid by the corporation.—A. Yes, and I understand paid in addition through his own department.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. He is really on loan from the Department of External Affairs?—A. Yes.

Q. For a fixed period?—A. Yes.

Q. The report of the Department of External Affairs committee which was tabled in the House yesterday contains this recommendation with which you are probably familiar. "That a close liaison continue to be maintained between the International Service of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the Department of External Affairs so that an appropriate and continuous policy will be followed in the broadcasting of messages to other lands." I was wondering if you have anything to add on this subject of co-operation between the corporation and the Department of External Affairs on the statement that Dr. Désy gave to the other committee on March 12.—A. I think he covered it pretty well. Perhaps I could just emphasize the full desire of the corporation to have that complete and well operating link on policy matters with the Department of External Affairs.

Q. As I understand it, at the present time Mr. Désy is, so far as the corporation is concerned, the link between the corporation and the Department of External Affairs.—A. He is the chief operating one, and the director of the service always has been since he is dealing with the service regularly day by day.

Q. It is not a matter that comes under the duties of the chairman of the board of governors in relation to contact with the Department of External Affairs in any way?—A. Not usually. Naturally there is discussion on very important matters, but the regular and ordinary channel is between the director of the service and the department, or in some cases members of his staff and the appropriate department officials.

Q. Was there any thought when this new committee was set up in the Department of External Affairs—I think on March 1st—

The WITNESS: A new section of the department.

Mr. FLEMING: I understand it is not so much a new section as a new committee within the Department of External Affairs, though I may be wrong about that. Is it felt that this new committee may be adequate to assist in the maintenance of close co-operation with the International Service? I was wondering if in the short time that has elapsed anything has been done as a result of the new set-up in the way of closer contact in the preparation of the materials that are being used for the International Service broadcasts or things of that kind. In other words, has anything occurred in the month since Mr. Désy gave us his views about that?

The WITNESS: I am not familiar with any new development. As a corporation we very much welcome the setting up of this new section or committee in the department. We thought it would help the flow of coordination if there is such a thing, but I am not aware of any particular development. I think our people find with the new section set-up there is a better and more co-ordinated flow of material and information and guidance to the service.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Has there been any change in the rate of the turnover in personnel of the International Service since this committee last sat a year and a half ago. Is it about the same as before that?—A. I think so. As far as I know I think it is just about the same.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. This is a sort of general question. I understand it may have been covered in the other committee, but how are employees, the people who are responsible for the composition of the program, the actual wording of it, how are they screened to make sure they are not broadcasting anything that may have a double meaning, or might contain some intelligence for someone else.—A. The whole staff of the service has been checked over, and this has been a continuing process with the appropriate security authorities for many years, and I emphasize it is a continuing process, not one just started or done at one time. Very full measures are taken with the appropriate authorities.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Any other question on the International Service? Now we will call for questions on Latin-American service.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Do I understand that on Tuesday we can go back to the financial aspect of the International Service on which Mr. Dunton will be having the information prepared in the meantime?—A. We have it now.

Q. We want to look into it.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: What is that?

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Dunton said he has the financial material on the International Service. Apparently you and I have misunderstood him earlier.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Do you want to go on?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): What is going on now?

Mr. FLEMING: Just a misunderstanding.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dunton has the financial figures on the International Service. A distribution of the copies will be made, and we will go on to discuss the matter. That is what is going on.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, may I just explain what these figures are: The first column on the left is a breakdown of the main estimates for the International Service for 1953-54, and the last column on the right is an estimate, and only an estimate, of the expenditures for the service under the same headings for 1952-53. The second column from the left is our estimate which I do not think has yet been approved for the new Polish Service which presumably will likely be coming before the House.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is the supplementary one?

The WITNESS: Yes. The third column is total of main estimates and tentative supplementary estimates for the Polish service.

Mr. GOODE: How many employees are there in this service included in the salaries of $780,000?

The WITNESS: About 181.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Looking down about ten lines I see there is a relatively substantial increase in the item "Travelling, Removal and Duty Entertainment" from $38,000 in the year ended March 31st, 1953 and $57,000 for this new fiscal year. What justifies that, Mr. Dunton?—A. I knew that was coming up and I have been asking a number of questions meanwhile. In the first place the $38,000

constituted an under expenditure of the budget in that year. The budget for the year 1952-53 was $50,000 and there was a saving there because quite a bit of anticipated travelling did not not take place. As I think I told the previous committee it was the intention to send some of the supervisors and senior officials to visit the area with which they were dealing. For various reasons those trips did not take place in this last year and so the figure was below the budget. It was put up this year earlier and would allow for some of that travelling, but this is an item which as I think we have said in other years we do not try to spend in the total amount. Travel is very carefully watched and if the amount is not needed it simply is not spent.

Q. We like to keep these estimates within the amounts that are definitely going to be needed. You see this is an increase of 50 per cent. What definite travelling undertakings are you contemplating?—A. The chief things would be trips of senior personnel to the areas they deal with, mostly in Europe and possibly in South America.

Q. Who are the officials who are going to be sent and just where are they going?—A. In the beginning there was the possibility of either the Director General or his assistant going to Europe during the spring to keep in touch with things. That likely will not happen now. I am not sure of the others. The new Latin-American section would be one; the head of the Scandinavian service would be another.

Q. Going I presume to the areas in which they are immediately concerned?—A. Yes. The head of the Scandinavian service has not been in those countries for some time.

Q. Will you give us the breakdown of the $57,000 between the three subjects, travelling, removal and duty entertainment in your preparation of this estimate.—A. It is here: Travelling $47,000, Removal expenses $4,500, Duty Entertainment, $4,500, Local Transportation, $1,000.

Mr. HANSELL: What is the meaning of "duty"?

The WITNESS: Business of the service. For instance, we were mentioning co-operation with the Voice of America and visits are expected between the services and there are discussions over lunch and that sort of thing. It covers that kind of function or activity.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I notice that in the Public Accounts—at least in the report of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1952, he drew attention to some matters in relation to the International Service. I read section 82 at page 82 of the report. "The International Shortwave Broadcasting Service was financed out of Vote 53. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation operates this service on behalf of the government and records the 1951-52 cost as $1,874,532 (including $37,538 actually incurred in 1950-51). This was $39,907 more than Parliament granted. However, no over-expenditure of the vote is recorded in the Public Accounts because the Corporation did not claim $49,950 until 1952-53." Could we have an explanation of that?—A. Could the treasurer deal with that.

Mr. FLEMING: Certainly.

Mr. BRAMAH: That is the difference between the government accounting and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation accounting. They operate on a cash basis and we operate on an accrual basis.

Mr. FLEMING: Will you relate the explanation to this particular item?

Mr. BRAMAH: In that particular item, in 1950-51 those accounts were not submitted to the corporation until a later date. They come in the following

year. It is rather difficult to explain it, but one year's get into another year's and part of that year's get into another, with the different date of closing the books.

Mr. FLEMING: Were these accounts not received until after March 31?

Mr. BRAMAH: The chief ones were received after March 31 and went into the following year. Do you understand what I mean?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes.

Mr. BRAMAH: And then some at the end of the year do not get into the books until they are actually closed. For instance, this year we have to close for 1952-53 tomorrow and a lot of the accounts for this year will not be received until next year and then have to be put in next year's account.

Mr. GOODE: Did you overspend the amount of money given you by parliament or not?

Mr. BRAMAH: No, sir.

Mr. FLEMING: It is a question of the year. The Auditor General points out that this was $39,907 more than parliament granted. Parliament grants for the fiscal year. I presume this problem must have arisen before in other audits of your books by the Auditor General?

Mr. BRAMAH: It comes up every year in the same way.

Mr. FLEMING: You have not modified your system of bookkeeping to conform with the parliamentary requirements?

Mr. BRAMAH: No. We keep our own system on an accrual basis. I cannot change the government's system.

Mr. FLEMING: A good many things in that system we would like to change.

Mr. GOODE: When do you close your books?

Mr. BRAMAH: We intend to close them this year a little earlier, on April 30th.

Mr. GOODE: When do the government close their books?

Mr. BRAMAH: We are supposed to get them closed tomorrow.

Mr. GOODE: It is quite understandable where there would be a difference?

Mr. BRAMAH: Yes.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Under the same section of the report of the Auditor General there is this further paragraph:

> Shortwave service revenues include $114,449 for rental of space in Radio Canada Building by the Corporation's National Service. Operating expenses of this Montreal building approximate $1.36 per sq. ft. It is therefore apparent that the present annual rental rate of $1.79 per sq. ft. will not be adequate to recoup the cost of specially installed facilities and depreciation, nor provide any return on capital invested in the premises.

Could we have Mr. Bramah's comment on that? I ask Mr. Dunton if there has been any change since in the method of calculating the rental for space in the Radio Canada Building occupied by the C.B.C. International Service.—A. Mr. Chairman, several years ago at the time the national service was taking over tenancy in the building this was discussed with the government and it was mutually decided that an impartial real estate expert should say what the rental should be, and an expert in Montreal was asked to give his opinion, and gave his opinion that as of the time when the arrangement started, when we went in and for a lease to be effective for five years, that at that time and under those terms it was a fair rate.

(The Chairman assumed the chair).

Q. Which amount was a fair rate?—A. $1.79.

Q. And when does the five-year period end?—A. I think next year, Mr. Fleming, and I am afraid we will have to face renegotiations with the government then.

Q. So there has been no change at all since this paragraph was written by the Auditor General?—A. No, frankly we would resist a change because we accepted an arbitration.

Q. How does this relate itself to the estimated revenue on this table which you have filed?—A. The revenue is comprised of that rent.

Q. Is there anything but rent in that figure?—A. I think the rental part is $156,000.

Q. And what is the balance?—A. $4,000; it is practically all rental. That is in the estimates for this year, an estimated revenue of $160,000, and of that $156,000 would be rental paid by the National Service to the Interntaional Service.

Q. What is the other $4,000 then?—A. I am sorry, Mr. Fleming, we are mixing two things. We estimated in the past year $160,000; the revenue collected would be $156,000.

Q. That is why you say you did budget a year ago for $140,000 and you apparently received $156,000, and you say in the note marked with an asterisk that the extra $16,000 was remitted to the Receiver General.—A. Yes. The $140,000 was in the estimates as revenue to make up the estimate. The excess would exceed the vote so $16,000 was paid to general revenue.

Q. And this year you anticipate receiving an increase in rental?—A. That will be because of extra space taken. As I say, we resist an increase of rent till we have to pay it.

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Chairman, are you talking about this item of $123,000, buildings and works? I am a little confused.

The CHAIRMAN: No, I understand it is the item "less estimated revenue", Mr. Hansell.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Hansell has no further question to ask, may I go on to say something about some of these figures down in the second part of the sheet, construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land, in the new Radio Canada Building. I see you are contemplating a very large increase in the expenditure on buildings and works, from $78,829 last year to $217,237 this year. What is the explanation of that?—A. Last year the vote for that, that whole heading for capital expenditures, in other words, was $284,700 and, as often happens with such capital expenditures, only the amounts in the right-hand column were spent. In the second column, the supplementary estimates represent revotes of still unexpended portions of last year's votes on capital expenditures.

Q. Is there nothing more in this year's estimates than that which represents a revote of last year's estimates that were not used?—A. Yes, there is in the main estimates in the lefthand column—I have the breakdown of that—the main estimates—the chief item is an expenditure, part of a two-year project for replacing the elevators in the Radio Canada Building which have not been quite satisfactory. That is the big item of $123,000.

Q. Are those the original elevators that were there when the building was constructed?—A. Yes.

Q. You did not put in new elevators when you took the building over?—A. No. We hoped that we could get by with them, but we found they are not satisfactory for the load of work they have to do now.

Mr. HANSELL: Are they any better than the ones in the House of Commons?

The WITNESS: I do not think they are. They simply cannot move the staff in and out of the building at the beginning of work, or at the end work.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Is that $123,000 included in the $217,237?—A. Yes.

Q. And is the balance entirely composed of a revote of last year's approved expenditures?—A. Yes, all the supplementary estimates are revotes except for $3,000 to be expended on equipment for the Polish services.

Q. What was the nature of the expenditure that was authorized for last year and not made? What was the reason it was not made within the year?—A. I have a lot of detailed figures. I think it would be more useful if we could leave that for a minute, Mr. Fleming.

Q. I go on to ask about the last three figures in the two end columns. You show substantial increases in all these figures: contemplated expenditures on office buildings and works or office furniture and furnishings are up from $7,180 to $36,432; acquisition of technical equipment up from $8,147 to $57,088, and supervision up from $6,051 to $17,158. What is the explanation of those increases?—A. The big item in that is not, in fact, furniture at all, but an addressograph machine for the sending out of program schedules, which we expect will save operating costs. This work has been done outside all the time before this and it has been found to be a good deal cheaper to buy and install the service's own addressograph machine. That is $25,000 of the office equipment item.

Q. What has been your outlay to this outside firm?—A. It has been about $10,000 for handling charges alone.

Q. Per annum?—A. Yes, per annum.

Q. That sounds like good business, to purchase a machine.—A. I think we will have some staff expense with that, but I believe it will be done a good deal more cheaply. The other big item is technical equipment, the installation of variable frequency drive equipment for the transmitter at Sackville.

Mr. FLEMING: Is this a recurring kind of expenditure?

Mr. OUIMET: No, it is not a recurring item. The purpose of variable frequency drive equipment is that it enables you to adjust your frequency at any particular time to a wave length which would be free from interference. And while we have a general channel assigned to us, we can shift it slightly so as to get out of a certain particular interference zone. Therefore, in order to do that, it has to be a pretty stable equipment. It must be variable, but the one we have now is not variable.

Mr. FLEMING: How long have you had it?

Mr. OUIMET: We have had it for a number of years—since the installation of the service.

Mr. MACLEAN: Would that be useful for counteracting jamming?

Mr. OUIMET: No, not particularly, because we cannot measure the frequency of the jamming at the other end. But should there be another station interfering, then by monitoring we can find out what frequency it has and we can shift our frequency slightly so as to avoid being on the same channel.

Mr. GOODE: You may not remember this, but a statement was made in the Committee on External Affairs that you started a certain type of International Service on a certain wave length, and even before you started it the jamming commenced. That information was given to us. I think I have the right story on it, that it was a new wave length you were using, and as you went on the air you found that jamming had taken place before this new wave length was used. I wonder if anything has been done to find out how that jamming came about?

The WITNESS: I think that was a wrong impression which got out. Perhaps Mr. Ouimet can explain.

Mr. OUIMET: It is not exact to say that the wave length was not known. As a matter of fact, it was published.

Mr. GOODE: Oh, I wish you would have told us that in the Committee on External Affairs. I was very much concerned about it.

Mr. OUIMET: I was not there. But actually, we have to publish the wave length ahead of time.

Mr. GOODE: I wonder who gave us that information?

Mr. FLEMING: I am reading now from page 143 of the evidence of the Committee on External Affairs as follows:

> An interesting note to illustrate the alertness of the Russian jamming system was brought to light toward the end of September, 1952. At that time the C.B.C. International Service scheduled a frequency which it had never used previously on any transmission. On previous occasions, when a new frequency was put into service, it took several days for the Russian jammers to line up on it. Thus, for those few days, the frequency was clear of intentional interference. However, on the occasion cited above, Russian jamming transmitters were in operation on the frequency, at the time of our scheduled Russian transmission, even before the new frequency was put into use.

Mr. GOODE: According to what Mr. Fleming has read, I was correct in what I said. I think that there was jamming before the frequency was put into use and I was a little worried about it at the time and I think for good cause. Do you know how that came about?

Mr. OUIMET: Of course. It is simply that there is no secret about the frequency we are going to use. As a matter of fact, we publish it. It must be known by the people who are going to listen, otherwise they could not find us on the dial, and they would not know where we were. So actually it is part of our regular operation to make it known. In this particular instance they went to the trouble, apparently, of finding out from normal sources of publication earlier than in previous instances. But there is no implication to this thing. It is a perfectly normal operation. The frequency to be used is not even considered a confidential matter, for the good reason that the listeners have to know where they are going to find it on the dial in order to listen to it. If we kept it a secret, they would never find it.

Mr. GOODE: Thank you for the explanation.

Mr. FLEMING: I think it was mentioned by way of a Russian compliment to the C.B.C.

The WITNESS: I think it showed that the Russians were interested in stopping us.

Mr. DECORE: Are we using any jamming in Canada to prevent the Russians from broadcasting to us?

The WITNESS: Not that we know of.

Mr. FLEMING: Only on the directional antennae TV between Hamilton and Toronto.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hansell?

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I want to go back a little bit. I notice salaries are given at $809,000. I shall not question that item except to ask if salaries are included anywhere else than in that column?—A. No, they are all in the one.

Q. At the bottom of that column I notice supervision charges of $103,450. —A. That is a charge or payment to the C.B.C. National Service for supervising the international operations. It covers the work done by a number

of our national officers on behalf of the International Service, for instance, the treasurer and his department, and other supervising bodies, and my own time, as much of it as is spent on it; and it is charged for at a 5 per cent rate. And that would answer your question too, Mr. Fleming. The same rate of 5 per cent is made in favour of the National Service for supervision of the Capital works.

Q. It would be salaries although in an indirect way?—A. Yes, in an indirect way. You are right, but not salaries of International Service personnel.

Q. No. What is meant by "pool services, Montreal, $175,000?"—A. There are a number of different services, technical and otherwise which are used by both the International and the National services, and by sampling methods and careful accounting technique, a proportion is worked out as to how much of the cost of each pooled service should be charged to the National Service and how much should be charged to the International Service.

Q. What about "news service, $62,000"? What would that be?—A. That would be payments to the news agencies which supply the news service for the programs.

Q. And that would be in addition then to any amount included, apart from the International Service?—A. This would only be for news. We have to pay separately for the raw news from the news agencies which we use in the International Service. It is separate from the National Service.

Mr. MACLEAN: What is the item for advertising and publicity? What does that cover?

The WITNESS: In the first place, it is budgeted at the same amount as it was last year. It represents what efforts are made apart from printed schedules to get listeners in other countries, and to provide publicity and miscellaneous things like photographs and publicity material which is sent out to newspapers, and that sort of thing. In some instances local advertising is included, but they are very few.

Mr. HANSELL: If I may return to the news service again, am I led to believe then that the calculation of the cost of the news service, that is the calculation by the news services, is based, partly at least, upon where the news has to go.

The WITNESS: Very much so.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. You do not pay these services for so much news received?—A. It depends on what you are going to do with the news when you have it.

Q. Can you give us the formula of that so that perhaps we can better understand it, or should we get that from the news services?—A. I do not think there is any formula. It is a matter of negotiation. Any radio station which wishes to buy a news service usually negotiates with the agency, and the agency state their price on the size of the station, the size of the area itself and so on. In this instance, the International Service, it is impossible for any kind of formula. These figures have simply been negotiated.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Do I understand then that the pool services $175,000 and supervision $17,158 are really credited then to the national service of the C.B.C.—A. Yes. I think recently the pool services have been paid first, for simplification in accounting—paid first by the national service, and a charge made against the

International Service. I think in the beginning they tried to have some services charged to one, and then to the other, but it was found more simple to charge to the one service, and then a pro rata is made of the charge.

Q. But it is a fact, is it not, that these two sums I have mentioned will appear in the income account of the C.B.C.?—A. Yes, partly as a revenue, and partly as minus expenditure.

Q. But it gets into the credit of the national service?—A. Yes.

Q. Where it goes on the income or is a deduction from expenditure to arrive at net expenditure?—A. Yes, that is right.

Q. And when it comes into the income account, I understand it goes under miscellaneous revenue?—A. A pool service payment would not come in as revenue. It is deducted from the department expenses.

Q. Department expenses?—A. Yes, the supervision charge goes in as miscellaneous revenue. It costs a lot of money to run a pool service and before they are charged to the national service, in a number of instances, a deduction of the pro rata operation charge to the International Service is made. A number of these services were originally operated by the International Service.

Q. When you speak of the department, are you speaking of the Department of External Affairs?—A. I am sorry, of the C.B.C. national service.

Q. Yes, that is what I understood. You are speaking of crediting in one form or another to the national service account of the C.B.C.

Mr. GOODE: One question on a small item, but I want to get an idea of just how your operation works. You have fuel at $16,000. Is that done under tender?

Mr. OUIMET: Yes, we call for prices from different companies and we give it to the lowest, unless there are special reasons not to do that, but generally to the lowest tender, though it is not public tender in the sense of public works, but we call for prices from a number of companies.

Mr. GOODE: Do you take the lowest tender offered?

Mr. OUIMET: As far as I know. I have no recollection of ever taking other than the lowest tender for fuel. Very often prices are pretty uniform.

Mr. GOODE: I expect so.

Mr. FLEMING: Does the same system apply to other purchases?

Mr. OUIMET: We always call for tenders on any major item or any item, even if not large, where there is competitive element or where competition is advantageous to us. In certain cases we may be buying equipment where we cannot get a competing article, so we have to be satisfied with one particular make, but in the case of paper or things which are available from a number of suppliers we call for prices even on a very small amount. We may call for prices on a $2,000 item, a small contract job—

Mr. FLEMING: You are speaking now of both the national and international services?

Mr. OUIMET: Yes.

Mr. GOODE: Is this policy laid down by the board of governors?

Mr. OUIMET: I do not know whether it is laid down.

Mr. GOODE: Could you tell us if the board of governors' policy call for tenders on competitive items.

The WITNESS: It has been ever since I have been in the corporation, though to my recollection we have never passed a resolution. It is just always accepted unless there is some very strong reasons against it.

Mr. FLEMING: And where you require something of the nature of a standard article you call for tenders, and if it is something to be specially constructed involving engineering services—

Mr. OUIMET: If it is something to be constructed where we can give specifications for the article it is sent to a number of companies who are competent to perform that service, and we get—you would call them submissions—they are not public tenders in the sense we do not advertise in the newspaper saying that anyone is welcome or asked to tender who wants to tender, but it is rather from a list of suppliers who we know can supply the type of equipment we want, and the standard of equipment we want, so we may ask five or eight or ten companies to give prices.

Mr. FLEMING: Do you prepare your own list?

Mr. OUIMET: That is right.

Mr. FLEMING: Have you ever had a case where any would-be supplier has complained he was not on the list, and then asked to be put on the list and been refused the opportunity?

Mr. OUIMET: Generally speaking it has happened, and names have been added to the list and in certain cases I believe there have been instances where a company might have asked and was not put on the list because in our opinion the company could not supply the standard of equipment we wanted, therefore it was no use giving them the trouble and expenditure of quoting on something which we would not buy. This has nothing to do with fuel. It refers to complicated technical installation.

Mr. KNIGHT: I was interested in that statement on fuel. Are we correct in assuming that there is no competition in the fuel business.

Mr. OUIMET: I am not suggesting that. All I know is that the prices are very close because it is well known, everyone knows the prices of the others and the fuel business is one where there are routine purchases made every year, or every month, while, in the case of the construction of a building and the purchase of equipment, we might buy one for five years. Of course, the prices that may be given by any manufacturer are absolutely unknown to the others, but in the case of fuel we would know it is being sold at so much a gallon.

Mr. KNIGHT: That must make it very difficult to make a selection of a particular firm.

Mr. OUIMET: That is right.

Mr. KNIGHT: On what basis do you make a selection if there is no competition in price?

Mr. OUIMET: If it was on a tender where the prices would be equal, we would either try to split the business, or give it to the firm we think will give us the best service, or which has given the best service.

Mr. GOODE: Might I suggest that you rotate the business at different times from one firm to another.

Mr. OUIMET: That is correct, I believe we do that also.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Just briefly, the item on printing and publications. I presume that involves mostly the schedules?—A. That is right.

Q. And the postage the cost of sending the schedules out.—A. Mostly, there is some office expense.

Q. You have a regular mailing list?—A. Yes, built up naturally by requests.

Q. And it is distinct from advertising and publicity?—A. Yes. There is a small amount for extra publicity of various kinds.

Mr. HANSELL: I was going to call Mr. Dunton's attention to the item of $48,000 for power and water votes. I understand that power is a large item in radio work, but may we have a breakdown? We might like to know how much water you drink?

The WITNESS: I think that is mostly power, Mr. Hansell. It takes a lot of power to operate two 50 kilowatt transmitters; and also for the operation of the building itself.

Mr. HANSELL: That is one place where you cannot bid for tenders. The largest part of the item is power?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Do you have some information on that figure I asked for earlier? There was a figure you asked to have stand.—A. That was the capital expenditure estimates for last year. They included a number of different items for the final completion of the various things in the Radio Canada building and in a number of them a revote has been asked for this year because they are mostly all under way at this time and the bills are not in. They include a number of items. Completion of office space; accoustical treatment on airlines of traffic offices; completing air conditioning system to correct for air leakage and vibration; correcting lighting problems areas that proved defective; installation of microphone and tape recording facilities; additional fire hose in the basement; paint storage facilities; some final technical equipment installation; a number of new receptacles, electric, that were found needed; a sign on the roof; further tape recorders. Some of those will be connected with the new service for the troops overseas. There are a number of items needed for final completion of the whole project.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Now we go on to page 47 International Service expenditures recoverable from government of Canada. Have you any question on that?

Mr. FLEMING: That was for the year before last and I think we covered that.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Shall we start on Canadian Broadcasting Corporation balance sheet, page 43 to 45?

The WITNESS: It starts on page 43 with the financial notes.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Chairman, may I ask first of all as to the form of the accounts. On page 46 on income and expenditure you separate sound broadcasting and television broadcasting; on page 44, you separate under fixed assets those used for sound broadcasting and those used for television broadcasting. Have you made a complete separation of accounts as between sound broadcasting and television?—A. I would say it is pretty complete. Some questions arise because of common services which would be a case of it being uneconomical to set up different services for the two and there is the question of how they should be allocated. We are operating on the basis of 5 per cent management charge on television in favour of the corporation as a whole. It seems to be about as good a figure as we can arrive at so far and I think it is right to say the accounts are very thoroughly separated.

Q. Dealing further with the balance sheet on page 44, the deductions for allowance for depreciation and obsolescence, are you operating on the same basis with respect to both sound broadcasting and television broadcasting? —A. Yes. They are both 2½ per cent for buildings and 10 per cent for equipment.

Q. That is the basis shown on the following page. I notice some observations made by the Auditor General and I direct your comment to them. In Volume II of his report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1952, at page 53 he makes these comments on the balance sheet:

> Fixed Assets—Sound Broadcasting $6,373,064—This represents land, buildings, equipment and libraries, at more than forty locations. The basis of valuation is cost, excepting the extensive holdings of recordings and music entered at a nominal value of $1.00 each for the eight main libraries. It is some years since the information in the detail records was confirmed by reference to the assets at each location. However, a stocktaking is now in progress. Until this has been completed and the necessary accounting adjustments made, it remains impracticable to verify by audit whether the shown values correctly represent existing assets.

Would you care to comment on that and tell us how far the stocktaking has gone since then?—A. It has been proceeding for some time and I think it is practically completed.

Could I ask the treasurer to comment on that?

Mr. BRAMAH: I think the last one is on the way and the others have been completed so far to our satisfaction.

Mr. FLEMING: Will that be reflected in your balance sheet for the year ending March 31, 1953 in any way?

Mr. BRAMAH: With the exception of Sackville which will be under way as soon as possible.

Mr. FLEMING: It will be reflected in connection with those on which you have completed stocktaking in the fiscal year just ended and it will be all reflected in the new year?

Mr. BRAMAH: Yes.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. The next reference is:

> Allowance for Depreciation and Obsolescence—Sound Broadcasting Fixed Assets $3,201,690.—It is recommended that, when stocktaking is completed, appropriate action be taken with respect to rates of depreciation and obsolescence. Those used by the Corporation through the years have never been scientifically determined nor consistently applied, with the consequence that the appropriateness of the $3,201,690 allowance is open to question.

Q. Will you comment on that observation?—A. My first comment is there seems to be always a great deal of difference of opinion about depreciation and I think accountants and other experts have differences of opinion and the board has considered it on several different occasions. As I think the committee will remember we dropped the charge for depreciation for three years when we were out of funds and the board did not charge for depreciation when we had no funds to charge it against. On reconsideration last year before this report we raised the rate of equipment from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. The feeling of the board is this is adequate now and we tend to doubt whether you could determine it much more scientifically than is being done. To some extent it can be a question of guesswork with electronic equipment as to when it will become obsolescent.

Q. Has the board taken any advice on that question?—A. Not beyond our own management. I might say we do not regard it as a vital problem at all because as you know we have no further depreciation. It is important in the sense of giving a good picture of the Corporation on the balance sheet.

Q. Operating statement?—A. Yes, but this represents a pretty fair rate.

Q. When you advanced the rate on equipment from five to ten per cent, did you make it retroactive?—A. No.

Q. And as to these years when you were not, when you did not have enough revenue to provide fully for the depreciation you were charging, the charge went on just the same—I mean, there has been no abatement in any year in the rates that were then in effect?—A. No; I think you will remember we did not actually show any for those two years.

Q. That is what I was trying to get at, I was trying to find out whether you showed it as a deficit or whether you suspended it.—A. We did not calculate depreciation for the years it was not shown on the balance sheet.

Q. And since your revenues became ample, you have not gone back and charged up what you failed to charge in those years?—A. No, but on the other hand I think you will recall in the earlier years the corporation had used quite generous depreciation allowances and then it dropped them for a few years and went back to the five per cent rate, and our board gave it consideration last year and thought it should go back to the 10 per cent rate, and on the whole in the last 15 years it is a pretty fair picture taken over-all. We do not think that our assets are over-valued at the written down value.

Q. I am continuing with the Auditor General's comments. Speaking of the operating surplus, he says:

> The operating surplus of $3,691,779 from Sound Broadcasting and the $369,225 deficit from television broadcasting may not be regarded as strictly correct, because (*a*) the $14,813,598 income of the corporation and (*b*) the disbursement of $243,353 for loan interest are related in the statement to sound broadcasting only, although pertaining to both sound broadcasting and television.

Would you comment on that?—A. I would like to comment on that, on the second part first, and I myself have not been able to understand the comment about the income relating to television when in that year I cannot think of any income that did relate to television, and certainly not in relation to any television operations. In the matter of interest, we had a problem, we had a question of interest on technical and capital expenditures. We had no revenue to charge it against and, therefore, he comments that it is shown against general revenues of the corporation. We did not know anywhere else to charge it against. In this year which has passed we will show the television interest charged against television income, since we will have some income to charge it against.

Q. Well, I suppose that you are not anticipating any surplus on television, but you will still have a deficit on television in this new fiscal year. Are you contemplating any change in the set-up of your income and expenditures statements?—A. In 1953-54?

Q. Yes.—A. In 1953-54 we hope we won't have a deficit in television.

Q. What about 1952-53 then?—A. Well, it was being financed almost entirely out of a loan.

Q. Is your statement of income and your balance sheet for 1952-53 going to appear in the same form as for the previous fiscal year?—A. We hope to show the differentiation more clearly; for instance, the charge for television interest against television revenue. We will have some revenue. It is a little difficult because our television expenditures up to the end of 1952-53, of course, all come out of loans, except for the commercial revenue.

Q. The next item the Auditor General mentions is: "The correctness of the corporation's liability under the pension plan for past service of employees reflected in the books of the company by a final payment of $109,225, has not yet been established."—A. Could I ask our treasurer to comment on that?

Mr. BRAMAH: I think it has been established now. The amount has been paid out. It is for the Auditor General to make his comments in this year's balance sheet. As far as we are concerned, we are quite satisfied that the accounting is correct.

Mr. FLEMING: The next one, Mr. Dunton, if you prefer Mr. Bramah to comment on this one perhaps he would. The Auditor General writes:

> Included as an expense of the year is a charge of $12,000 for the estimated full cost of a deferred pension in favour of the chairman, in respect of the period November, 1945 to December 31, 1951. It was indicated that the matter was still under review, but as the records now are, doubt must necessarily be entertained as to the power of the corporation
>
> (*a*) to absorb the cost without contribution by the chairman;
>
> (*b*) to vary the approved pension plan without the concurrence of the Governor in Council.
>
> Should it be that the action taken is in conflict with section 3(7) of the Act, a situation would result which would be unsatisfactory alike to the corporation and the chairman. The matter is accordingly drawn to the notice of the Board of Governors.

The WITNESS: Perhaps you would like Mr. Bramah to start to comment on the first part.

Mr. BRAMAH: This has certainly been brought to the notice of the Board of Governors and everybody is conversant with it. Once it was decided that this pension was to come into effect we in the accounting division set up this $12,000 as a possible liability. It has not yet been paid out. We are still holding it pending an order in council to the effect that this is what is to be done.

Mr. FLEMING: I see. It is, so to speak, in suspense at the moment.

Mr. BRAMAH: It is in suspense, yes, sir.

Mr. FLEMING: What was the decision of the board in regard to this matter?

The WITNESS: You will remember the Act was amended at the end of 1951 to make possible pension arrangements for full time members of the board. After that the board simply asked the management to work out arrangements which would be on the same basis as for employees, and following that the treasurer thought there would be a liability and set it up simply as a book-keeping liability. Our administrative people through the year did a lot of work on these pension arrangements, which required a great deal of legal and technical discussion and work, but there is still no approved plan. The Board of Governors approved finally a pension scheme, which seemed to have the agreement of all the authorities concerned, on the same basis as for the employees. That has still not been approved by order in council.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Is the pension plan as related to full time members of the board different from the plan with respect to staff?—A. It provides for exactly the same benefiits, and so on. I might explain that our administrative people first drafted the change in the form of an amendment to the employees' plan, and the board actually approved the plan on that basis, and then it was thought that for technical and legal reasons which were beyond us it might be more

satisfactory, instead of making it technically an amendment to the employees' plan, to have a parallel plan providing for just the same system of benefits and contributions, and so on. I think it was partly so that no question could be raised in any way of any interest in the employees' plan being modified even to a very small extent.

Q. What, in general, are the terms of the pension plan as to contributions and as to benefits?—A. Just the same as for the employees. The individual contributes six per cent and then gets an annuity payment for each year of service equal to two per cent of the salary in that year. That is the rough basis of it.

Q. After retirement at what age?—A. Sixty-five. And then both the employees' plan and the proposed parallel plan for the chairman and full time members of the board provided for the corporation paying all past service benefits but that plan for full time members of the board has not been approved by the Governor in Council.

Q. In other words, it would not be contributory as to the retroactive features of the pension in the case of the full time members of the board?—A. No, just as it is not contributory for the employees' plan. I think there has been some misunderstanding about it, for this reason. Our plan is similar to plans in many industrial organizations. It is not the same as the government plan or the plan of some other of the Crown agencies, but similar to most private corporation plans, in that the corporation pays all past benefits. They are not contributory. On the other hand, the scheme of benefits is not in any way different, and in many ways it is not as good as the government superannuation plan, or other pension plans which are of a funded nature and therefore more flexible.

Q. One more point which the Auditor General makes in volume 1 at page 32, in section 81, where he says:

> A pension plan is operated for the benefit of the employees. It provides that the corporation assume the entire cost with respect to service, prior to April 1, 1943, of employees over the age of 35 as of that date. In the audit it was observed that some employees have left the corporation's service before qualifying for annuity benefits; nevertheless, $20,127 was paid into the fund with respect to their past service. The practice seems unnecessary as no right to an award of pension now exists. However, the law officers have given an opinion to the effect that it is permissive so to augment the fund. The practical result, from the accounting viewpoint, is that Canadian Broadcasting Corporation expenses include $20,127 which may be described as a voluntary supplement to the pension account.

Can you make any comment on that?—A. Things get very complicated with different opinions about them. Our management had a legal opinion to the effect that this was a liability and should be paid. The corporation thought it was fair to pay it. But some authorities with which we deal do not have the same opinion as legal experts, the Auditor General, and the Department of Finance.

Q. When you seek legal opinion, do you go to the Department of Justice or to outside counsel?—A. With respect to our pension plan, our officers had to deal with lawyers in Montreal who had worked on the original plan, for the employees', with the Department of Justice, for general counsel; and with the Department of National Revenue. And then of course we may, later on, we may get an opinion from the Auditor General and there may be an opinion from the Treasury Board officials if it comes up for cabinet approval. So you see, it sometimes gets rather baffling from an administrative point of view.

Q. Is this sum of $20,127 still carried in the fund?—A. It is carried in the reserve of the pension fund.

Mr. KNIGHT: Is Mr. Fleming finished?

Mr. FLEMING: I am through with my questions on the Auditor General's report.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. I have a question to ask. I have no doubt that Mr. Dunton knows what it is because I served notice of it in the few remarks which I made in the House when this committee was set up. I think I can squeeze it under the wire here. I was absent at the earlier part of our sessions, and I suppose it would be legitimate to ask this question now under the heading of "Office Furniture and Furnishing" or "Acquisition of Technical Equipment".

I have long been interested in the matter of a production centre for Saskatchewan. I live in a city in Saskatchewan and the people in that city are tremendously interested in this question. It is due to them that I bring it up. Have any of these funds been spent, or are they being expended for architects' fees, for example, or for plans and blueprints for such a production site, or has any work or actual organization been done? If Mr. Dunton will answer that, then I shall ask some more questions in a moment. What is now being done in the way of expenditures for a production centre for the province of Saskatchewan? I think Mr. Dunton told us last year and perhaps the year before that, that it was on the priority list.—A. There has not been a direct expenditure up to date outside the corporation of C.B.C. money, but there has been time spent by C.B.C. officials in studying the project. I do not think you were at the meeting when I outlined our capital plans for the coming year. It includes production facilities in Saskatchewan. As I explained then, we still have the hope of working out a project which will not be too expensive in our capital plans involving construction, and which will include some facilities at Regina and at Saskatoon.

Q. I take it there will be one major and one minor project. Would that be correct?—A. Not necessarily.

Q. I am being bombarded with letters from interested people, particularly members of the Board of Trade, as well as lots of private individuals. I want to point out—and let me be accused or not of prejudice—that I think that the best place for a production centre in Saskatchewan is in my own city of Saskatoon. With that end in view I shall now advance three or four arguments. In the first place, Saskatoon is a university centre. We have there the whole staff of the extension Department of Agriculture. The place of origin of the Farm Forum program was Saskatoon. We have the university professors and particularly now, in atomic research and that sort of thing, we have things which I feel are vital. Again, there is our geographical position. There is our proximity to the main broadcasting station at Watrous, and there is our geographical position in that it serves the greater part of Saskatchewan, and that it is further away from the United States boundary. In addition, Saskatoon is the educational centre of the province. I suppose that Regina would dispute with me my claims that Saskatoon is the musical centre of the province. I do not know about that. But as you know, we have an excellent hotel, one part of which might lend itself to the plans of the C.B.C. in that regard. I have asked this question of Mr. Dunton before and I think last year he told me that the matter was still one for decision. I take it that a decision has not yet been made. Would I be correct in saying that the decision is to be made under the scheme of a dual operation such as you have been suggesting?—A. A firm decision has been made to establish studio facilities for Saskatchewan, but

exactly how and to what degree and where will depend on work which is still going on by our management as to what we can do in both Regina and Saskatoon.

Q. Could I change my question then from "where" to "when"?—A. I would say as soon as a fairly economical scheme can be worked out. We would like to confine such expenditures avoiding building a new structure and we are looking at and currently carrying on conversations now with different people in both places as to the possibility of renting facilities or using facilities in combination with other people. We know, and we are very well aware of the advantages of having facilities in Saskatoon, but we have already had very eloquent and forceful reasons put forward from Regina which would make it very difficult to avoid having something in either city.

Q. I think that completes my questioning unless there is further information which Mr. Dunton wants to have with respect to putting forth arguments. But I suppose as long as they are considered, that is all we can do about it.—A. I can assure you, Mr. Knight, they will be very well considered and that the board and management has done a lot of thinking and work with respect to Saskatchewan.

Q. Anyone who has lived in Saskatoon as long as I know it is eminently suited for the purpose of C.B.C. I have drawn that to Mr. Dunton's attention on a number of occasions and I suppose that is all I can do.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I do not intend to question Mr. Dunton today, but I hereby serve notice that we shall have a discussion of it before we get through. Now, to get back to depreciation. You are now charging depreciation at 10 per cent?—A. On equipment.

Q. Yes on equipment. Mr. Fleming asked who you discussed this rate with. Did you get any outside advice as to whether this was the proper ratio to charge? I would wonder who you could get that advice from, and, secondly, how you set the rate of depreciation at 10 per cent. In my experience, which is not very large, I would wonder how you get away with a depreciation basis of 10 per cent. You are telling the committee, as I see it, that your equipment is good for 10 years. I would doubt that that is correct.—A. Would you suggest it is too long or too short?

Q. I would think that 10 per cent depreciation would be very low.—A. I would think not. We bought a good deal of very expensive equipment 10 years ago and it is still good. As I said in answer to Mr. Fleming, that is one of the reasons it is so hard to get an authoritative opinion from anyone. It is partly a matter of guess work.

Q. It is strictly intelligent guess work.—A. I think to a large extent it is, and I think our management is as good at intelligent guess work as any in the country.

Q. Are you speaking personnally. But, I think your rate of depreciation is too low, and I would expect in the next ten years that would be proven right, because I do not see how your equipment would be good for 10 years.—A. Perhaps the only way to do is to wait and see. I am quite sure that transmitters we bought about three years ago will be good and giving valuable service 7 years from now.

Q. Is that true of all your equipment?—A. Not all. We do have some minor equipment which we actually write off from time to time.

Q. If you are satisfied, certainly the committee should be, but it seems to me that it is very low, and in view of the progress that the industry is making, I would think it is very low. If you had said 20 per cent, I would have agreed with that.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. It is an overall average for all equipment, and you use equipment of many kinds, and it may be there is a pretty rapid obsolescence on some kinds as the electronics industry develops very quickly. I suppose you have to balance the whole thing out, and so you arrive at the figure of 10 per cent which is in effect double the rate previously.—A. We felt 10 per cent was generous for the one reason that we have large amounts of equipment, transmitters and so on, though perhaps some microphones might become obsolescent by reason of newer types, but I think the whole averages out.

Mr. GOODE: Actually my criticism was favourable to the board as you understand. I think you are being very frank to tell the committee that depreciation was only 10 per cent.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Let us put it this way. You are paying income tax, corporation tax now, or will be.—A. We understand we would be subject to it if we had enough taxable income.

Q. And has this question been submitted to the Department of National Revenue, the question of the basis of your depreciation?—A. No it has not, and one reason we have not gone further into it is that it does not look to us as if we would have enough taxable income to have to pay taxation. Of course, if it were a taxable matter, we might try to raise our rates, but not having any taxation, we have been trying to give a fair picture in the balance sheet.

Mr. FLEMING: I think Mr. Goode put an idea into your head that is not very good.

Mr. HANSELL: I see some looking at their watches, and newspapers, and I would like to bring up a point of order.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Do you not think, Mr. Hansell, we could go through this financial statement and then after that deal with your point of order, because we want to be clear so as to get on with the TV discussion next Tuesday if possible.

Mr. HANSELL: I thought you were through.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Fleming has a few questions.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Dunton indicated earlier that one statement he is preparing for the committee would not be ready until Tuesday, and I was going to ask about the budget for this coming year in relation to that, but I think there are some other things that could be asked now. On page 45 you set out the loans. Now that you have more sources of revenue, have you set up any program for the repayment of the loans?—A. Not specifically. Each carries its amortization arrangement under the terms of the loan.

Q. You have a right to accelerate the payment, have you not?—A. We could and we have considered that.

Q. I mention that because of the reason that when these loans were made, your sources of revenue were very much smaller than they are now. For instance, in the 1948 loan for example, under sound broadcasting, my recollection is that one was made at a time when you were faced with a period of deficits.—A. The principal repayment starts in 1955, and we have considered the possibility of accelerating the repayments, because if possible it is much better to do so, but, after consideration, the board decided not to, because of the pretty heavy capital program we have ahead of us, and because of the uncertainties of the years ahead, and we thought it better to wait until the amortization fell due and retain the loans already made.

Q. You do not think, for instance, that you might take the net operating surplus for 1951 and 1952 of $3,300,157 and wipe out your loans on sound broadcasting entirely, and you could be in a better current operating position from that time on?—A. We did not Mr. Fleming. We put, in effect, most of that surplus into capital development, and those are things which we can now look forward to undertaking. Because of the number of projects that we were being asked for and which are needed all over the country, we decided not to pay back some loans before they became due, but rather to have some funds so we could actually plan to undertake a fairly well planned program of capital development and know we would have the funds for it.

Q. You pay the interest regularly on these loans?—A. Yes.

Q. And then, speaking of the capital development program, have you ear-marked the new grant of $6,250,000 per annum in any way? Did you make any attempt to segregate that and use it for the purposes you intended it might be used for when you applied for it, or has it been merged with other revenues of the corporation and used only in general for the purposes of the corporation in capital development?—A. It has been merged with the general income of the corporation on the development—on capital development—that I know have been going on and will go on. We had in mind the reasons which were put forward at the time we were allocated the statutory grant.

Q. This may be anticipating what is going to appear on your statement at the next meeting, but will your statement on the year ended March 31, 1953, show a surplus, or would you rather leave that until the next meeting?—A. Yes, I would rather leave that.

Q. I think my other questions will relate to the statement we are going to receive on Tuesday.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hansell?

Mr. HANSELL: My point of order was in respect to the telegram that Mr. Goode read at the commencement of the present sitting. I believe it is in order when you refer to a telegram or read it, to place it on the table, and I think the ruling has been given on that before. However, I am not going to ask that the rule in question be invoked, but I would ask Mr. Goode if he would agree to extend to the committee the courtesy of telling us who the telegram is from.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I never said I had a telegram. There was no such thing as a telegram. I said I had had a telephone conversation.

Mr. HANSELL: Oh, a telephone conversation.

Mr. GOODE: It is quite a natural mistake. I was talking on the telephone to British Columbia today on another matter entirely when I brought this matter up and within an hour I had an answer from British Columbia that told me no independent station carrying the Premier Manning broadcast had ever received instructions from the advertising agency or from Premier Manning to delete any intimation that they were speaking about the Premier of Alberta. That is the information I have and there was certainly no telegram and I never said there was.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: That settles it.

Mr. HANSELL: I mistook the word "telephone" for "telegram". I would not ask Mr. Goode to give us the name of the person whom he spoke to on the telephone on another matter.

Mr. GOODE: I would be glad, if Mr. Hansell would ask me after this meeting, to give him the name of the person.

Mr. FLEMING: I understand then we will have available by the next meeting two statements; one will be the statement of income and expenditures on a

tentative basis for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1953, and then a second statement which will indicate—did we ask you to prepare the statement on sound with respect to your budget for the fiscal year commencing April 1st?

Mr. BRAMAH: The statement you want is an operating statement and balance sheet on sound. That is entirely different from the budget, sir.

Mr. FLEMING: We do not want to confine it to sound. As far as you can do it, would you reproduce for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1953, a statement of income and expenditures which appears at page 46 of the report?

The WITNESS: Our treasurer and some of his men were working until five this morning trying to get it ready and we could not give you items for 1953-1954, but could give you for the year just passed and indicate generally how it would go for the coming year.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Have you a budget drawn up for the fiscal year commencing April 1st, 1954?—A. We have budgetary figures but not in the same form. It would take a lot of work to put them in the same form as these figures.

Q. We do not wish to put you to more work than we can avoid. Would you bring us your budget figures for this year in the best form you can?—A. We will give you an indication of the coming year too.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Now gentlemen, do you think we can hold a meeting on Tuesday afternoon after the trip to Toronto? We will be coming back on Tuesday morning I expect. Is it agreeable to have a sitting on Tuesday at three-thirty?

Agreed.

Will somebody move we adjourn?

Mr. FLEMING: I so move.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Seventh Session—Twenty-first Parliament
1952-53

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. ROBINSON

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 5

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1953
TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1953

WITNESS:

A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1953

CORRIGENDA

Minutes of Proceedings of April 14, 1953—No. 3

Page 63—Lines 9 and 10—delete "Governor, Donald Manson, Special Consultant". Lines 13 and 14—delete "P. E. Meggs, Supervisor of Information, J. P. Gilmore, Assistant to Co-ordinator of Television".

Minutes of Proceedings of April 16, 1953—No. 4

Page 89—Lines 10 and 11—delete "Donald Manson, Special Consultant". Lines 13 and 14—delete "P. E. Meggs, Supervisor of Information, J. P. Gilmore, Assistant to Co-ordinator of Television". Line 16—after "J. A. Halbert" change period to comma and add the following "S. Schnobb, Assistant to Treasurer".

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, April 20, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met in Toronto at 12.30 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Carter, Decore, Dinsdale, Fleming, Goode, Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Knight, MacLean (*Queens*), McCann, Robinson and Smith (*Moose Mountain*).

Also present: Messrs. M. J. Coldwell, M.P. and H. P. Cavers, M.P.

In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, F. J. Crawford, Governor, J. A. Ouimet, General Manager, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, H. Bramah, Treasurer, R. C. Fraser, Director of Press and Information, R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors, and J. A. Halbert, Assistant Secretary.

Having arrived from Ottawa earlier this day, the Committee assembled at the King Edward Hotel, where it was welcomed by Mr. Dunton and other officials of the C.B.C., and invited to luncheon.

After luncheon Mr. Dunton introduced Mr. Fergus Mutrie, Director of TV for Toronto, who outlined the program of Inspection and indicated to the members of the Committee certain highlights that might prove noteworthy. Mr. Mutrie also sketched the building of the Television Establishment in Toronto, accenting particularly the youthfulness of those working in this relatively new field of broadcasting.

Dr. McCann, Minister of National Revenue, spoke briefly mentioning some of the plans for expansion by the C.B.C., particularly in the Toronto area.

The Committee then visited the Jarvis Street Establishment of the C.B.C., and was divided into small groups. Personnel of the Corporation, under the direction of Mr. R. C. Fraser, acted as guides for these groups, explaining the various background preparations, sets, studio arrangements, office accommodation and coordination between various units.

The mobile TV Unit was inspected and its uses explained.

Members observed a rehearsal of "The Big Revue" and the various stages of preparation of other TV programs.

A buffet supper was served following which members viewed the news report "Tabloid" and the weather report.

Members of the Committee were permitted to attend the televising of the one-hour feature "The Big Revue" being able, at the one time, to see both the actual production and the finished entertainment as it appeared on the monitors.

On completion of this show, members of the Committee expressed their appreciation of the work being done by the directors, artists and technicians, throughout the various steps of production.

73928—1½

The Committee returned from the C.B.C. to the hotel and then to the Union station to entrain for Ottawa, where it will meet again on Tuesday, April 21 at 3.30 o'clock p.m.

Other persons who took an active part in making this a very informative, interesting and enjoyable meeting were: Messrs. R. Horton, Technical Director of TV for Toronto, S. Griffiths, Program Director of TV for Toronto and W. W. Moore, who identified the personnel and outlined the duties of those taking part in the feature presentation "The Big Revue".

TUESDAY, April 21, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presided, except for a brief period when the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Pierre Gauthier, was in the Chair.

Members present: Messrs. Beaudry, Boisvert, Carter, Dinsdale, Fleming, Fulton, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Gauthier (*Sudbury*), Goode, Hansell, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Knight, MacLean (*Queens*), Richard (*Ottawa-East*), Robinson, and Smith (*Moose Mountain*).

In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, J. A. Ouimet, General Manager, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, H. Bramah, Treasurer, D. West, Accountant, R. C. Fraser, Director of Press and Information, R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors, and J. A. Halbert, Assistant Secretary.

The witness, Mr. Dunton, was called.

The Chairman, referring to the Committee's Toronto visit of April 20, requested Mr. Dunton to convey to his officials and staff the appreciation of the Committee for the informative and interesting day spent at the Jarvis Street establishment of the C.B.C.

The Committee considered the 1951-52 annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

The witness tabled a tentative statement of C.B.C. income and expenditures for the fiscal year April 1, 1952-March 31, 1953, and was questioned thereon.

Mr. Dunton outlined the budget of the C.B.C. for the fiscal year 1953-54.

The FINANCIAL REPORT (Sound Broadcasting) was adopted.

TELEVISION was considered and questioning continuing thereon, at 5.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m., Wednesday, April 22.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

APRIL 21, 1953.
3:30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum.

Before we commence our work this afternoon I am sure the members of the committee would wish me to express our deep appreciation for the very interesting day we spent at Toronto yesterday.

Some MEMBER: Hear, hear.

The CHAIRMAN: I know everyone I talked to found it an intensely interesting day and I wish, Mr. Dunton, that you would convey the thanks of the committee to all the C.B.C. officials who treated us so kindly.

Mr. Dunton, please.

Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, called:

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, have we completed our work on sound or are there any other items?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): We are at the financial statement.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Dunton was going to bring a tentative financial statement for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1953 and a budget for the new fiscal year.

The WITNESS: We have a tentative statement for income and expenditure for 1952-53.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions arising out of this statement?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Dunton, on the income side apart from the statutory grant and licence fees, I notice your income from commercial broadcasting is up approximately $60,000. I think you mentioned at a previous meeting that your miscellaneous revenue from sound broadcasting is up relatively substantially. It has risen from $265,000 to $426,000. What is the reason for that?—A. The chief change indicated by the note at the bottom of this statement includes a charge of 5 per cent to television by the sound broadcasting service. $140,000 is a transfer and I think in the final statement it will be better not to show it that way. It is income to the sound end of it.

Q. It is a book entry?—A. Yes. I think it would be preferable to show it as real revenue coming into the corporation.

Q. Your total expenditures have risen from approximately $11 million to $14,200,000 in round figures?—A. You are taking in depreciation, are you?

Q. Yes. It was in your other statement too I thought. In your statement for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1952, there was your figure of $10,674,000 for sound broadcasting and your figure of $369,000 for television broadcasting.—A. That television figure includes the depreciation figure. I think it might be easier to compare the sound with sound and television with television. It is on this tentative statement. The first pair of columns are sound and the second pair television.

Q. Then in summary your expenditures on sound broadcasting have risen from $10,674,000 to $11,561,000?—A. A little under $900,000.

Q. Yes, approximately $900,000. Then on television your expenditures have risen from $246,000 to $2,781,000?—A. Yes.

Q. What are the items on the sound broadcasting side that chiefly account for the increase?—A. Mostly things I outlined earlier in the general development of service; catching up on things that had not been done before, had not been properly supported. There are some larger items. One is the coming into effect of the new wireline contract in September; the start of the French network in October; and a number of different program items which I mentioned such as the start of the C.B.C. Symphony orchestra, the start of the Trans-Canada matinee, the development of the actuality broadcasting department and so on. A great deal is represented by general improvement in programs and improvement in organization where it had fallen behind in earlier years.

Q. The big increase is in programs. It is about $750,000 increase on programs and about $125,000 on engineering?—A. Yes. The engineering is partly represented by some of the new facilities that went into operation in that year. New studios in St. John's and some other improved engineering work, and of course in all these fields there is a certain regular increase in the salaries, ordinary annual increases within the grades, and there are some new positions in all the divisions where there had been inadequate staff before. Programs will be both improvements in organization and also in direct program expenditures for performers, writers and so on; about half and half on each side.

Q. Your direct expenditure on television was $2,781,000?—A. Yes.

Q. And your income from television was $536,000, and after you have charged your allowance for depreciation and obsolescence on both sound broadcasting and television you show a surplus for the year of $376,000, out of a total income of $15,335,000.—A. Of course, as the committee is aware, we are keeping the two accountings separate. On a cash basis that would be right, but we are managing the financing of the two quite separately.

Q. How do you propose to show that surplus when you draw your new balance sheet?—A. That will be worked out. The assets were shown pretty well separately last year and we will separate them still further in the balance sheet for this year just finished. That will show a pretty complete separation.

Q. In a word then you have expended this year between the sound broadcasting and television just about your full income?—A. Yes, that would be right, balancing it that way. We think of it differently, as sound having a surplus which you can apply to capital development, television having had a heavy deficit since the only capital comes out of loans furnished by the government.

Q. What are you going to do about the accumulation of those deficits on television? You have been keeping them separate for two years now.—A. We hope that this year, the year in which we are now in, there will not be a deficit in television. We expect that the new sources of revenue, if the Department of Finance estimates work out, will provide enough so that we do not have a deficit, together with our commercial income.

Q. Are you going to consolidate that anticipated surplus with the deficit of the last two years on television? What are you going to do about consolidating those previous years?—A. It will all show in our books and statements under the deficits in the last two years. They have had to come out of loans. That has been the deliberate policy of financing television. During the development period it was to be paid for out of straight loans. But from now on, we hope television expenditures will be taken care of out of revenue.

Q. And what about the loans?—A. The loans all have dates of amortization and we will have to start to repay the principal when the time comes.

Q. Do you expect to have more revenue in this new fiscal year than you had in the fiscal year ended March 31?—A. Yes, because if parliament approves this new system, and provided we get the proceeds of the excise tax on television receivers, it will provide for the first time a basic source of revenue for television.

Q. And what amount do you expect to receive?—A. The estimate indicated by the Minister of Finance was $6 million.

Q. And that $6 million will be completely additional to the amount you are now receiving, less the licence fees?—A. Yes. All we have received on the revenue side up to now has been some commercial revenue and those miscellaneous items which are mostly interest on investments in respect to television; that is, money advanced to us which we have held and got interest on pending payment out.

Mr. KNIGHT: About those licence fees, what do you expect to be the curve of the receipts of those excise fees over a period of years? Would you expect it to be fairly heavy in the beginning, with all the new television sets, and so forth, or do you anticipate a tapering off?

The WITNESS: It is hard for us to see much of an upward curve. It might well rise this year, or perhaps the next year, above the previous two or three years, but it is not a continuous upward curve such as the annual licence fee system would be.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. When you speak about your sound broadcasting, what amount do you expect to receive to replace the licence fees you have received which, last year, amounted to $5,750,000?—A. It was indicated in the budget speech what the estimate of yield of that tax would be. It is about the same as the licence fee, and we are proceeding on the assumption that in the coming year it will be the same.

Q. And you expect to receive $6 million from television sets?—A. Roughly, yes.

Q. From the excise tax?—A. Yes. The Minister of Finance thought that the two would yield about $12 million, divided about half and half.

Q. So you are going to have approximately $15 million income for sound broadcasting, and in addition, in the new year, $6 million for television?—A. $18 million coming in through public channels, and on sound, about $12 million.

Q. I mean your total income. Do you expect to have a total income of about $15 million to work on?—A. Yes. We hope that commercial revenue would bring it up.

Q. By how much?—A. It is hard to estimate at this stage; probably on the same basis that this figure here is mentioned, probably over $1 million.

Q. That would be about $7 million for television?—A. It is very difficult to estimate that. The way we are operating television is that we balance very carefully the use of the funds we have available, and as we get more money from commercial broadcasting, we will put it back into programming in order to build up a service.

Q. The television picture of financing is this: You expect $6 million from the government, and $1 million from commercial?—A. Yes. As I say, what we are counting on is the $6 million, and we will shape the service in addition to that.

Q. I am trying to get your idea of what you are going to have to work with and it looks like $15 million on sound broadcasting, and $7 million on television.—A. Roughly, yes.

Q. The total amount will be $22 million next year?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions, gentlemen?

Mr. FLEMING: Is this an appropriate time to ask some questions on the television rates coming down to that matter of the $1 million?

The CHAIRMAN: Were there any other matters that were pending, Mr. Dunton?

The WITNESS: I do not think so. I think we have dealt with them all.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. What about the budget for this new year?—A. I can outline it to you. It has just been compiled this morning in a comparable form. Could I give it now?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The WITNESS: Of the same proportions as before, the statutory grant is $6.250,000.

Excise tax collection will be the same, $5¾ millions; commercial broadcasting, $2,200,000; miscellaneous, and that includes the cross charge from television, $610,000, giving a comparable figure of $14,810,000 on the revenue side. This is just sound broadcasting.

On the expenditure side, current expenditure, that is the figure corresponding with $11,561,000, the corresponding figure would be $12,843,000. That is the estimate of operating expenditures, plus the reserve of the amount still not actually committed of $660,000, that is in respect to the projects which are planned, but the exact cost of which is not yet known, or the date on which they will start is not yet known, that is the total figure, $660,000.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Could you give us the figures under expenditures corresponding to this particular item?—A. In other words, including that $660,000 you would have the figure of $13,503,000 corresponding to the figure of $13,561,000.

Q. $13,561,000?—A. I meant to say $11,561,000. My tongue slipped. I am sorry.

Q. Would you break that down, with the seven items?—A. Yes. Programming, $7,078,000; engineering, $2,549,000; station networks, $1,655,000; and administration, $765,000. Press and information, $416,000; commercial, $286,000; and interest on loans, the same, $94,000.

Mr. MACLEAN: What will be the increase in that commercial item, from $235,000 to $286,000?

The WITNESS: Chiefly improved research facilities which I was discussing the other day, starting this last year. You will notice that the expenditure on the commercial department is actually a little less in the year which has just passed than in the year before. Part of the charge of additional listener research facilities would go into the commercial department. That would be the chief item here.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Is there anything you have to add to what you have already told us in regard to this increase of $567,000 in relation to programs?—A. To come in the year we are in now?

Q. Yes.—A. Mostly a further development of what has been going on; a still further improvsment in actuality broadcasting; some more in regional programming spread across the regional points in the country. Quite a part of that is represented by the full year's operations on developments which only went on during part of last year, and therefore the cost is higher than the full year.

Q. Have you any more to tell us about the increase in engineering of $239,000?—A. A lot of that will be the new facilities we know will be going

into operation; the Moncton station, the new studios at Winnipeg, the Prince Rupert station which we previously leased, and which we are now taking over as a full C.B.C. operation; the relay transmitters will go on an operating basis this year; there will be some additional network charge for them, and also some maintenance and work charges on them; and again some amount for general and normal salary increases within the ranges.

Q. Then there is a station networks wire line increase of $232,000?—A. That is nearly all, in fact the new contract will be in effect for a full year—the extension of the French network for a full year as against a half year, and some of the amount for the relay transmitters that will be going into effect.

Q. Then there is an increase of $119,000 for administration?—A. A good deal of that will be improving administration to catch up with an increased load of work. Administration includes various administrative departments including the treasurer's department which must have further help; and our personnel and administration department needs further help, partly as you know by reason of the fact that we are getting into collective bargaining with unions and we have increased amounts of personnel work which will have to be taken care of under this item.

Q. Can you give us the television figures comparable to last year?—A. We have not got the television figures so far broken down in the same way. They are broken down under different headings. The actual total planned amount is $6,300,000 net expenditure out of our own funds apart from commercial revenue. I could give you a breakdown of that which would not exactly correspond to what you have in the statement.

Q. That will do.—A. Current operation administration services $142,620; technical services $1,093,000; program services $2,187,000; film services $428,000; staging services $903,000. That is, the total of these operations is $4,754,000, and network and national operations $371,000; publicity and information, $30,000; interest on loans $370,000; supervision and overhead $300,000; contingency $225,000, and that brings you just about the $6 million figure, and then, in our planning, we have another $250,000 for what we call ordinary capital, very small capital amounts, and that should go on the balance sheet to capital.

Q. Is there any reason for the increase in press and information of $74,000 on sound. You have not anything corresponding to that on TV, but you call it publicity?—A. That is in the current year.

Q. That is the new year. Your increase in the new year over last year for press and information is $74,000.—A. It will be simply trying to do a more efficient and effective press and general information work as we have been told to do by a number of bodies, the Massey Commission and previous committees and so on. It will not represent any one major development. There are further developments on all press and information work that we did not mention under the heading of press and information, because a good deal of the administration of the work is not ordinary publicity. It has been found better for receptionists and telephone girls and so on to be members of the information department because they can operate much better since they are dealing with the public if they are part of that department, and there is a lot of routine and internal administration included in these amounts. They handle our librairies because they are best suited to do so.

Q. It does not necessarily mean an increase of expenditure on press services?—A. This does not have anything to do with the news coming in for broadcast. This would be a general activity in trying to give more information about the corporation and about its work.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. Possibly this question has been asked before and I am not sure this is the time to ask it, but do these additions to the French network go into operation this year?—A. They have been in operation since October.

Q. Will there be any worthwhile percentage of the French programs originating in these places like Moncton and so on?—A. I should say that the western extension came into operation in October. Moncton will go into operation as soon as we can complete the station, and in Moncton we expect to do some originating from there, not a large amount, but some. We will have studio facilities and be able to do some originating from there. In other cases, in the west, the outlets are all private stations and we are doing some production in co-operation with them now and hope to do more in future. There will be some special programs for the western part of the French network, and national programs coming back from there to the French network in the east.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that complete the questioning on finance?

Mr. DINSDALE: We will be going back to TV for a general discussion?

The CHAIRMAN: If we finish with the financial questions then we will commence our work on television.

Mr. DINSDALE: Mr. Chairman, will there be a chance to discuss television financing after a general discussion on TV? There are some other questions that I might like to ask.

The CHAIRMAN: If the committee wishes. We have already covered some of the financing aspects of television in this discussion.

Mr. FLEMING: It just occurs to me, dealing with Mr. Dinsdale's question, that it might be just as easy now to start discussing television from the point of view of the financial aspects.

The CHAIRMAN: Whatever the committee wishes.

Mr. GOODE: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, that that be not done just at this time, because there is a certain number of questions I want to ask on television policy in the west, and then I think perhaps, if Mr. Dinsdale and Mr. Fleming will agree, that we might discuss finances from the national standpoint at any later date because I also want to ask questions on the finances as far as the west is concerned, and perhaps it could be done that way if Mr. Dinsdale would not mind.

The CHAIRMAN: Then let us start on the general discussion of television and we will proceed to the financial aspects later.

Agreed.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask questions about TV in relation to the west, and particularly in regard to British Columbia. Mr. Fulton asked some questions at the beginning of the committee meetings which, if I may say so, were very well put indeed. I was not able to be here and if I do repeat some of the questions he asked, it will just be because I was not able to be in Ottawa at that time.

The first question is: What is the C.B.C. television policy for Winnipeg west?—A. In the way of building facilities?

Q. I would like to know your policy now on everything from the eastern boundary of Manitoba to the western boundary of British Columbia.—A. We are authorized now and are proceeding with the establishment of television stations and production centres at Winnipeg and Vancouver. That is all we are proceeding with now.

Q. What is the situation, Mr. Dunton, regarding Vancouver? What have you done there?—A. Briefly, we have bought a building for the production

centre. We had been trying for some months to acquire a suitable site for the transmitter and transmitter tower, and we think we now have that site. In general, we are proceeding just as quickly as possible to get the station established with its production centre.

Q. Are you free to tell me where that site will be?—A. Yes. We expect it to be on Seymour mountain.

Q. Has that been finally decided?—A. There are some negotiations to be completed about the power for it, but if those negotiations are successful—as we expect they will, and hope they will be completed in the next very few days—we will go ahead there.

Q. If you do get this site, Mr. Dunton, when do you expect to put out the first television program to the lower mainland of British Columbia?—A. I beg your pardon?

Q. If you conclude the negotiations regarding this site which you told me about before, and on which you have not yet completed negotiations, if those negotiations are completed successfully in regard to one or two sites, when would you expect to put your first television program out to the lower mainland of British Columbia?—A. This fall.

Q. What do you mean by "this fall"? Could you pinpoint it a little more closely?—A. It is hard to pinpoint it because of the uncertainties. We had a great deal of difficulty in finding a site which we could use and which the various authorities concerned would let us use. We would hope that we would have transmissions on a temporary basis—that is, without the complete production facilities—ready early in the fall. It will be rather after that, probably the later fall or possibly the beginning of the year, when we could have the full production centre in operation for television programs.

Q. What are you going to do to put television in operation there in time for the coronation?—A. That is impossible.

Q. You spoke about temporary facilities. Have not some other locations temporary facilities—for instance, as far as Ottawa is concerned?—A. Yes, it would be somewhat of the same kind of arrangements as those being made for Ottawa, in that we would get the actual transmitter itself established as quickly as possible and possibly with a temporary tower and some temporary arrangement for projecting films and kinescopes, and as soon as we had all that we could get some programming on the air.

Q. Is it true you have made arrangements with KVOS, at Bellingham, Washington, to televise the coronation?—A. Yes. I do not have the details, but we have been in touch with them regarding the relaying of our films of the coronation.

Q. You know a definite statement has been made in the British Columbia press about that very point?—A. With all my travelling in the last few days, I have not been able to keep up with the latest news.

Q. Is there not one of your staff who could give us that information, because it is important in British Columbia that the coronation should be broadcast.—A. I think we can be pretty confident it will work out, Mr. Goode. We cannot be absolutely certain. We are, of course, completely conscious of the desirability of having it broadcast if possible, and for that reason we have had discussions with the Bellingham station.

Q. That means the people of British Columbia will watch the coronation through television broadcasts from United States stations?—A. It would seem so, and by means of recordings which we supply the station.

Q. On the other hand, you are making different arrangements as far as Ottawa is concerned. You are putting up temporary equipment in Ottawa so that the people here can view the coronation, having in mind that you have full television facilities both in Toronto and Montreal.—A. This is quite a different situation. First of all, we had permission to go ahead by Ottawa

some time ago; indeed, long before Vancouver. Then Ottawa will be on the network as soon as the network is through. It will be a simple matter to operate without local production facilities by taking program service from the network direct from Montreal and Toronto.

Q. And the western taxpayer is still paying for it, though?—A. I do not know how, Mr. Goode. There are loans to the corporation for these capital expenditures, which the corporaiton will have to pay back out of general revenues.

Mr. FULTON: When do you expect that will be?

The WITNESS: When the loans are paid back? They all have due dates and we have not got away yet with not paying to the Department of Finance money when it was due.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. As far as my statistics on Ottawa are concerned, the population in this area is around 202,000. The radios in the district approximate about 46,500, that is including radios in cars, so we can take it, I think, that the people who are interested in radio amount to about 46,000 around Ottawa. In the area in which I live on the lower mainland of British Columbia, there are 144,400 radios. I am going to suggest to you that an area that can control an outlet of that kind for radios should have had at least some first consideration in regard to television. Now, before you answer that— —A. I will be very glad to answer it.

Q. Perhaps you cannot answer it. But every statistic that you want to quote in regard to the comparison between the Ottawa territory and the Vancouver territory would lead any reasonable person to submit that Vancouver should have been considered in the third instance as far as television was concerned. We in British Columbia agree that Montreal should have had the first chance on television, Toronto should have the second chance because of population—

Mr. FLEMING: It should be the other way around.

Mr. GOODE: That has to be proven. Could I complete my questioning, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): Go ahead, and louder.

Mr. GOODE: Vancouver is the third largest city in Canada, and Mr. Fleming will not argue against that, I am sure—And I demand, and the people of British Columbia demand, and some of my colleagues in the House agree, that Vancouver should have been given the next opportunity to view television. I would query your policy that would keep from British Columbia the same type of program that we saw in Toronto last night. I cannot agree with such a television policy as that, Mr. Dunton, and I have heard nothing from you today yet to warrant that we should have any other opinions. We have the population there. You have taken some steps in regard to giving us television by buying this land in British Columbia, and yet it has taken months and months to complete that. I acknowledge you had some difficulties, but not difficulties that could not have been overcome in the number of months you have been working on it. Now, as you know, CJOR—and I have had some correspondence regarding it—have purchased some land from the corporation of Burnaby in regard to some type of television program. That does not need any reference to the C.B.C. Do you remember the correspondence we had on it? I think you called it telemetre service.—A. I know we had correspondence. I do not remember the details of it.

Q. That land has been purchased on Burnaby Mountain. CJOR figures that is the finest location in the lower mainland of British Columbia to establish that type of television. Why is it then that the C.B.C. would want

to leave the municipality of Burnaby and go to Seymour Mountain?—A. I think there were one or two questions. The first was why we were proceeding in Ottawa first.

Q. Yes. You said you could not answer that.

Mr. RICHARD: Before we go any further, I do not think Mr. Goode's figures are right. There are many more than 200,000 people in this district. There are over 300,000 people.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Mr. Dunton would be given an opportunity to answer some of these questions.

Mr. FULTON: I am wondering if Mr. Dunton would clear up a difficulty I have in following Mr. Goode's questioning. You might differentiate between government policy and C.B.C. policy or tell us whether it is C.B.C. policy which has produced this result or government policy which you are following?

The WITNESS: At the last parliamentary committee we told the committee what our ideas were about the development of television that we thought the next stage should be one to include several stations proceeded with simultaneously. Those points included Vancouver, and Ottawa. We were given authorization for Ottawa first, and work proceeded at Ottawa first and we were later given authorization for Vancouver and have proceeded with plans for Vancouver just as quickly as possible after authorization. We even took a chance of proceeding with it before we have the funds to do so.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Who gives you authorization to do these things?—A. The government has to license us and because of the state of our finances has to propose to parliament approval of necessary loans.

Q. But it is not done on your recommendation?—A. Yes, for a capital expenditure. And as I explained well over a year ago we asked the government for permission to start stations at Vancouver as well as Ottawa.

Mr. KNIGHT: Is not Winnipeg in there some place?

The WITNESS: Yes. We suggested a second stage of television development to be proceeded with simultaneously.

In connection with Burnaby and Seymour I do not think there is much connection between the CJOR operation which you mentioned, and I know little about it, but I understand it is some sort of a plan to set up a large receiving antenna to receive American programs across the border and then distribute them by wire to homes in Vancouver. Our problem is to construct a television station which will serve the greatest possible number of people of the lower British Columbia area. Our engineers have done a great deal of work in the region and we know one of those mountains in north Vancouver would give much the best reception in the way of widespread reception in southern British Columbia. Burnaby was one possibility and we were extremely grateful to the corporation of Burnaby for the way we were received in our request about establishing a television tower there. Our officials stated it would be much better if we were on one of the mountains of the north and if something developed that we could go on one of the other mountains we had investigated, it would be preferable; and they were kind enough to say we could go ahead on that basis. But since, it has been established we can go on Seymour Mountain, and that will give much better reception in a number of areas than Burnaby Mountain.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. There are two independent corporations who wished to go into the television field in British Columbia who prefer Burnaby Mountain to any other location. Why would that be? Have you any idea?—A. I do not know.

It is possible it would cost rather less to go on Burnaby Mountain and put up a transmitter and tower at somewhat less cost, but you would lose outlying coverage and we are interested in serving outlying areas.

Q. How much more coverage would Seymour Mountain give you than Burnaby Mountain? Do you know?—A. It would improve it very much in directions across the straits, to Vancouver Island, and up the Fraser and just about all the directions we wish to reach. We are planning, on that mountain, to use a directional antenna, so we are not broadcasting back into the mountain but more into a southern part of the area.

Mr. FLEMING: On the Hamilton station you are insisting on a directional antenna.

The WITNESS: That is a different matter.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. With reference to C.B.C. televising in B.C. before the end of the year, the people of British Columbia and especially the low mainland are very interested in when we are going to get television. Could I bring you down to a more exact time? It could be that we are not going to have television in British Columbia until next summer and negotiations may be prolonged as far as this power line is concerned. Can you give us any idea when we will have television?—A. The Seymour thing is practically completed. There is some negotiation which will involve money and we do not want to involve ourselves until that is complete. When it is, we can go ahead with definite work on television transmitter and tower.

Q. How long do you think these negotiations will go on? Who are they going on with, B.C. Telephone or someone like that?—A. B.C. Electric.

Q. Are they likely to go on for another six months?—A. No. If they are not completed within the next few days we will go some place else.

Q. Will you tell me how many days?—A. No, I cannot. Money is involved. We are trying to save money as well as more quickly.

Q. Will you tell me if the negotiations are not completed successfully in the view of the C.B.C. by the end of this month you will make other arrangements?—A. I would not like to commit myself to that extent. I can tell you I do not expect it will be the end of this month before we know completely, finally and definitely.

Q. What if they go on to the end of May?—A. I would not like to discuss the date.

Q. You told me if it is not completed within a number of days you would make other arrangements.—A. That is why I do not like to mention the end of May. I think it will be before that. We would have gone faster if some of the people in north Vancouver had been more helpful.

Q. If it is not complete by the end of May will you make other arrangements?—A. I will say this: we would have made other arrangements before that in any case.

Q. If you do by the end of May, when do you think we will have television in British Columbia?—A. I think in the next few days we will be going ahead and have a signal of some sort in early fall and will produce programs from there in late fall or early next winter.

Q. It might go into January or February of next year?—A. That is for production of programs. There are problems, so, unfortunately, no one can guarantee it.

Q. Have you applications from private people in B.C. for private television stations?—A. The department gets those.

Q. Do you know of any?—A. No.

Q. Do you know of any applications dated 1951-1952 from a station in New Westminster?—A. I think we heard one way or another they did put in an application.

Mr. FULTON: Maybe I could read this: "In 1945 CKNW, New Westminster, applied for permission to instal television to serve Burnaby, New Westminster, Vancouver and all of the lower mainland."

Mr. GOODE: I have that too. I did not ask that question because I was not sure Mr. Dunton had that information.

Mr. KNIGHT: Did these people get any guarantee they could open their stations this day next week or three months from now?

Mr. GOODE: Let me proceed with my questioning.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Do you know anything about this application?—A. I have heard and read a good deal about it from statements by Mr. Rae.

Q. What would be the policy of the C.B.C. if Rae or anyone else made application with respect to a private television station on the lower mainland?—A. I think in that connection you have to take into account the general statements of the government on issuing licences. C.B.C. only makes recommendations about licensing. The government, the Minister of Transport, and the government as a whole, is the licensing authority. They make the final decisions and the over-all policy and if you read the statements on behalf of the government they indicate the development of a licensing system for single coverage just as quickly as possible but not of duplication of stations.

Q. I would suggest your recommendation would be an indepedent television station be not allowed in British Columbia until the C.B.C. were established. Is that correct?—A. There is a good deal of history in the whole development of the policy of granting licences. You go back to the Massey Report. In November 1949 the government issued an interim policy and at that time authorized us to proceed with stations in Montreal and Toronto and the Massey Report recommended we proceed and that no private station licences be approved before national programs are available. We went into operation last September and in December the government through Dr. McCann made a statement about its general over-all licensing policy.

Q. In regard to that Massey Commission Report may I quote to you from a speech made at the Canadian Club in Montreal on June 11, where the Rt. Hon. Vincent Massey was speaking to the Canadian Club. He said this: " 'There appears to be some misunderstanding of the Commission's suggestions. It recommended that private television broadcasting stations be licensed only when the C.B.C. has national programs available.' Mr. Massey added: 'This does not mean, however, that there can be no television in, say, Halifax or Vancouver until the C.B.C. has completed its system of national networks.' He said that " 'Films will form a large part of Canada's television material on all stations, whether private or C.B.C.' " He definitely stated there that it was the intention of the commission not to shut out private stations.—A. After the C.B.C. had a national programming service available. But there ar now 7 private stations licensed in Canada.

Q. No. He says there could be no television in Halifax or Vancouver as th case may be until the C.B.C. had set up its system of national television.—A. I think he was using those as examples and he did not mean that you had to wait until the C.B.C. had cabled or relayed their programs all across the country. We have a national program service available now and, as I have said, 7 private stations have already been licensed.

Q. I take a different view on it from you, Mr. Dunton.

Mr. KNIGHT: What was that expression again: You said until the C.B.C. has completed?

Mr. GOODE: Completed its system of national networks. That is what it says here. There is no doubt about the intention of Mr. Massey to amend something, or a statement, or a point of view which had come out in the newspapers in regard to the Massey Report.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Do you not think that he was expressing a personal opinion there?

Mr. GOODE: He was the chairman.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: That is right. But he could not lay down the policy of the government or the policy of the C.B.C. It was just his opinion.

Mr. GOODE: Surely no one would be in a better position to qualify a statement of the Massey Commission than the Right Hon. Mr. Massey himself.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I admit that.

The WITNESS: I think what is happening is fitting in perfectly with that statement. I think at the time there was some suggestion that there could be no private stations in Canada until the C.B.C. had opened stations all across the country linked by direct network connection. They did not say that in their report. They said there would be no private stations until there was national programming available, and that all the licensed stations should carry that national programming service. And as I have said, 7 private stations have already been licensed.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. My interpretation of Mr. Massey's remarks are entirely different from yours.—A. They appear to be.

Q. Suppose you received an application from an independent station in British Columbia. Suppose an application came to you from an independent B.C. operator, giving you sufficient financial statistics, and showing that they were a responsible corporation. What would be the recommendation of the C.B.C.?—A. In the first place, the government is the licensing body. As I have said, we will not have referred to us applications from areas to be served by public facilities. Therefore they are not accepting applications at the present time from areas served by facilities which have been announced and which are being made. Under those circumstances, at the present time such an application simply would not reach us.

Q. Do you know that there are 5,500 televisions on the southern slopes of the lower mainland of British Columbia?—A. I did not know the exact figure.

Q. Each one of them is tuned into KING, of Seattle. I do not know of any advertising money going to the Seattle station, but I do know that when the Bellingham station proposed to operate on the air, an advertisement appeared in Both the Vancouver *Sun* and the Vancouver *Province* asking for a television salesman for the lower mainland. The latest figures I have show an advertising commitment of $122,000 for the month of May. On KVOS. To have that money go down to KVOS in Bellingham seems to me not quite good business for Canada. It is my information that you should recommend, if an application comes in from British Columbia to the Department of Transport, that an independent television station should go into British Columbia at the earliest possible moment. I say that because I do not think that competition will hurt the C.B.C. whatsoever. I do not think you have to be afraid of it. After what we saw last night in Toronto I am quite sure that an independent television station in British Columbia would really have to be on its toes and spend plenty of money in order to stand up to you. That was a fine performance I saw yesterday, and because I saw that performance, I am insisting that British Columbia should get television at the earliest possible moment. And why you should worry about competition to that kind of broadcasting which you will be

turning out from Toronto is beyond my comprehension. I do not think that an independent television station could stay with you as far as quality is concerned, frankly, I do not think you are going to have television until January or February. You said in the winter time, but we have very little winter in British Columbia, and usually it is at the end of January or the first of February.

Mr. KNIGHT: Not at the time I was there.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. So why not let independent television go in there and stand up against the type of competition you can give them when you erect your station there? Because I say again there is no station in the United States that can stand up against the programming which you put out last night on "The Big Revue". That was fine television and you are to be complimented on it. But we in British Columbia want to see it as well as the people in Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa, and as early as we can get it. I disagree with the action taken in regard to the Ottawa area. I think that Vancouver and Burnaby together have far larger populations within their boundaries, and I think that the C.B.C. should give British Columbia either independent television, or some kind of temporary television now.—A. We have been trying very hard for some time to get a station in Vancouver. We agree with you very strongly about that.

Q. I wish you would agree with me that independent television is ready to go in there now.—A. I think you mentioned that it was not good for Canada for advertising money to go to Bellingham.—A. Yes.

Q. Yes.—A. I wonder if you would not have that difficulty with building up and developing an effective television system right across the country. You speak of competition, but the competition would not be between private Canadian television and the C.B.C. It would be between American programming and Canadian programming. As I explained at a meeting at which you were not present, Mr. Goode, it is far cheaper for a private station, or ourselves or an advertiser in Canada; it is infinitely cheaper to carry American programming by some means, and to get an audience through operating that type of program operation in this country. But if we, in this country, are going to develop a national system with public and private stations cooperating in that system and carrying an effective and reasonable amount of Canadian programming, it is going to take a great deal of effort, both on the private and the public side. If we are to divide that effort and break it down by means of American programming, it will afford very little chance for a really effective national programming service development with good sized Canadian content. It is a matter of where the judgment of Canadian interest lies. We are trying to develop an effective system using a good measure of Canadian programming. We have some idea of the difficulty of doing it, which I think you can see when you look at the mistakes and so on of private stations starting in Canada. They simply would be unable to produce and use a very large amount of Canadian live programming. They would have to rely to a very heavy extent upon imported American material. Perhaps a lot of people want to look at a great many, but if you want to build up a really effective flow of Canadian programming, it seems to me that we have to get every integration of effort right across the country. It is a matter of what parliament finally wants. But that is the way we are trying to do it.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. You surely are going to present Canadian programming over the C.B.C. stations in any event, are you not, when you get those stations established? You are going to present Canadian programming?—A. We hope so.

Q. You will not be deterred from presenting such Canadian programming by the fact that there were other stations which had got into actual physical operation ahead of you, would you?—A. We would not be deterred, but it would be a question of having the resources to support that programming all across the country.

Q. You mean?—A. In addition to such funds as come through public channels, whatever they are, there would be commercial contributions to an effective national system as we see it in Canada irrespective of the public financial support. If we start operating too much with American programs, and adhering too much to them, it will be hard for us to do really effective Canadian programming and develop it by Canadians right across the country.

Q. Do I take it from that—and I have no desire to be unfair—that you mean that if these private stations became established first, and were for the bulk of their time broadcasting American programs on a commercial basis, that the commercial revenues would become pretty well absorbed by those private stations, and that the C.B.C. would find it very hard indeed to get advertisers to take time on a commercial basis on a C.B.C. station? Is that the first thing which I take from your statement? And the second thing is that the volume of commercial revenue which you expect to derive, or the proportion of your total revenue in television which you expect to derive from commercial television broadcasting is so substantial that the lack of it you think would very seriously hamper your television development program? Are those two things fair assumptions to take from your statement?—A. I would not put it quite that way. It is not just exactly income or revenue. That would be very important and it will become increasingly important. It is also part of the general public support, the audience for the station, the general support for Canadian programming, and the building up of a basis of programming service based on the system of public funds and the system of commercial revenues. We think the contribution on the commercial side would have to be substantial. We would naturally carry on some programming without it, but to have it grow and develop into an effective system which spreads right across the country is going to be a very difficult task, and it will need all the advertising and the resources that can be made available to do it.

Q. I take it that you must feel that the difficulty of providing the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation television with a sufficient share of the television audience would be so grave if you allowed private stations to get into the field ahead of you that you feel—or rather, it is government policy perhaps—that in order to build up CBC television development you must prevent private stations from getting in ahead of them?—A. I would not put it that way. We do not think of it in terms of competing with private stations. We think of it in positive terms, of trying to develop Canadian programming.

Q. But you would do that in any event; you would have this programming which you have outlined and which is going to go forward in any event, and you would not be deterred from doing that because some other stations got into the field ahead of you?—A. But you need resources to do it, and that is what worries us very much. We must look to the years ahead and to the resources to maintain effective Canadian programming across the country or any reasonable amount of it.

Q. I am trying to find the facts and to assess whether the reason you are so concerned over private stations getting into the field is that they would absorb such a large part of your audience if they got in first in point of time. Do you feel that this loss of audience and thus of commercial revenue would make you unable to go ahead with the development of programs as you see fit, and compel you to rely to a much larger measure on public finance than you now hope would be the case? Because what you say in fact is that the audience

on which you are going to rely at the present time would be lost to you, and therefore you are at the present time relying on the Government policy of disallowing private television broadcasting, which is reserving to you all the most profitable areas?—A. I would not say so much. First, we are speaking of duplication in the same areas. I do not think it matters which one starts first. It would be a fact that the audience and the resources related to that area would be divided at a time when it is going to be very difficult to increase our resources in order to get effective programming service going across the country.

Q. When you speak of resources, you surely must mean commercial revenue?—A. To a large extent, yes.

Mr. KNIGHT: We seem to be getting back to the broad general question here of a mental wrestling match which we have had in connection with radio and which is now developing in the matter of television. As far as I am concerned, I believe that television is more important even than those broad agencies of culture and nationality, if you like. I am not too particular or not too anxious about Mr. Goode's case. I am not talking about his local problem, we all have those but I am not too anxious that we should sell our birthright for a mess of pottage because we happen to be in a hurry about somebody getting money. I am not interested in money as a matter of fact, but I am very interested in the preservation of our national culture, our national characteristics, as opposed to a hodge-podge sort of thing which might result from our propaganda, our culture coming under the influence, shall we say, of advertising agencies from whatever direction. That is a statement of broad general policy to start with, and personally, from my obesrvation of certain programs, I am not so sure that we want television at all if we have got to take it on that basis, or take it of that quality. If it is the policy of the C.B.C. to build something up along the lines I have suggested then I am backing the C.B.C. to the hilt in that particular matter. As for the preservation of our freedom and all this talk about free speech and questions and the rest of it, I suggest to you Mr. Dunton that you cannot have any freedom anywhere any more without control of some type, and so far as I am concerned if there has to be control, then I would want that control to be exercised by parliament and by the elected representatives of the people of this land rather than by some people who are interested in making money out of the people of this land and who live in another land.

Mr. FULTON: I have a whole series of questions that I want to ask the witness, and I wonder if it would be—I hate to be invidious—but I wonder if it might be suggested that Mr. Knight reserve his comments until later, and put his questions if he has any questions to ask.

Mr. KNIGHT: I am not a lawyer, but I am sufficiently adroit to put this in the form of questions.

Mr. FULTON: I wish you would do so.

Mr. KNIGHT: If that has to be done in order to conform to the order of the chair. I could ask Mr. Dunton if he does not consider that video has greater potentialities than sound broadcasting and particularly in its relation to the buying of the minds and souls, if you like, of the young people in our homes.

The WITNESS: Yes we do. It would have a good deal stronger impact.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Do you agree with me that we in this Canada have something here that is worth preserving, that it is worth harging on to this individuality which makes Canada Canada and Canadians Canadians, as opposed to people from the United States?—A. One of the chief things we are trying to do is to give expression to that in television services.

Q. And if I may, with Mr. Fulton's permission, make one observation in the form of a question, who am I, you might say, to criticize the great people, our friendly neighbours to the south? I am not criticizing them, I am simply asking to be left alone so we do not have to submit to certain forms of advertising or propaganda or culture or what have you. I think that is largely what I want to say.

Mr. FULTON: Are you an isolationist?

Mr. KNIGHT: Do you not think—

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily.

Mr. FULTON: I want to put the question as to whether he is an isolationist.

Mr. RICHARD: Are you?

Mr. FULTON: No.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Is it not a fact that if any power were to set out to influence the minds of the people of this country, or change the national structure or characteristics, is it not your opinion that television would be one of the post potent agencies by which that could be done?—A. As I said in my opening statement, we thought it was the most effective form of mass communication yet developed.

Q. And you would agree with me that our national culture and characteristics, faulty as they may be, appear to suit us, and you are of the opinion that they should be preserved and that control of our own television through the elected representatives of the people is the one way by which we could best preserve this culture and our national characteristics.

Mr. FULTON: I am not too sure it is in order to put a question like that to this witness. I understand Mr. Dunton is chairman of the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, a body which is concerned with operating radio under government direction —

The WITNESS: Not government direction.

Mr. FULTON: Government policy.

The WITNESS: Not government policy.

Mr. FULTON: Generally you have to conform to government policy.

The WITNESS: No Mr. Fulton, except to the degree which the government can enforce its stated policy as to licensing stations or the proposals by parliament, but in the carrying on of our operations we do not have to conform.

Mr. FULTON: Not in day to day operations, but the whole scope and ambit of your work is controlled by government policy.

The WITNESS: It is controlled as to licensing just as are the activities of private stations.

Mr. KNIGHT: If I can proceed with one or two other questions. Do you consider, Mr. Dunton, your organization or your corporation as just another radio company, in commercial competition with private stations.

The WITNESS: Certainly not. We have a national duty—a duty set by parliament.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. I presume you are thinking of the radio activities as initiated by Mr. Bennett.—A. As stated in the Canadian Broadcasting Act, and to implement the recommendations of the various parliamentary committees.

Q. I think I have made my position reasonably clear, and I am not in any particular hurry to see my children or grandchildren inundated with that kind of thing, for the sake of getting what they call a fast dollar.

Mr. GOODE: You are not suggesting my argument was built around that because it was not. I think you are referring to matters which I raised, and I might add that it certainly was not guided by anybody making a fast buck.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. What about the system in Britain? Can you give us an idea of how television is carried on in Britain under the idea of public ownership?—A. At the present time there, only one corporation is doing television broadcasting and that is the British Broadcasting Corporation. There have been suggestions that the government may licence other stations.

Q. But they have not seen fit to do that up to the present?—A. No, and of course the present corporation carries no commercial broadcasts.

Q. The change of government does not seem to have made any change in governmental opinion in that regard?—A. I think there has been a more recent statement by the present government indicating that they would like to license commercial stations.

Mr. KNIGHT: I see, there is a tendency—

Mr. FULTON: Yes, towards competition.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are you through Mr. Knight?

Mr. RICHARD: Just one question. I think the witness said the C.B.C. were following the same policy in television as in radio. Is that not what Mr. Goode said, and I take no offence on what he said, as long as we get television. Is not the reason that we get national programs from Montreal and Toronto due to the fact that we want more room here, and we have no production space here. We can obtain from Montreal and Toronto, reasonably, what are called national programs.

The WITNESS: As I explained to the last committee, we wanted to build several stations simultaneously, and one was in Ottawa, because it was easy to operate and the cheapest to operate.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fulton, I think you have questions to put.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. I do not want to get into a detailed controversy over the extent to which you are subject to government policy or not subject to government policy, but would it not be reasonable to say that in the field of television, particularly in this developmental stage, that you are much more directly influenced by government policy with respect to television than perhaps in the field of radio?—A. I would not think so Mr. Fulton, except as regards the provisions of the Act and the circumstances. As regards the question of establishing new stations and that sort of thing, the government issues or does not issue authorization to build stations, and they make up their mind about that as they do in sound broadcasting, though perhaps they have had to make more decisions because television has developed quickly and there is the question of where you may build, and the additional factor as regards licensing which has had to be proposed by the government, but apart from that there is no fundamental difference from sound broadcasting apart from the fact it is in a very developmental stage.

Q. But getting back to matters which we were discussing this afternoon, in regard to the fact that at the moment in the larger centers the C.B.C. alone is allowed to develop television, is not that a direct result of government policy?—A. At the present time, yes.

Q. And in fact the C.B.C. has no say in the question of when or whether other stations will be licensed?—A. We are just in the position of dealing

with such applications as may come before us, and making what recommendations we might have, and the government on these matters has made a statement.

Q. So with respect to the licensing of other television stations, or private television stations, say, in a city like Vancouver, it is the result of government policy that the application for these licences do not even come before you?—A. At the present time yes.

Q. That is not direct C.B.C. policy?—A. No, not direct.

Q. To refuse to allow private stations to operate?—A. This is covered at the present time by a government statement of government policy on licensing.

Q. I think probably the best way to go about this from here on, is to take as a basis the comments you made at the first meeting when you made a general statement, and ask you certain questions on that statement. You said first of all that your television crews were self-trained—I am summarizing what you said—that no outside assistance was obtained either by bringing in outside experts or by sending your production people outside. Why did you decide to follow that policy?—A. After very careful consideration, our management thought that a better job could be done that way. Naturally, as I mentioned, some of the senior people did visit and study television in other countries, and at first our management thought we would send our operating people for training to other countries, and as they got more confidence, they thought that young Canadian people might do the job themselves, and learn it better if they learned from the beginning by doing it. Perhaps Mr. Ouimet will have a word to say on that.

(The Chairman resumed the chair).

Mr. J. ALPHONSE OUIMET (General Manager, C.B.C.): It is simply that we felt that the quickest way and most economical way of training our staff, whether technicians or producers, was by self-training. In the first place we had to train them to work to our budgets, and not to the budgets they might have in another country. So, they had to be trained to our methods, and I think that the training they got proved it was the right way. We could have sent a great number of them because there is a large number of these employees to be trained, and we could have sent them outside, but then they would have had to come back and then be trained to our particular facilities, and actually I do not think they could have been trained any faster or any better, and we would have had all the travelling expenses connected with the operation.

Mr. FULTON: Are your facilities greatly different from the television facilities in other countries?

Mr. OUIMET: They are more limited.

Mr. FULTON: Yes, they are different in quantity but not in their nature or quality?

Mr. OUIMET: That is right. They are limited in quantity, certainly not in quality. Also, because they are limited in quantity, procedures have to be slightly different, and you can well imagine that the tradition of operation, or practices of operation, like, for example, in Great Britain, may vary greatly from the operations and methods of, say the National Broadcasting Company or the Columbia Broadcasting System in the United States, and it is because of these differences that it was thought unwise to have people trained in a particular system and then have to modify that training even if it was only to what might be considered a fairly minor extent as compared to doing it ourselves when there was nothing to be gained.

Mr. FULTON: I can quite appreciate that your programming outlook, if I may call it that, might be different and that, therefore, you would not want to get programming people trained outside, but surely the technical operations must be the same?

Mr. OUIMET: Oh, but they were trained in Canada. Some of them were trained in schools in Canada, schools like the Ryerson Institute, to mention one, and there were others, and also they were trained by our own instructors who had studied for many years and were ready to give this training.

Mr. FULTON: I perhaps have taken a wrong meaning from what Mr. Dunton said. I understood him to say they were self-trained entirely within the facilities of the C.B.C.

Mr. OUIMET: We are talking about two different things. All the theoretical training was done either by theoretical studies from books or in schools, while the practical training was done with our own cameras. They would go to the school in the morning and practise in the afternoon in the studios.

Mr. FULTON: It is a fact, is it not, that the stations of the United States and Great Britain engaged in production before you did?

Mr. OUIMET: Oh, yes.

Mr. FULTON: Why, then, did you find it appropriate not to send some production people to see how they produce a television program, if they were producing before you were actually producing it?

Mr. OUIMET: This was done as far as seeing how it was done, but nobody was sent down there to stay there for a week or a month or three months. However, a number of our fairly senior personnel visited quite a number of stations and tried to pick from that number of stations what they considered to be the best methods since they differ from point to point.

Mr. KNIGHT: They were observers, in other words?

Mr. OUIMET: They were observers, and obviously we benefited greatly from the experience of others and we tried to benefit from some of their mistakes, which applies largely to the work of those who did not have the same advantages we have.

Mr. FULTON: Perhaps what I might call the degree of isolation was not as complete as what I had understood from Mr. Dunton's statement. Now, what about the construction teams, that is to say, the people who are now actually engaged in building your television stations, supervising your construction from the C.B.C. point of view. Do the same principles Mr. Dunton outlined apply there, or were they sent away to get practical experience in the construction and installation of equipment?

Mr. OUIMET: It was done in very much the same way as for the operating staff. Our engineers, and our architects, of course, before they set out to design and build a station, had to see a few stations, so they were given the opportunity of seeing what was done in other countries. They were sent on purely observation trips; there was no training, but our engineers—our trained engineers and trained architects—once they know our requirements, keep up with development in the field generally, and they were ready to simply go ahead and design the stations and have them built.

The WITNESS: I would like to remark that last year one of our senior engineers was called upon to give a very important paper at one of these important engineering meetings in the United States on the subject of television.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Then, Mr. Dunton, you speak later on in your statement, of network stations, and you said that they would be in operation late next month. Mr.

Goode has questioned you with regard to your expectation for Vancouver. Could you give us some target dates for your other C.B.C. stations?—A. The target dates cannot be too precise. In Winnipeg we would hope in the fall, but rather later in the fall; Halifax, probably at the beginning of the year. That is about as precise as we can be at the present time.

Q. And you expect to have Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa and Halifax all in operation before the end of this year?—A. Or, if not complete by that time, at least by early next year. At the present moment it looks as if Halifax would not be ready till the beginning of the year.

Q. You said also that by next year you expect the great majority of Canadians will have national television service available to them. Could you be a little more precise and indicate the extent of the coverage you envisage when you say "the great majority of Canadians"?—A. Yes. You will at first have those C.B.C. owned facilities which you mention, and which I think alone covers over 40 per cent or very close to 50 per cent.

Mr. OUIMET: Very close to 50 per cent of the population.

The WITNESS: In addition we have seven private stations licensed to operate TV, which will be partners in the national system in carrying national program services, and we expect, likely, additional private station licences shortly which could also be in operation next year, also carrying national program services. It is estimated that 71 per cent of the population will be covered next year by national program service.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Then you intended your statement to be confined strictly and to be understood in the sense of population, not area?—A. Yes. There is a great deal of area in Canada.

Q. What do you have in mind for bringing television to the rural areas?—A. First, the development of this service through both C.B.C. facilities and private stations as far as possible, and then I think we will have to start looking at the more difficult areas and trying to find ways of serving them. There may be further technical developments by then and we may be able to serve other areas by relay depots and transmitters. We shall be hoping to be developing direct network connections in very much the forseeable future. It is our hope that we will have direct network connections with the stations in the southern part of Ontario and Quebec in 1954. We now have a vision or hopes of connections as far west as Winnipeg and east as far as Halifax by about 1956. That begins to offer possibilities for some relay transmitters on the way. I think what you are probably mentioning now is one indication of the great challenge that faces Canada in developing an adequate television system in view of the very high cost of coverage, especially when you get into the more sparsely populated areas.

Q. So far you are assuming the greater proportion of that cost yourself, are you not?—A. In what way?

Q. As a result of the government policy, not of your own, far the greater proportion of the cost of television coverage to Canadians is thrown on the C.B.C.?—A. A good deal in the production of programs, but, as I say, already there have been seven private station licences granted and private investment in them for transmitting facilities will be quite an item.

Q. But we are now leaving aside the heavily populated areas and discussing the lesser populated areas, and I am concerned in the same way Mr. Goode is, because you have tremendous gaps in the west. For instance, from Vancouver to Winnipeg is quite a gap. Vancouver and Winnipeg have C.B.C. stations and no private stations have been licensed in those areas in between. All private stations that have been licensed are from Sudbury east.—A. All those areas

are open for application—the corporation would have liked to have gone ahead with one station to each of those provinces, but we have not been authorized to do so.

Mr. GOODE: Including British Columbia?

The WITNESS: We are authorized for British Columbia now. In addition, we would like to have been authorized for other provincial areas, but we have not been so, and those areas are all open for private applications, and some are moving along.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. But the most profitable areas in Canada are reserved for the operation of C.B.C. stations?—A. I would not say that, Mr. Fulton. There are some areas which are considered highly profitable in which private stations have been licensed. I would not say profitable, from the point of view of the C.B.C.

Q. The areas of heaviest concentration of population are reserved to the C.B.C. stations, such centres as Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa and Halifax.—A. There are heavier concentrations of population, say, around London, Windsor and Hamilton than you will find around Halifax, and I think probably around Winnipeg. Some of the stations already licensed will cover very large populations.

Q. In the west there are two major concentrations of population, one at Vancouver and one at Winnipeg. There are other cities of considerable importance, but you are not interested in those; in fact you are not allowed to be interested in them because of government policy in that regard, you are not allowed to be actively interested in those areas.—A. No, except to provide program services to private stations located in those areas. I would not consider Edmonton to be a sparsely populated area, though.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I do not want to interfere with the continuity and if I ask this question here I might be keeping the continuity. I was going to ask about Alberta because the minister in parliament stated that it was contemplated putting a station in Alberta, but he was not able, at that time, to say whether that station would be in Calgary or in Edmonton. Now, that was a definite statement he made. Has the C.B.C. given any further consideration to that?—A. Yes, we have. As we understand the situation, we have not been authorized to establish a station in Alberta and the way is now completely open for private applications.

Q. Have any private applications been submitted to you from Alberta?—A. None came in in time for the last meeting, but unofficially I hear that several are being worked on, but we do not get them from the Department of Transport till they are complete.

Q. That question, I suppose, would then be properly asked of the Department of Transport?—A. Yes, and again they might not have the information. Sometimes people do not get their applications in much before the deadline for board meetings. I think it is fairly general knowledge that there are more than one application for each of Calgary and Edmonton being worked on by different interests.

Q. Have you given any consideration to the one point as to whether a C.B.C. station would be located in Calgary or in Edmonton?—A. Not specifically. Our general idea had been to locate, if we could have, in the provincial capitals.

Q. Yes, I see. Now, Mr. Goode and Mr. Fulton asked you particularly as to when it might be expected stations would be established in other areas. I am not going to be as persistent as some gentlemen, but I would like to give

some encouragement to the people of Alberta, and so I would like to get from you some idea as to when television facilities would be available there.—A. As the situation stands, it depends on private applications. As I say, I have heard there are several different interests applying and working very hard on plans for both Edmonton and Calgary, and it is a matter of going through the procedure and applying, coming before the Board of Governors, going through a hearing, and the recommendation resulting from that, and the decision of the government, and all the time it takes to build a station.

Q. As far as the C.B.C. is concerned, you could not give any idea when they could put a station in?—A. At the present time we are simply not authorized to build in that province.

Q. We will have to get after the minister to amplify his previous statement, then.—A. It seems to me it has been clarified more since, Mr. Hansell. I am sure, at the present time, the way it is, is that those areas have been reserved for private stations.

Q. If you do recommend applications according to population I think that is really the fair way. I would suggest you watch Alberta, and of course, being in the south, I would like to see one in Calgary. It would serve my own constituents. But the general wide policy of population, I think, should be one of the first factors.—A. I think there are applications from each city being worked on and those would not be excluded one or another.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Could I ask one question about the end of this gap. In respect to Mr. Goode's question he elicited fairly detailed information about your plans for Vancouver. What about C.B.C. plans for the other end of the gap? What are the plans for Winnipeg? Has the location been found, and what about buildings and other things?—A. Winnipeg has proved simpler than Vancouver. We bought a new building last year with television in mind. The building on Portage avenue will include a television establishment and we will put the television transmitter and tower right on that site.

Q. Mr. Hansell has been asking about Alberta. What about application from Saskatchewan? Are you anticipating any?—A. It is a matter of fairly general knowledge in broadcasting that there is at least one application being worked on.

Q. Is the corporation under the same restriction in regard to Saskatchewan? —A. We are not authorized to go ahead and I understand the government's policy is to consider applications from all these areas.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. In your statement at the first meeting you said that the policy of the C.B.C. is that the basis of Canadian television should be as far as possible the production of Canadian programs with Canadian talent. That is a summary of what you said.—A. Yes, it is a summary, because I also talked about bringing programs in from outside the country and explained that we wanted to build up a balanced program and maintain a care of Canadian programs.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: You do not consider yourself an isolationist for that?

The WITNESS: No.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. You explained that the basis should be Canadian programs with Canadian talent. I am not saying you suggested it be confined to this. You outlined the difficulty in achieving that aim and said the main difficulty was that economic factors worked against this principle and you mentioned the fact that in the United States the cost of programming is spread over a far

greater number of people than in most cases would be the situation in Canada. Am I right in saying that the basis of the type of television coverage you want to give in Canada is the highest possible Canadian content?—A. I did not use the phrase "highest possible". I emphasized reasonable amount or care of Canadian programs and spoke of bringing in a good proportion from outside the country, balancing and trying to have a good solid amount of good Canadian programs.

Q. It is one of your major desires to present Canadian programs with Canadian talent to Canadian listeners?—A. Yes.

Q. And not only that Canadian listeners should have a chance to see Canadian programs but also that Canadian talent should have a medium through which it can develop and reach Canadian audiences?—A. Yes, there is a point here. It gives it a chance to develop.

Q. In the light of this policy I have been puzzled by the situation in regard to the Hamilton station. It is a fact that in a letter which the Department of Transport wrote to its technical consultants on the approved list, it was suggested that any application for a private station in Hamilton would have to show a directional antenna. I believe the station now has been licensed with such an antenna, has it not?—A. I understand so.

Q. What is the effect of that antenna?—A. As I understand it, the general effect of the antenna is to reduce the signal northeasterly across Lake Ontario, and to reduce it also southwesterly to a limited extent. At the same time it increases the signal southeasterly down the Niagara peninsula, and also in a northwesterly direction, because a directional antenna has a double effect, it squeezes the signal in some directions and pushes it out in others.

Q. That would be carrying out the principle laid down in this letter which reads as follows:

> It is felt that it would be desirable if the Hamilton Grade B contour did not overlap the Grade A contours of Toronto and London and further if the Hamilton area TV station did cover the Niagara peninsula?

—A. Yes.

Q. The Hamilton station is not on the same channel as the C.B.C. station in Toronto?—A. No.

Q. So there would be no question of the Hamilton station, interfering with the Toronto station in the technical sense of the word in regard to the reception of those two stations, would there?—A. No.

Q. Then the effect of this directional antenna which is made a necessity for the Hamilton station is to limit the number of television programs which the people in the Toronto area can receive?—A. I think it gets down to the basis of the whole general policy of extending the single service coverage as quickly as possible, and not having a duplicate service at this stage. I think it is quite clear that under the policy adopted there was not to be two stations in one area. But it is quite easy in many areas to get almost the same effect with two transmitters, perhaps one nominally serving one area and the other one being so constructed that it would be effectively serving the other area so that in effect in would be a duplicate.

That problem came up in several areas. It is understood that there should not be two stations in Toronto, for example, or two stations in London. And if another were to be built in another area and if it would provide almost the same service, it would have almost the same effect. There are complications in different parts of Canada. And if it was the situation in Toronto and in the London area, that Toronto provides the same service in Hamilton, or if the question came up as to the station to be built there, which would effectively duplicate the other station, or one which would provide a new and effective service to the coverage of the national system of Canadian television, the con-

sultants of the Department of Transport worked out a suggested plan of coverage all across the country in order that coverage would be provided as widely and as quickly as possible.

The question is this: You have a circle around the Toronto area and one around the London area. But Hamilton would have to be taken as a special area. And as I understand the consultant's letter, they asked for further guidance about how that was to be done. I think the result from the letter which you just read was to suggest how they might have another station without in fact its becoming a duplicate in other areas, while extending the coverage in the widest direction, for instance, getting it down into the Niagara peninsula, which would not be getting a service otherwise.

Q. But the fact is that the requirement of a directional antenna does have the result that the people in the Toronto area only receive one television program?—A. Oh, they can receive Buffalo, particularly, very well.

Q. One Canadian television program then?—A. In fact, yes. They probably would be receiving Hamilton to some extent, but probably not well.

Q. You say they would be receiving Hamilton to some extent but probably not well?—A. This comes under the concept of first having in Canada a single service, and extending it as rapidly as possible before there is a widespread duplication of stations.

Q. And the result of that concept which you are following at the present time is to eliminate one Canadian television station program from the Toronto area?—A. I hardly think that is the result, because if you wanted to, the more straight forward and fair thing to do is to license other stations in the Toronto area instead of the way this works out, that there can be a station serving Hamilton which would also cover the Niagara peninsula and give a service they would not get otherwise, and there would be more people getting some Canadian service.

Q. I will leave the technical argument on that point until a later date. I am not sure that I am qualified to enter into such an argument, but there are technical people who claim that it is possible to give the Hamilton area and Niagara Peninsula adequate coverage without a directional antenna, but let us leave that technical argument until later. It does seem to me fair to say that the result of your concept which you have referred to in that area at the present time is having the result that the listener in what you might call the fringe of the Toronto area, that is the area between Toronto and Hamilton, would only have the opportunity of listening to or seeing one Canadian television program.—A. There are other by-products. Some people are getting a service they would not otherwise get.

By the Chairman:

Q. Has the range of television increased during the last several years?—A. Not effectively, just as we get more experience in building towers and providing transmitters, but not to any real extent.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. As far as the Niagara peninsula is concerned a station in St. Catherines could give very good coverage?—A. Yes, to that immediate area. But it is also fair to point out that applicants from Hamilton—this is a rather curious situation. You have three different applicants, and shortly before the deadline, they quickly combined their applications into one and said we stand behind the statements or proposals in all three applications and one of these principles was a directional antenna.

Q. Yes, but surely when you get a letter from the Department of Transport, suggesting that any application for a station in Hamilton should have a directional antenna included, you would not expect them to apply without

including that?—A. But of the three technical representations, two did and one did not, and when they came before the board, we specifically asked them if they stood behind their statements, and they assured us they did.

Q. But the application reached you after the letter was sent out by the Department of Transport?—A. Yes.

Q. And therefore anyone applying and really wishing to follow up the application would know that was a requirement to be met before the licence would be granted?—A. Yes, they would probably have to meet it but I think also they said it would not make any difference, and they were quite ready and happy to go ahead on that basis.

Q. I suggest the reason for that is that they knew they would not get a licence except on that basis?—A. Yes, but I believe they should take responsibility for what they say.

Q. I suggest the Department of Transport has to take the responsibility for what it says. There is nothing peculiar or unusual in people coming before the board with an application for a licence, and knowing they would be bound by the requirements laid down by the Department of Transport, in framing their application to meet those requirements. What is the alternative?—A. Their alternative is simply not to apply.

Q. And therefore not get a station?—A. But other people expressed an interest in that area.

Q. And this Department of Transport directive would apply to them just the same?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Well gentlemen, it is 5.30.

Mr. RICHARD: Did I understand Mr. Dunton to say, in answer to Mr. Fulton, that if Toronto were to be licensed to two channels it would be more fair to allow Toronto two stations instead of one?

The WITNESS: Exactly.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. The fact is that in Toronto listeners cannot only not get an alternative Canadian program, but is it not also a fact that the result of this policy is that the Canadian talent which might be used in the Hamilton station does not have an outlet at all in the Toronto area?—A. I do not think that will apply at all, Mr. Fulton, because the Hamilton station will have a wide audience and the promoters expressed great confidence in using Canadian talent.

Q. But the Hamilton talent will not reach any audience in Toronto or will not reach it to a desirable degree in the area between Toronto and Hamilton?—A. We would hope, and the promoters of the station gave us some reason to hope, that they would develop good programs which could go on to the whole national service.

Q. That is a hope for the future, but I am asking you whether it is not a fact that such Canadian talent as may be used at Hamilton station, as a result of this government policy, will not be heard in Toronto?—A. I do not say we disagree with it.

Q. But the result of the policy at the present time is that Canadian talent used on the Hamilton station is not going to have an audience in the Toronto area?—A. It does not have much of a direct audience, but we were assured there will be plenty of chance for that talent to be used.

Q. I think you have answered the question when you say it will not have a direct audience in the Toronto area, and it won't have any audience other than through a hook-up with the C.B.C. television network.—A. We hope the network will be operating just as soon as the station is established.

Mr. CARTER: Is there any special reason why Hamilton talent should be beamed to Toronto or to any other part of Canada?

The WITNESS: Our whole desire is to try to get Canadian talent, as a whole, seen by as many Canadians in all areas as is possible.

Mr. FULTON: I think your policy at the present time has the opposite effect as far as Canadian talent is concerned. You are depriving it of a Canadian audience.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, it is 5:30. Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Before we adjourn, Mr. Chairman, this is not a question, but is only to remind Mr. Dunton that he was going to let us have some information, and I refer to the approximate cost of construction and maintenance of a booster station at Blairmore and Coleman.—A. I think I have it.

Q. And also a transcript of the interpretation of the Justice Department's ruling as to dramatized political broadcasts. You say it was only an opinion, but would you be able to let us have a summary of it?—A. Perhaps it would save time if I get that all ready for the next meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could meet tomorrow, gentlemen. Is that agreed?

Agreed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Seventh Session—Twenty-first Parliament

1952-53

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. Robinson

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 6

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 1953

WITNESS:

A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1953

ORDER OF REFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, April 22, 1953.

ORDERED—That the following Bill be referred to the said Committee: Bill No. 340, An Act to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, April 22, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Carter, Courtemanche, Decore, Fleming, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Goode, Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Knight, MacLean (*Queens*), Richard (*Ottawa East*), and Robinson.

In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, J. A. Ouimet, General Manager, H. Bramah, Treasurer, G. Young, Director of Station Relations, R. C. Fraser, Director of Press and Information, R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors, and J. A. Halbert, Assistant Secretary.

The Chairman announced that the Sub-Committee on Agenda would meet immediately after the Committee meeting tomorrow, April 23.

Mr. Dunton was called.

The Committee considered the TELEVISION section of the 1951-52 annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the witness answering questions thereon.

The witness tabled a memorandum re: Section 22 (3) of The Canadian Broadcasting Act. (*See Appendix "A" to this day's evidence*).

At 5.00 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m., Thursday, April 23.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

74202—1½

EVIDENCE

APRIL 22, 1953.

3.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum. I had intended to call a meeting of the subcommittee on agenda tomorrow afternoon, when we could better assess how we are getting along with our work. I was wondering, however, at this time if I should not draw to your attention that the bill to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act was referred to this committee this morning, and whether it would be your wish to proceed with the consideration of the bill at our meeting tomorrow. Possibly, also, members of the committee might wish to hear from Doctor Eaton, for instance, or Mr. Lesage, the Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance. What would be the committee's wishes in this respect?

Mr. FLEMING: I don't think there is any urgency in repoting that bill back to the House. It is not a long bill, and I think it would be better taken up after we advance with the business before this committee which covers revenue for both the television and sound broadcasting. I would suggest that we carry on our meetings as planned until we finish the work we had laid out and then take up the bill when we can see the complete picture.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we leave that to the subcommittee on agenda, then?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): It does not prevent us from having a sitting tomorrow, though.

The CHAIRMAN: We will almost certainly need to have a sitting tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. FLEMING: This bill does not need to be reported back this week or, for that matter, even next week.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we might leave that to the subcommittee on agenda and I would appreciate it very much if the subcommittee could arrange to meet at the conclusion of tomorrow afternoon's meeting of the committee.

Agreed.

Mr. Dunton, will you sit in, please?

Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman, Board of Governors, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, called:

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed today, I wonder if I could make a suggestion to you. I have noticed in the last couple of meetings we have had that most of the questioners have taken a considerable amount of time, and it has been obvious that other members who wished to ask questions have been delayed in doing so. I wonder if you would consider my suggestion that we be confined in our questions to a period of fifteen minutes, with the idea that a questioner who has exceeded his fifteen-minute period can return after others have had a chance to ask questions. I notice that members of the opposition—and I refer to Mr. Fleming and Mr. Fulton—have had a number of questions to ask, and I have noticed, too, that other members wished to ask questions at the same time. All of us wish to respect their position and not interrupt them, and that is why I suggest that if fifteen minutes was allowed to each questioner it would give every member a chance to ask about cetrain questions that interest him.

Mr. DECORE: I think fifteen minutes is too long.

The CHAIRMAN: If the chairman might express a wish, it would be that any individual questioning would be less than fifteen minutes.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not think, Mr. Chairman, the time limit is the important thing. I think it is the continuity of questioning that is important. As one is questioning, they should not go on to another subject until someone else is able to ask supplementary questions.

The CHAIRMAN: The chair will attempt to maintain continuity in our work.

Mr. FLEMING: I suppose the difficulty, which is natural, is due to the fact that we are dealing broadly with television; if there had been some way of breaking the subject down, like sound broadcasting, it would be much easier. I am sure no member wants to monopolize the time of the committee, but he does not always know that other members wish to break in on some particular subject, and he tries to carry on a continuous examination.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well. Mr. Dunton is available.

The WITNESS: I have some information relating to an earlier meeting. One is an interpretation on section 22 (3). I have this written memorandum and perhaps the easiest way should be to distribute it.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that material in form for distribution?

The WITNESS: Yes.

(See Appendix A)

The WITNESS: Mr. Hansell had asked about the cost of the repeater stations at Blairmore and Coleman. These costs cannot be broken away from the total costs for Blairmore, Coleman and Natal, since it is all part of a one-line project. The cost of the three would be as follows: C.B.C. capital cost, $10,500; C.B.C. ordinary annual operating cost, $7,000; that is chiefly for the wire line connection. Then there is an item of capital cost for the wire line companies which they wish to charge to us, a total of $52,800, which they propose would be paid over four years, making a little over $13,000 a year, which means that for four years we would pay some $20,000 annually. The figure of $52,000 is still under negotiation. It is a good deal more than we thought it would be originally at the time the decision was made on these repeaters, and that figure is still subject to negotiation.

Mr. HANSELL: What three repeaters did you say they were?

The WITNESS: Blairmore, Coleman and Natal.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you any further questions on that particular subject, Mr. Hansell?

Mr. HANSELL: No. I will suggest that this document on Section 22 (3) be added to the evidence as an appendix. There should be no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed to?

Agreed.

(See Appendix A)

The WITNESS: There was some other information Mr. Fulton had asked about regarding Wednesday night awards.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that in form for distribution?

The WITNESS: No, I have just notes on it.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Fulton is at present in the House. He will be up later.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps then we could wait till Mr. Fulton is here. Are there any questions on the memorandum which has just been distributed on the interpretation of section 22 (3) of the Canadian Broadcasting Act?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. May I ask this question. Have the C.B.C. and Mr. Young had any difficult problems of interpretation of this section 22 (3) of the broadcasting Act in relation to political broadcasts, say, within the last couple of years?—A. There have been a few difficulties through the years.

Q. Are they of recent date?—A. There were some at the time of the last Ontario election, which is less than two years ago. There were considerable difficulties then. I think those are the chief recent major ones, although the question comes up from time to time, Mr. Fleming.

Q. It is still a live subject, then, in the experience of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation?—A. Oh, yes. I think usually at the time of each election campaign something comes up in this connection.

Mr. KNIGHT: What would be the status of the program "Press Conference"?

The WITNESS: That is taken as not being political because it is not done on behalf of a political party or specifically directed against any political party.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Apparently there is some significance in the definition of the word "political", since you have quoted the dictionary meaning, it is favouring one side or directed against another. Is that your definition?—A. This is taken from a legal opinion, I think it makes common sense that a press conference, a commentary program or a forum that may deal with political things, are not counted as "political" broadcasts, in that they are not done on behalf of one party of specifically against another party. We think a political broadcast has a political purpose.

Q. Most people interpret the word "political" as meaning partisan, and I gather that, broadly speaking, that is the interpretation the C.B.C. has put upon it.—A. Yes, our legal advisers have indicated that kind of meaning.

Q. It is a colloquial meaning of the word "political". It may not be sound, though.—A. It certainly makes common sense not to say that anything that deals with political matters should come under this section.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not want to ask Mr. Dunton his interpretation of borderline cases, but there certainly would be some question as to some interviews. For instance, supposing a Vancouver paper, or a newsman, or a radio newsman in a radio station interviewed the leader of a political party on the subject.

The WITNESS: I think the distinction there, Mr. Hansell, is that if it is a bona fide interview there is no question, it is quite all right; but if it is a cooked-up interview between the leader of a party and one of his supporters, then under the interpretation given to this section it would not be allowed. I think there is a basic difference there.

Mr. KNIGHT: A private station would not be under any such restriction as this, it could sell its time as it wished?

The WITNESS: This is provided for by a statute, and it applies just as much to private stations as to our stations.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. There was a discussion between you, Mr. Hansell, and I the other day in regard to the Premier of Alberta and I must say that I am quite sure that Mr. Hansell was speaking in good faith, and I have no reason to believe he would not speak that way, but evidently the little interchange between us was published in the Alberta papers and some people took the trouble to write to

me, and I have before me an advertisement put out in one of the Alberta papers, which says this:

> April 13th, at the Capitol Theatre, Canada's National "Back to the Bible Hour". An outstanding program conducted by Premier E. C. Manning. Subject: "The latest threat to the Western World" or "What is behind the Soviet Peace Offensive". Featuring the entire radio cast, under the direction of Mrs. Muriel Manning. Come early and bring your friends.

I just thought that I would point out to Mr. Hansell, in all friendliness, there are some things that need, I think, looking into. I believe this is definite evidence that the premier's name has come into some broadcasts in Alberta, but whether it is right or wrong I do not wish to give an opinion on at the moment, but I do wish to point out that what I said the other day was not without some foundation.

Mr. HANSELL: That is, I understand, a newspaper advertisement.

Mr. GOODE: Yes, and it has Premier Manning's picture on it, too. May I put this on the record, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: We cannot get the picture on the record.

Mr. HANSELL: All I would care to say is that surely if it is an advertisement published in a paper it does not come within the broadcasting regulations. Surely that is not so. I do not like this matter being continually brought up before the committee because it is a sort of delicate thing. I can fight this thing out through to the finish and it won't hurt me or Mr. Manning a bit, but it is a delicate thing. I do not want a misinterpretation to be placed on Mr. Goode's remarks in respect to the advertisement. I trust he is not inferring that by discussing some worthy topic in the light of what Mr. Manning declares to be of prophetic significance it is going to be termed a political broadcast, because you cannot, and I say this, I do not believe a man can interpret the Bible prophetically without referring to history and what is happening in the world today.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid, gentlemen, that this subject will be continually entering into the realm of discussion rather than questioning, and I might suggest that we confine ourselves, for the present at least, to questioning Mr. Dunton, who is now before us.

Mr. DECORE: I think the subject raised by Mr. Goode is on the term "Premier Manning" instead of "Mr. Manning", and it is not on the advertising in the newspaper but on the way he is being introduced on the radio over these religious broadcasts, and I think that is the way we should consider it.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you any comment to make, Mr. Dunton?

The WITNESS: No.

Mr. HANSELL: My comments on that were registered the other day.

Mr. GOODE: When you said that Premier Manning would bend over backwards to keep his name out of the broadcasts.

Mr. HANSELL: Them's fighting words, Mr. Chairman, and I do not want to fight. I used it purely as an illustration. If you want to take it out of its context, go ahead and do so, but once again I say it does not make any difference what you say—people are going to listen to Mr. Manning and they know who they are listening to.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, may I go on to the subject of television?

The CHAIRMAN: I think that would be agreeable to the committee.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. May I take up, first of all, some of the financial aspects of television. Mr. Dunton, to date, as I understand it, you have had placed at the disposal of the C.B.C. a total of $8 million for the development of television and all of it by way of loans from the government.—A. That is right.

Q. Now, can you indicate how much has thus far been spent out of that total?—A. Most of it has been spent.

Q. Have you the figure of expenditures, say, to March 31, 1953, the total?—A. I have got it all added up. It has been all spent apart from some $500,000, working capital, which we have left over. It has been spent on capital establishments in Montreal and Toronto and on the operating expenditures during the years, the past three or four years, up to March 31. So we start this fiscal year with some working capital to come and go on from that $8 million of loans.

Q. May we take it, then, in round figures the total you had made available to you is $8 million, no more, no less.—A. Yes.

Q. You have had no sources of revenue for purposes of developing television other than the loans?—A. We have had some commercial revenue in the last seven months.

Q. Yes, but I will come to that; and of that $8 million, you have expended to March 31, 1953, then, approximately $7·5 million?—A. Yes, as you remember with regard to the loans, it was said at the time they were made that they were for the purpose of covering capital expenditures and covering all operations up to the end of this fiscal year. We have done that and have come out with a little to come and go on.

Q. Can you give us a breakdown of the expenditure of that $7·5 million?—A. In total?

Q. Can you tell us how much has been spent to date on buildings, how much on equipment, and under the heading of actual operating costs, how much on programs and what other headings you list your expenditures under?—A. I have not got it just that way, but I think I can do it. The total capital expenditure, including preliminary expenditures on the Ottawa transmitter, which you remember were to come out of the last loan in this last year, have amounted to approximately $4,500,000.

Q. What do you call that?—A. Capital expenditure, Montreal and Toronto. The first expenditures on the Ottawa station.

Q. Can you relate that to buildings or equipment?—A. The total?

Q. The total of buildings and equipment amounts to $4·5 million.—A. Yes, everything of a capital nature.

Q. Yes.—A. The previous years' operating expenditures were about $400,000.

Q. How many years?—A. The previous three years. These were incurred as we started the television organization.

Q. It is the three years prior to the year commencing April 1, 1952?—A. Yes.

Q. Three years at $400,000?—A. Yes.

Q. That amounts to $1,200,000.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood that the total was $400,000.

Mr. FLEMING: Oh, it is not $400,000 per annum, it is a total for the three years?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: I beg your pardon.

The WITNESS: And the net expenditure this year, not taking into account depreciation of $2,245,000—

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. You gave us a figure of $2,781,000 yesterday.—A. Yes, that is the total expenditure; I was subtracting.

Q. That is the gross, the gross expenditure of $2,781,000. Then, of course, there is some revenue against that. Can we take it, then, those round expenditures so far, the $4·5 million were expenditures of a capital nature, on buildings

and equipment, in the three years ended March 31, 1952, and $400,000 spent on development—of what?—A. Preliminary development, the building up of the staff and the training, the first work before April 1, 1952.

Q. And then during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1953, the expenditures you outlined yesterday came to $2,781,000, were of a current nature?—A. Yes.

Q. And your total income thus far from the television, from commercial sources, in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1953, $536,000?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that the financial picture in outline?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, could you take the figure of $4·5 million capital expenditure on building and equipment and give us the breakdown on that as between the different places where you have been carrying on your development?—A. Yes. Roughly, about $2,100,000 in each of Montreal and Toronto, and $300,000 as the first part of Ottawa.

Q. Had you not made any expenditures on Halifax, Winnipeg or Vancouver up to March 31, 1953?—A. We have actually made some expenditures. They will come out of loans to come.

Q. Loans to come?—A. Yes. As I said yesterday, we have managed to get these projects going and we have taken the chance of using some of the corporation's cash to start making some payments that we had to make. There is a loan before the House now for capital expenditures of $4·75 million for the new projects and the costs of those projects will come out of that loan.

Q. When you say it is before the House now, in what form do you mean? I was not aware there was anything of that nature before the House now.—A. There is an item in the main estimates.

Q. That is for television?—A. Yes.

Q. And you have anticipated that in relation to a beginning on Vancouver?—A. And Winnipeg and Halifax.

Q. How much up to the 31st of March last?—A. The chief actual expenditure has been buying the Vancouver building. Most of the capital expenditures have been on actual work of our own staff and we have been ordering equipment. I do not think much more has been paid out, though. It is committed through orders, but not paid out.

Q. I understand that $4·75 million is going to be an addition to the $6 million you expect to receive from excise taxes for television, and the $5·75 million for sound broadcasting.—A. The $4·75 million to be used for capital projects for television only.

Q. That will be in addition to the $6 million per annum from excise taxes?—A. That will be used totally for operating unless we have some left over, but we are not counting on capital expenditures being made out of revenue that comes in out of the excise tax.

Q. I think you should go back and correct the impression you left yesterday by one question I asked and one answer you gave. We had the figure that you were going to have at your disposal in this new fiscal year that commenced April 1, $22 million. I understand that now that will have to be increased by $4·75 million.—A. I am sorry, I thought you were speaking of operating revenues and that is what it is.

Q. It is a misunderstanding and I appreciate that; by all accounts, then, current and capital expenditures on sound and television, you will have at your disposal in this fiscal year which commenced April 1, $26·75 million.—A. Yes, that will be right.

Q. Now, turning to the breakdown you have given us of the capital expenditure on Toronto and Montreal of $2,100,000 each. Is that buildings?—A. It completes the projects as first planned. They will have to be added to enable us to develop the national service, to supply our own stations and the private stations. Some more equipment will be needed for the

making of kinescopes and that sort of thing and for network connections, and eventually some additional production facilities to enable us to get out more production to supply the components of the national program service for private stations and our own.

Q. But that will be relatively small in relation to this large figure of $2,100,000?—A. Yes, naturally.

Q. Is the $300,000 figure for Ottawa the entire capital cost of the work you are planning here?—A. No.

Q. What proportion of the $4·75 million goes to Ottawa? Can you give us a breakdown of that figure?—A. Yes, in addition it will be about another $655,000.

Q. So that Ottawa will run close to a million?—A. $950,000.

Q. How is the balance of the $4·75 million to be used in your capital program?—A. I can give you the total figures of the various projects. They are total figures because we anticipate completing all the projects that we have in mind now that are authorized now and going ahead, but we will need a further $2 million next year, and that will complete everything that is now authorized, so the totals I will give will add up to more than $4·75 million. The estimates are our all-inclusive figure covering everything: Vancouver, $1,700,000; Winnipeg, $1,300,000; Halifax, at the moment, is in for $1,100,000. That is subject to further engineering studies. We are not sure yet where we can locate studios and transmission masts advantageously, and that may have to be modified a good deal. Extra facilities at Montreal for the network service, that is, the national program service, $125,000.

Q. $125,000?—A. $125,000. Corresponding extra facilities in Toronto, $350,000. I have given you Ottawa. The second transmitter and associate facilities in Montreal, $550,000; and then later additional production facilities in each Montreal and Toronto, probably the equipment of a studio in each place, $425,000 each.

Q. Does that complete it?—A. Yes.

Q. What is that total?—A. There is an item of $20,000 for temporary Ottawa transmitters. You get a total of $6,650,000, adding up what I have given you.

Mr. GOODE: How much is that?

The WITNESS: $6,650,000.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Would that all be described as capital expenditure?—A. Yes, all capital.

Q. And when we look at the $4·5 million you have already expended and add another $6,650,000, does that bring us to $11,150,000?—A. Yes.

Q. And does that represent the capital portion of the total cost of bringing your national TV network service into existence?—A. All that is envisaged and authorized so far.

Q. We had a figure 1½ years ago of $15 million. I suppose, trying to relate that to this figure of $11·1 million, that must have included your figure of experimentation and development of a nature other than capital?—A. There are so many figures involved I cannot just remember what the $15 million was.

Q. Probably you do not need to go back to it now. My best recollection is that that was the over-all estimate of the entire expenditure on television for all purposes, in setting up your whole national system.—A. I think that was related to the basis of figuring at the time. We were doing that on the basis of the revenue of $15, licence fee, and I think, my recollection is, that was the figure we thought would be necessary for the financing of the capital plus the deficit period while the licences were building up, which is not related to this.

Q. Again, trying to see the picture in particular details, in the setting up of this national network service with your stations in six large centres and your use of kinescope and recordings, and that sort of thing, your capital expenditures will aggregate $11,100,000, and you will operate in the foreseeable future on a budget of about $7 million per annum on current account for television only, until you build up your revenue.—A. We cannot commit ourselves to that amount. We understand the basis of current revenue will be from the excise taxes, but and we have no means of knowing how much they will be. That is the main revenue we know for the time. As I said the other day, we foresee the curve of operating expenses will tend to go up. We cannot have confidence that the curve of yield on taxes based on sales of sets will go up.

Q. I suggest you look at the remarks of Mr. Macdonnell in the House last night on that I used the expression "for the foreseeable future". Let us take this coming year. The estimate is $6 million from the excise tax, and you figure another $1 million from commercial revenues, and that will come to $7 million current expenditure on TV?—A. Yes.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. These last remarks of Mr. Dunton regarding the estimated income from excise taxes, that is an estimate that has been made, is it not?—A. Yes, that is what we understand.

Q. And that will be one of the major factors determining what that income will be, and that will depend upon the speed with which the private stations that have been licenced will get into operation, will it not?—A. That will be one of the factors, yes.

Q. What is the estimate in that regard for this coming year? Is it estimated that these private stations that are licensed for TV will be operating in this year? Is that assumed?—A. We do not really know, Mr. MacLean. It is always hard for even private stations to get accurate estimates when a project will be completed. Most of them are aiming at being on by next winter or late this fall, or early next year.

Q. Why I ask that question is that there will be a close relationship in some areas between the sales of sets and the dates on which these private stations get on the air, and the speed with which they get on the air will have a considerable effect on your income from that source, I presume?—A. Yes, and the speed with which our own stations get on, too.

Q. Yes, that is another factor.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. May I ask if you contemplate the completion of this program involving the capital expenditure we have been discussing by the end of this fiscal year, that would be March 31, 1954?—A. No, I am afraid not. In answer to questions yesterday, I indicated the target dates, what we are shooting at for the projects on all the installations of equipment won't be finished before the fiscal year ends, and a good deal of the expenditure will fall in the next fiscal year.

Q. By what date do you expect to have this project completed, I mean, according to your best estimate now?—A. I would say there would be a difference, Mr. Fleming. For instance, probably the additional facilities at Montreal and Vancouver will be rather later. The first priority will be stations in the other areas. These may be rather later, probably during the first half of the next calendar year, perhaps about one year or fifteen months. It is hard to estimate now.

Q. In the beginning of 1955?—A. No, 1954, probably the spring or summer of 1954.

Q. About the second transmitter in Montreal. When you set that up, is it your intention to have one transmitter used for the English-language programs and for the French-language programs?—A. Yes. As you know, there is a good deal of complaint now in Montreal from the people of each language.

Q. The intention is to have one station devoted to each language, not to attempt to have programs in both languages on both stations?—A. No, that has always been the plan.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): In your estimation, how long will it take to have two transmitters in Montreal, one in English and one in French?

The WITNESS: We hope next winter. All the facilities are ready. The space has been reserved for the equipment and for the antenna. A great many of the English programs will come in from outside, of course.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. This $1,700,000 for Vancouver—does that include the cost of the building you have already purchased?—A. Yes.

Q. How much will the equipment cost for Vancouver?—A. It is a difficult thing to break down. You have the shell of the building and then structural changes have to be made for studio purposes, air conditioning, and so on.

Q. Then I take it the equipment is not ordered for Vancouver yet?

Mr. OUIMET: I think part of the equipment is ordered.

Mr. GOODE: How long does it take for this equipment to be delivered? Does it have to be specially manufactured?

Mr. OUIMET: No, it does not have to be specially manufactured. Usually they are regular items which manufacturers already have or can duplicate, and it varies. Some items may take a month or may be delivered from the shelf. Other items may take five months. It all depends on what particular part of the equipment we are referring to.

Mr. GOODE: But you have not ordered all the equipment for the Vancouver station yet?

Mr. OUIMET: No.

Mr. GOODE: And some of that equipment that you have not ordered may be some of that five months delivery you told us about. Is that right?

Mr. OUIMET: No, I think that the estimates of time that Mr. Dunton has already given you keep in mind what deliveries we can expect of the equipment.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. When, Mr. Dunton, do you expect all the equipment for Vancouver to be ready for delivery to the C.B.C.?—A. I think, as I said yesterday, we would hope to have the production part of the station operating by late fall.

Q. Some of this equipment might not be delivered by then?—A. I think our engineers are pretty confident it will be.

Q. What about this building you bought. How much did it cost in the first place and, too, where is it located?

Mr. OUIMET: It cost $200,000.

Mr. GOODE: Where is it located?

Mr. OUIMET: It is at Bute and Georgia Street.

Mr. GOODE: Do you happen to know the assessment?

Mr. OUIMET: No, but we can find out.

Mr. GOODE: Can you identify the building? Is there any name to the building?

Mr. OUIMET: It was a building used as a garage and showroom, but I do not remember the name of the building itself.

Mr. GOODE: I understand you bought it far below the market valuation. That is the information I have.

Mr. OUIMET: That is what we thought, and furthermore it was very well suited for our purposes because, being a garage, it has a very strong floor and it is a very strong structure, so that it can carry the load of our equipment, and furthermore it has a very high ceiling and very large spans between columns, so we can put in large studios; in fact, it was just what we were looking for as a shell to be adapted to television use.

Mr. GOODE: How much would it cost to put in the addition necessary for the reception of this equipment?

Mr. OUIMET: It is difficult to give a direct answer because it depends on whether you include in your cost the air conditionnig and the lighting especially for studios which we consider normal, as well as the cost of the equipment; but the structural alterations, the heating and blocking up of windows, I believe the figure I have in my mind is another $200,000.

Mr. GOODE: Is that going to be awarded by tender?

Mr. OUIMET: That will go to tender.

Mr. GOODE: When?

Mr. OUIMET: I cannot give you the date exactly.

Mr. GOODE: I am beginning to get a little dubious about this station being opened in the fall.

Mr. OUIMET: May I say when we give an estimate of the start of operation in Vancouver of early fall, this is on the basis of no live production in Vancouver, so the studios do not come into use at that period, they come into use later and, as Mr. Dunton has just mentioned, the estimate is for late fall.

Mr. GOODE: I understand, and hope you will understand that you are committed to send television out into the Vancouver area this year. I understand it cannot be live, because I happen to know what you have to do to that building, but you are going to give television this fall in the Vancouver area. Have you anything to tell me about the probable date?

Mr. OUIMET: There is no information over and above that given yesterday.

Mr. GOODE: Well, I am going to ask you that question every day that the committee sits.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. On the question of general revenue, following up what Mr. Fleming was questioning about. I suppose, Mr. Dunton, not only must revenue be adequate, but it must be fairly uniform over the next year or two, when you are getting started in television. I was wondering if you are concerned, as I am. over that fact. The new method of financing by way of getting excise tax might not keep up, but I would like to get your comment on that and other alternative methods. I would rather see the C.B.C. guaranteed something uniform over a period of years. I realize when you are planning something it is nice to know what you have to work with. Have you any comment to make on that?—A. Not particularly, Mr. Knight. We are optimistic about the yield of this tax for probably a year or two, but we always see before us an inevitable rise of the curve of operating costs as the system develops.

Q. I suppose I would be right in saying that the general public does not realize the cost of television production in comparison with that of radio. What was the estimated cost of that production we saw in Toronto the other day?—A. Between $6,000 and $7,000.

Q. It rather brings out, I think, what Mr. Coldwell was speaking about in private conversation the other day, when he mentioned a certain program in the United States, the program of Alastair Cook, "Omnibus". Did he not say that the Ford people put $3 million into it?—A. It was a figure of that magnitude, I think.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Is that one program or a series?—A. A series.

Q. How many in a series?—A. I am not sure what they cover. It probably costs $40,000 to $50,000 an occasion. It is quite a long program, an hour and a half.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. What do you think the possibilities in this country are of developing an interest by some industrialists in our national programs?—A. That is part of the basic question that faces Canada as a whole in television, the great difference in cost, say, to an advertiser or an industrialist between using imported material and supporting material produced in Canada. That is an issue that has to be faced, not only by the C.B.C. but by the country as a whole, in trying to develop real effective television programs. Naturally many advertisers would sooner sponsor a film or network program from the United States because of the much lower cost to them. It would cost them far less than the show we put on the other night, which draws a very good audience, and it is cheaper than anything of comparable appeal in the United States, and a program be brought in from the States for a very tiny fraction of the cost of that production.

Q. Surely we have reached a stage in our development now where we should have people who are interested in this type of thing, interested particularly in selling our own goods. Would it be true that this type of thing—I do not want to use Mr. Goode's name for any particular purpose except that he brought up this thing the other day, he was very anxious to have television started immediately in a certain section of the country, and I take it it would not be produced in that part of the country but would be by film or kinescopes brought in from the United States and that would be advertising or selling American goods. Is that true, or would that be the result?—A. I do not know what any individual person would do, but what we do know and what anybody who studied television carefully knows, and agrees with, is that anybody trying to carry on TV independently, not working with the national service, would have difficulty in carrying on any real amount of live production. Some might be able to do more than other. It would not be a question of the intention of the owners at all; it would simply be a question of the economic pressures upon them. The whole pressure would be to use material from outside the country and not to use material produced here.

Q. I was going to suggest, to finish that point up, would Mr. Dunton agree it would be a good thing if we could keep in mind that they who are making their money in Canada, selling goods in Canada, should go into this sort of thing as is being done by the Ford people in the United States?—A. It would be an excellent thing, but a very expensive thing for any Canadian sponsor. We are shaping all our practice and policy in television with a view to attracting support for a Canadian production of different kinds. Some are already doing that. Others have desired to do it but in their judgment they could not afford it, and want to bring in material from outside the country.

Q. I think I am recording the incident correctly when I said Mr. Coldwell mentioned this to you the other day when we were gathered together at that performance in Toronto. It struck me it was a new idea to you but it had possibilities.—A. There is a difference. The production of the "Omnibus"

program is subsidized by the Ford Foundation, a charitable foundation. Then it is put on the network and in part has been sold to a sponsor. So you get two possibilities. In this activity Ford Foundation has been trying to stimulate the development of what they think is a different kind of commercial program, and which they want to demonstrate that it is worth sponsoring as well, so we have two possibilities.

Q. I will ask a question which is not relevant. Could you tell us without looking it up or going to any trouble whether many of your applications for TV, on the part of private interests, come from owners of newspapers. Are they as assiduous in the matter of asking for television rights as they were in asking for radio stations?—A. We have only the seven before us so far, and of those the following were interested: Two newspapers were interested in the Hamilton application, a newspaper was interested in the London application, and also in the Sudbury application, as well as in the Saint John, New Brunswick application.

Q. That is four. Anything in the west?—A. There were not any applications at the last meeting from the west. I have given four out of seven.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I was wondering, following along the line of questioning by Mr. Knight, who has been thinking that a Vancouver station will be broadcasting all American programs. That is not so. I think the C.B.C. broadcasts film and their own productions in Toronto and Montreal, and I would like to know if that will be shipped out there to be televised in Vancouver.—A. Our station in Vancouver, we plan, will carry a pattern very much similar to the station in Toronto, with a number of the sam programs which will go out by recordings, and with some local production as well included in the service. There will be some material from outside Canada. And we hope to bring programs from Vancouver to feed into the system across the country.

Q. That is eventually, but you said a little while ago, to begin with that perhaps the Vancouver people would have to be satisfied with what you call dry productions—is that the term used?—A. No, I think Mr. Ouimet was explaining it was temporary operation we were speaking of and that we would only be able to broadcast films and kinescopes.

Q. That would be from Toronto or Montreal?—A. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN: The production in your studios in Montreal and Toronto will equally or partially be available to those private stations when they go on the air as well?

The WITNESS: Certainly. We will be obliged to supply them with a basic national service. We are planning a supply of about 10½ hours a week, a good deal of which of course will be drawn from Toronto or Montreal centres, and we plan from the other centres as they develop as well.

By Mr. Kirk:

Q. I wonder if we could devote just a few moments to the maritimes, after we have spent so much time discussing the west. I wonder if Mr. Dunton would just give us a picture of the situation as far as the proposed outlet for Halifax is concerned, give us some particulars on the population which it will cover, the area, the circumference or radius that the circle will be, and then after he has completed giving us information on Halifax, perhaps he could take Saint John and also if he has the information on Sydney.—A. I wonder if I could leave that till tomorrow and I could give it to you more quickly then.

Q. The same general information as to how many people will be served. I am interested in what the maritimes will have, and I am also wondering if from Saint John it is expected that receivers will be able to pick up television

programs on the Nova Scotia coast in the vicinity of Digby.—A. I will anwser that last one now. According to the technical plans that television stations in that area have filed, some reception on the Bay of Fundy coast will be received. I think we have some rough figures on those areas, which Mr. Ouimet will give.

Mr. OUIMET: For Halifax, about 350,000 people, and in the case of Saint John I am not absolutely sure because I do not remember exactly the pattern of coverage of the station, but if it was a normal pattern of an average power, well, it will not be very far from the figure I have already quoted for Halifax.

Mr. KIRK: Have you the figures also for Sydney?

Mr. OUIMET: I do not have the figure for Sydney. Knowing just from memory the population in Sydney, and if you consider, say, a radius of 50 or 60 miles around Sydney, I would say it would run close to 200,000 people, but I may be overly optimistic on that.

Mr. KIRK: Well then, do you think that Digby might pick it up or that it might be picked up at Yarmouth, I want to refer to a specific case. We are at the moment getting a certain amount of television from stations in Maine, which will be just as far from Yarmouth or perhaps a little farther from Saint John, and I wonder if the stage has been reached where the engineers are prepared to say that they believe when you are transmitting over water that you are going to get a bigger coverage than when you are transmitting over land. We do, upon occasion, in Canada, say from perhaps 100 miles away, get television from Maine stations, and if that is the case and it is all over water, I wonder if you could pick it up from Saint John, which is 100 miles over water.

Mr. OUIMET: I would say that the transmission of television signals over water would not be better than over flat land, but it would be better over land which is not mountainous or hilly in between. It is a question in television, not of conductivity of the water as compared to the conductivity of the land, but simply of having a clear line of sight to the transmitter and the receiver. So water, being flat as compared to the average land, generally you would expect to get slightly longer distances.

Mr. RICHARD: Do the television waves bounce on the water as they do on average land?

The WITNESS: It is difficult, if not impossible, for the engineers to predict definite reception at distant points. I heard of someone the other day receiving clearly signals from Montreal, 140 miles away, but no engineer would say you could hear that.

Mr. MACLEAN: Is there any preliminary research that can be done, or have you decided on a completely theoretical basis as to the location of a transmitter, as to its most efficient location?

Mr. OUIMET: Well, it is more than theoretical. Actually there is a lot of experience that goes behind it and we have pretty well the equivalent of practical tests. In certain cases, for example, when we started in television in the case of Montreal we were not too sure of one location as compared to another on the mountain in Montreal, so we made tests, and as we learned more and more about it then the necessity for those tests became a great deal less important, so we can tell very well in the average area, unless there is a great deal of mountainous country, just about what we can expect at any particular distance. We deal entirely pretty well on probabilities, but when it needs to be quite accurate we will make tests if we feel that our approach, our engineering, has to be verified by tests.

Mr. MACLEAN: In that connection, Mr. Ouimet, in Prince Edward Island the broadcast transmitters have a very good coverage in the adjoining provinces. I do not know whether that is because we are on a very flat

island, that probably has something to do with it, but I am speaking from the geographical point of view. Would it be a reasonable assumption to estimate that the same might apply to television?

Mr. OUIMET: Unfortunately not. The reason why radio transmission from Prince Edward Island extends to a good portion of New Brunswick, and also Nova Scotia, is the fact that you have salt water in between, which is a very good conductor for radio waves, but in the case of television transmission it is a matter of radius entirely and the ground conductivity or the water conductivity does not come in.

Mr. HANSELL: Would it be proper to say that television can only reach the horizon?

Mr. OUIMET: This is what most engineers and scientists were figuring on about ten years ago, but the fact is that past the horizon it attenuates very rapidly, but with sensitive receivers used today and with the stronger power of the transmitters you can go a considerable distance past the horizon. I think the horizon from the average station will not be more than about 40 miles, but yet signals will be received consistently well 60 to 70 miles away and not quite so well up to a distance of 80 to 90 miles, usually much weaker signals.

Mr. FLEMING: Sixty is a pretty good average.

Mr. OUIMET: You can have a good idea of the transmission over 20 miles distance by watching the signals in Toronto coming from Buffalo, which is 60 miles away.

Mr. CARTER: How does atmospheric interference with television compare with sound broadcasting?

Mr. OUIMET: Actually, if you measured the actual voltages of the interference, the atmospheric interference is much less on the television frequencies than it is on the ordinary broadcasting frequencies. But there are other types of interference which come in, especially man-made interference from automobiles, which is much greater on television than on radio, and also with diathermy and other types of things.

Mr. KIRK: What about the height of the mast and the power of the stations? Those are the two main factors in determining how far you can receive the signals in television, are they not?

Mr. OUIMET: Yes sir, even more so in television, and there is a third factor in television, the nature of the terrain. In television it is mainly the height of the mast and the power of the station, and there is another one, the topography and the mountains in between.

Mr. CARTER: Is there any research indicating the possibility of televising on shorter wave lengths than you now use?

Mr. OUIMET: That is correct. Television can be broadcast on the present bands and on frequencies which are much higher than the present bands. There is a great deal of research going on and there are some stations operating on frequencies which are about four times the frequencies which are used, let us say, in Canada at present.

Mr. CARTER: With respect to this account of beaming wave lengths to the moon and their baffling off the moon to different parts of the earth, do you think that is within a reasonable possibility?

Mr. OUIMET: It has been done. You are not speaking of television?

Mr. KIRK: Yes.

Mr. OUIMET: I thought you were speaking of beaming signals to the moon and getting a reflection. That has been done.

Mr. KIRK: I am speaking about television.

Mr. OUIMET: That is for the indefinite future.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): You would then see the man in the moon.

Mr. OUIMET: I would not count on that for practical purposes.

Mr. FLEMING: That is like the space ship in your show on Monday night.

Mr. MACLEAN: I have a supplementary question. You mentioned artificial interference. There is a service provided to suppress interference so far as ordinary broadcasting is concerned. This may be a question for the Department of Transport, but is there any service in existence now or in the near future for the suppression of interference which applies only to television, or to interference with television chiefly?

Mr. OUIMET: Yes, there is in the Department of Transport. We understand they have done a lot of work on it. They are taking care now of cases of interference with television. We had the pleasure of co-operating with them even before there were stations in Canada on the air, in studying the problem, and making some measurements.

Mr. RICHARD: Coming back to Ottawa, I should like to know if the engineers are satisfed now with the tower that is going to be erected or which is being erected? Will it be satisfactory for the whole area, and how many people will it serve? Is it in a satisfactory location now?

Mr. OUIMET: The permanent tower in the Ottawa area will be as high as the tower which we have in Toronto and the topography is about the same type or pattern that we have around Ottawa. There are no big mountains or ranges of mountains, and we expect to have very good coverage. There again, I have not got the exact figures in my mind. When I think of Ottawa I think of a coverage of about 100,000 families, but I do not know the number of people per family in the Ottawa area.

Mr. RICHARD: Can you tell me if it is definite that we will have television in June, in Ottawa?

The WITNESS: Our engineers are working very hard and they expect to be on with it by the end of next month.

By Mr. Richard:

Q. Will we have bilingual television in Ottawa?—A. There will be programs in both languages.

Q. In a fair proportion?—A. We think it will be a fair proportion. I may say that in Montreal we have not tried to work from percentages backward, but we try to put on the best programs in the two languages and to have the best service possible in each language.

Q. Does that mean that we will in Ottawa have a service from the Toronto station and the two Montreal stations?—A. They will come from Montreal as well as Toronto. In Montreal we will have one centre with two transmitters. The reversing will cost quite a lot of money too.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): You will have three services in Ottawa?

The WITNESS: Not simultaneously.

By Mr. Richard:

Q. Eventually, I suppose you expect to have an altogether French network in television?—A. Oh yes, we expect to. As I indicated before, we hope that by some time next year we might have a connection with Quebec City.

Q. So that Ottawa might have a French service?—A. In time, yes, although I would not like to indicate that it will happen quickly, because there are many factors.

Q. But it is in your plans?—A. It is in our continuing plan, but it is one of the things that we hope for in the stage ahead.

Mr. HENRY: Before Mr. Ouimet is finished with his testimony, I thought I would ask him how high that tower is in Toronto?

Mr. OUIMET: It is 500 feet. The top of the antennae is 500 feet, but the tower itself is 450 feet approximately, and the radiators are on top of the tower.

Mr. HENRY: If I am looking for the best reception, let us say, 30 miles outside of Toronto, will it be advisable to raise my aerial to the maximum height of your tower to have them equal, or may I have my aerial lower than the tower?

Mr. OUIMET: Fortunately you do not have to do that. It would be an expensive proposition. I should say that within about 10 miles, reception is good on an indoor antenna. But when you go to let us say 20 to 25 miles, you may have a simple outdoor antenna. And if you go to 40 or 50 or 80 miles, then you must raise your antenna to a greater height in order to get a more sensitive reception element. But all these figures will vary with the topography. For example, north of Montreal I have received very good pictures on an indoor antenna at 45 miles distance. It all depends on where you are and what interference you are getting and whether you are high up to start with, or down in a valley.

Mr. HENRY: Before I finish I want to ask Mr. Dunton if he is aware that the manager of the Canadian National Exhibition has increased the Canadian content of the grand stand program there this year, and whether or not there are plans to cover it this year by television.

The WITNESS: I think we had a desire to do so last year when we were on a temporary basis. If Mr. Bushnell were here, he could give you a very good account of the union difficulties, and the obstacles which are involved in broadcasting a show such as that.

Mr. HENRY: Are you indicating that you have union difficulties which are such that you cannot take advantage of it this year?

The WITNESS: We would have to look into it. We would like, if possible, to broadcast the grandstand show or at least a part of it, but I must see whether we can overcome all the difficulties.

Mr. FLEMING: Not every night, though?

The WITNESS: No.

By Mr. Henry:

Q. The manager of the Canadian National Exhibition sent us a very voluminous report of the increased Canadian content in that show and of the special efforts on his part, and I think it would be a pity if steps were not taken now to help him out.—A. We would like very much now to help him out.

Q. What about kinescope recordings? How long after they are taken may they be used from the standpoint of obstacles in by way of performing rights and so on?—A. It depends on what the kinescope carries. There are different lengths of time depending on whether or not members of the actors or musicians organization are used, and there may be copyrights involved too. Most of ours, done with Canadian actors, are 60 days.

Mr. OUIMET: It is a matter of agreement with the association of performers. It is a matter of negotiation and it will vary, I suppose as the contracts are renewed. It may be a month with some, but at the present time I believe it is about 60 days with the actors unions.

Mr. MACLEAN: As a supplementary question to Mr. Ouimet, he was speaking about the elaborate receiving antennaes which people might put up to give them a second program in a city where they now have a transmitter,

or in a city where there is no transmitter, in order to get an outside program. Is there any likelihood that municipalities may limit the building of those antennaes? And what would be the reaction or the result of that on the possible sale of receivers?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): One provincial government did better.

The WITNESS: That is a rather delicate question. I think there might possibly be some constitutional issues involved, quite apart from city by-laws, but we do not know. There may be pretty heavy pressure by public opinion too.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. There is one question which comes to mind as a result of some of the questions you were asked in the last few minutes. It has to do with the coverage from Halifax. Do you expect to be able to reach the city of Saint John from the Halifax station?—A. You mean Saint John, New Brunswick?

Q. Yes.—A. No, oh no, not at all. There is a private station going in there which will be a part of our system.

Q. Is there any directional antenna prescribed with respect to the Saint John, New Brunswick, station?—A. No. We may use one in Halifax ourselves, a directional antennae.

Q. With a view to what?—A. Going more inland.

Q. To prevent the waves going in what direction?—A. From going out to sea.

Q. Is that for the sake of economy?—A. You would have a better service for more people.

Q. Coming back to the subject of revenue, you gave an estimate which we understand was tentative, of about $1 million for the year which you have just commenced.

The CHAIRMAN: If I might interrupt for a moment, for the past few minutes we have been covering the expectations as to the development of television in various parts of Canada and I was wondering if our questioning on that particular subject was at an end? I take it from your opening remarks that you are now going to the subject of finance?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on the general development of television across the country?

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I have just one question on that. I know that everyone is anxious to get television as quickly as possible in his particular area but is there not a possibility of rushing this type of construction at the expense of a good job well done?—A. I think there is that possibility. Perhaps some people would say that we realize it too well. Certainly it is the concern of our own management and engineering staff to turn out a good job and not sacrifice a gain of a few weeks or months in order to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, it is now 5.00 o'clock, and the division will take 15 or 20 minutes. I presume it is hardly worthwhile to return here today, so we will meet tomorrow at 3.30 in the afternoon, in room 497.

APPENDIX "A"

Memorandum on Section 22 (3) of The Canadian Broadcasting Act

In response to a question by Mr. Hansell, I indicated that the Corporation has had legal advice concerning interpretations under subsection 3 of Section 22 of The Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936, which provides that "Dramatized political broadcasts are prohibited." This advice has not been in the form of theoretical information but has been in response to specific instances wherein various proposed programs have been submitted for an opinion. Opinions received have been summarized in a regulations bulletin issued in 1947, which reads:

> Regulation 8 and Section 22 of The Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936, govern political broadcasting. Subsection 3 of Section 22 states "dramatized political broadcasts are prohibited". This precludes the broadcasting of any theatrical device and *confines political broadcasting to strictly political addresses and announcements.* Political interviews and question and answer programs have been deemed to contravene this part of the Act because of the dramatic artifices involved.

A resume of the opinions on which this is based, follows:

> The term "dramatized" political broadcast is not defined in the Act and therefore the meaning which must be ascribed to these words is that which is given to them by common usage. The Oxford Dictionary defines "dramatized" to mean—to convert into a drama; to put into drama form; to represent dramatically. The same authority states that "dramatically" means—in a dramatic manner; from a dramatic point of view; with theatrical effect.
>
> Where two men conduct a dialogue over the radio in a form of a discussion, such as illustrated in your letter, they are putting on a performance in a dramatic manner and with theatrical effect. The opinion is that such dramatization of a political broadcast is prohibited by the Act.
>
> By reference to the shorter Oxford Dictionary, "political" means "taking a side in politics." A political broadcast, it seems, must be quite definitely tied up with a recognized political party in some way.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Seventh Session—Twenty-first Parliament
1952-53

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. ROBINSON

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 7

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1953

WITNESS:

A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1953

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, April 23, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presided, except for a period when the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Pierre Gauthier, was in the Chair.

Members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Breton, Carter, Courtemanche, Dinsdale, Fleming, Fulton, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Gauthier (*Sudbury*), Goode, Hansell, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Knight, MacLean (*Queens*), McCann, Mutch, Richard (*Ottawa East*), Riley, Robinson, Smith (*Moose Mountain*), and Whitman.

In attendance: Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, J. A. Ouimet, General Manager, H. Bramah, Treasurer, G. Young, Director of Station Relations, R. C. Fraser, Director of Press and Information, R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors, and J. A. Halbert, Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Dunton was called and supplied answers to questions asked by Mr. Fulton at a previous meeting.

The Committee considered the 1951-52 annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the witness answering questions thereon.

The sections of the report *Television* and *Financial Report* (Television) were adopted.

The Committee expressed its appreciation for the information and assistance supplied by Mr. Dunton and his officials.

The witness was retired.

At 5.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m., Tuesday, April 28.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

74204—1½

EVIDENCE

APRIL 23, 1953

3.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum. I hope I am not too ambitious when I express the hope that perhaps we might finish television this afternoon. I now call on Mr. Dunton.

Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, called:

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that you had some information available for Mr. Fulton yesterday in answer to some questions which had previously been placed before the committee.

The WITNESS: Yes, I have. I think Mr. Fulton asked about the awards for the Wednesday night programs, by the Institute for Education by Radio and Television. We have checked that up since. In 1949, following the inauguration of the Wednesday night series, for the whole series as planned, there was a special award given. And again in 1950, and in 1952 there was honourable mention for a long feature program entitled "Vienna, the Glorious Age."

I think it is interesting that in the thirteen awards which were announced just the other day, the C.B.C. won four out of nine awards for programs, which were heard nationally either in the United States or in Canada. Actually, only one went to the American network. The other four were for programs produced by other organizations, such as educational bodies in the United States. The judges made very favourable comment and they pointed out that ours were particularly good. The different categories were judged by different judges. Canada has shown up very well in the different categories.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions arising out of this return?

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. You have the categories with you, or would it take too long to let us have them now?—A. I have them right here. This year the first award was won for "Summer Fallow". That was a series of plays and documentaries which we put on in the summer in place of the "Farm Forum".

And there was one for the program series "Return Journey", which was a dramatic series on the rehabilitation of alcoholics.

Q. Could you give us the categories, or the sort of competition names? In what categories were they competing?—A. I think that "Summer Fallow" would be an agricultural program which was heard nationally.

Q. The second would probably be documentary?—A. Probably public affairs, talks and discussions.

Then there was an award for "Cross Section," a series on the Dominion network dealing with the industrial life of Canada both from the labour and management point of view. I think that comes in the straight public affairs section.

There was another one, I am not clear what classification it was. It was a first award for a "one occasion" broadcast on the birthday of Queen Elizabeth last year. I think that comes under a "one occasion" category, or a "one time" broadcast.

We also received an award, among the regional awards for "Prairie Gardener", and honourable mention for the program "The Way of the Spirit", which was a dramatized bible story program on Sundays.

There was honourable mention given too, for the 100,000 Summer Drama series, and for a documentary series which included a long documentaary program on atomic development in Canada, another on the Labrador iron ore development, one on Kitimat, and also the oil development broadcast; and a very interesting award for a national school broadcast series which was produced by the C.B.C. in conjunction with the Departments of Education of the three prairie provinces.

And there was one award, I think it was a "first", for a program called "Canadian Primer", an international service program, I was going to say "primitive", but giving fundamental information about Canada to be broadcast abroad.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Yesterday we had completed, or almost completed, a fairly full discussion of the anticipated extension of television service across Canada. Are there any further questions along that line before we leave that subject?

Mr. FULTON: You mean the whole subject of television, or just the extension of it?

The CHAIRMAN: We were speaking of the extension of service to the various parts of Canada and we had completed or almost completed that particular phase of our work. I just thought before passing on to something else I might ask if there were any further questions along those lines?

Mr. GOODE: Before we complete that, I should like you to advise me on this point: I have some press clippings here which refer to a meeting of the C.B.C. Board of Governors which was held in January. At this meeting it was claimed there were applications for independent television in western Canada which were in the hands of the Department of Transport. If Mr. Dunton is correctly quoted here, he said that the board had not received any applications from independents in the west, but they might be in the hands of the Department of Transport. Will we have an opportunity here of being able to question a competent official from the Department of Transport on the subject of independent television in western Canada?

The CHAIRMAN: I shall be glad to take that up with the sub-committee on agenda which, as you know, will be meeting this afternoon following this meeting.

Mr. GOODE: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on the subject which I just mentioned?

The WITNESS: There is one thing I should like to mention in connection with that subject and the information we have given the committee about capital development, and it is that under the new Financial Administration Act the corporation is now required to submit capital budgets each year which are approved by the Governor in Council and tabled in parliament. I simply wish to point out that those budgets, when they come, will be purely on a cash basis. They will be estimates of actual cash outgo from April 1, 1953 to March 31, 1954, and will not necessarily bear a direct relationship to the figures we have given for the various projects which are, of course, the total figure for the whole project, not taking into account the actual dates when each cheque will go out.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on the financial aspects of television?

Mr. FULTON: You have given us a complete and detailed account of the total cost of television development to date?

The WITNESS: I think it was pretty complete, Mr. Fulton.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on "Financial Aspects"? It is difficult to call headings. Are there any questions of a general nature to which we may now proceed?

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. I would like to ask Mr. Dunton, if he is in a position to tell us, if he has a television policy yet with regard to political telecasts.—A. No, we have not. That is a subject which has been on our mind a good deal in the last few weeks and we have waited for an opportunity to get at it. In general, of course, it will be covered by the provisions of the Canadian Broadcasting Act which governs television broadcasting as well as sound broadcasting. Within those provisions, we think there is a place for a good deal of thinking and planning about this. Our idea is to have a meeting just as soon as possible with the representatives of all the parties, as we do in connection with political sound broadcasting, and try to work out a plan for the broadcasting of the coming election on a sensible and an agreed basis. We think political broadcasting should have its part in television and I think particularly for this election it will mean working out a plan in which we and the parties will learn and evolve a fair plan which will be useful.

Q. Are you going to run into any difficulties under your regulation preventing dramatized political broadcasts at the moment? I mean if you are going to permit telecasts of political activities; are you not going to run up immediately against that regulation which prevents any dramatization of political broadcasts?—A. Yes, we have discussed that. That is a statutory provision in the broadcasting Act and at the last meeting we discussed the interpretation of that. Political broadcasts did raise a number of questions with regard to television and that is the kind of thing we would like to work out on an agreed basis with the parties rather than trying to go by too rigid rules at the beginning.

Q. If you have discussed that at the last meeting I won't discuss it further. I am sorry I was not here, though.—A. We did, but not the television aspects of it. If this committee has any suggestions about how it should work, or other aspects of it, we will be very grateful to receive them.

Q. Then you do feel that there is an immediate obstacle in the way of televising political activities under that provision of the Act which prevents dramatized political broadcasts?—A. I have to say it is perfectly plain that the provision of the Act would prevent us or any other station broadcasting, say, a television drama put on in the interests of a political party.

Q. A drama, yes, but what about the actual television broadcast of some political proceedings, let us say a nominating convention as an example?—A. That, I think, would probably be difficult under the provision of equitable time to all parties. It requires a fair division of time among the parties. In sound broadcasting we do not, except for some special provisions, broadcast special party activities or that sort of thing. A certain amount of free time is allotted and the parties nominate the speakers and put them on. I think we will proceed on the same basis with television, working out with the parties allotments of free time and then discussing conditions for the production by the people who will speak on that free time.

Q. Yes, but a political party is not free at the moment to buy time to put on any form of dramatized political broadcast?—A. No, it is not in sound broadcasting and would not be in television broadcasting, either.

By Mr. Gauthier (Sudbury):

Q. There is a good bit of that going on now in radio, isn't there?—A. There is not supposed to be.

Q. That is the effect I get from some of it.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. What I was wondering is whether you are going to have any difficulty—for instance, at the present time there would be nothing to prevent a political party, I suppose, from broadcasting a panel discussion?—A. Yes, there is; under the interpretation that we discussed yesterday, a panel discussion, if it is done in the interests of a party, is interpreted as dramatized broadcasting and is not allowed. Even an interview between two people, if arranged in the interests of a party, is not allowed.

Q. Then your interpretation of the Act is, shall I say, so strict in connection with sound broadcasting that it obviously covers all the same sort of activity in television broadcasting. What I thought was that in television, you portray or see live movements and actions, so that possibly broadcasts which are not an offence against the Act in sound broadcasting become an offence merely because they are on television. Do you anticipate any difficulty of that sort?—A. I think it is possible there would be, and what we hope, as I say, is to proceed not by rigid restrictions of wording or to get more legal interpretations, but try to proceed by getting agreement from the parties as to what is sensible and fair and the division of time allotted to it.

Q. Have you had any discussions on that yet?—A. Not yet, but we hope to as soon as we have time.

The CHAIRMAN: Would there be any inference in arranging for political broadcasting by way of television due to the fact that it is only available to certain parts of Canada and not generally available throughout Canada?

The WITNESS: I suppose there might be. Our preliminary thinking had been for time on our available facilities, allotting that time on an agreed division of time. There would be essential fairness in it even though it covered only parts of the country. As you know, all the time on C.B.C. facilities is provided free.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. I am sorry I was not here last meeting, and if I ask questions which were covered before, please tell me so right away. Mr. Dunton, have you got any policy worked out with regard to the statement made by the minister last March 30th, that eventually it is contemplated that private stations may be allowed in areas which are presenting reserved exclusively for C.B.C. stations, to indicate whether or not those private stations will be granted licences on VHF channels or will they be restricted to UHF?—A. It will simply be a matter of availability of channels under the Canadian allocation plan and in many of the larger centres there are more than one VHF channel available.

Q. I think in all the centres that are now reserved to you other VHF channels are available?—A. Yes. In all of those centres there are more than one VHF channel.

Q. So you are saying that when it is decided, or so far as you know, when it is decided to permit private stations to apply for licences in those areas, the VHF channels as well as the UHF channels will be open for applications? —A. As far as we know.

Q. At the present time your stations all operate on VHF channels, do they not?—A. That is right.

Q. What arrangement have you in mind to make your broadcasts available to stations which may be operating on UHF frequencies?—A. It won't make any difference. We supply kinescopes or direct network connections. They are delivered to them in the same form—VHF or UHF is simply a difference in frequency.

Q. There is no difficulty in a station picking up your signals or whatever you call them in television, and then relaying them even though that station puts out its signal on UHF?—A. No, neither from kinescope recording nor from a network.

Q. I see. In connection with this allocation of channels there is a release put out by the Department of Transport which shows the complete allocation of all television channels in Canada. Some question was raised as to why it was published in Canada such a long time after it was released in the United States. Do you know anything about that? Those were allocated, I understand, by international agreement?—A. What statement was that? Have you got the date, Mr. Fulton?

Q. Proposed plan for television coverage of Canada, dated December 22, 1952, Department of Transport, and then there is a lengthy Canadian television allocation—five pages of mimeographed material, showing the allocation of channels by frequency, by provinces and by city.—A. I am not sure. I would not mislead by making a wrong statement. That is the Canadian allocation plan showing a number of channels allocated to different cities.

Q. Yes, broken down by provinces.—A. And with several channels shown for most of the larger places?

Q. Yes. I will show you what I have here.—A. The Department of Transport could explain that to you, I think. The material under the heading "Canadian-USA Television Allocation Plan" was, I think, published long before December of last year in Canada, but the Department of Transport could give you the details.

Q. My information is that it was confidential so far as the press of Canada was concerned, until it was released on December 22.—A. I could not be sure, but I think not. I would not know for certain.

Q. We are going to consider having a Department of Transport official here later, so I will reserve that question.

By Mr. Gauthier (Sudbury):

Q. Mr. Dunton, I noticed a few weeks ago that certain private television stations were given licences in certain regions, of which Sudbury is one of them. Has your board any control or power over these licensees to make sure that television is really going to be available as fast as possible in those regions, or can the licensees bog down and just take their time about producing television programs?—A. That is a matter for the Department of Transport who actually give the licences, and they have regulations governing the progress to be made.

Q. I see; as long as they show the Department of Transport they are doing everything they can to speed it up as fast as possible, taking into consideration all the difficulties involved in establishing a station—that is the information I wanted.—A. I think the practice is that the department imposes time limits, but if he is proceeding as hard as he can, then these limits may be extended, but I know the Department of Transport follows them up.

(The Vice-Chairman assumed the chair).

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. When was the allocation plan first publicly announced by you?—A. I am afraid I have not got direct knowledge. I think it was some time ago. I think you may find it came out unofficially in the United States before it had been formally agreed on between the two countries. The Department of Transport would know that.

Q. In the agreement between Canada and the United States there has been worked out as between the two countries an allocation covering a zone within 250 miles of the border, north and south, has there not?—A. I think that is right.

Q. Now, I am informed—and I would like you to correct me if I am wrong—that in the United States the minimum distance between co-channel stations—by which I understand stations which occupy the same channel—is established at 170 miles. In other words, if there is one station on channel 2 there cannot be another station established on channel 2 within 170 miles of the first one; whereas in Canada that minimum distance has been fixed at 250 miles. Am I correct there? No, I was wrong, I should have said 220 miles rather than 250 miles.—A. To my knowledge that is practically right but the Department of Transport could give you more accurate information on it. My understanding is that the Canadian authorities endeavour to maintain a slightly wider separation in order to maintain the coverage in areas further out. It is the sort of thing we discussed at yesterday's meeting, and which was in reference to fringe areas. Reception in fringe areas naturally will be much better if the spacing of the stations is kept wider apart. You will not get as much interference in those more distant areas.

Q. But on the other hand you won't have as many areas which are distant from the stations if the stations are closer together?—A. No, but the way the map of Canada works, you will have more places where they can get some sort of signal this way than by trying to get a wider utilization.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is, on the same channel?

The WITNESS: Oh, I think the Department of Transport people could deal with it better. This is probably their field.

Mr. FULTON: I think we perhaps should hear someone from the Department of Transport.

Mr. MACLEAN: How many VHF channels are available in Canada?

The WITNESS: Twelve.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Does the agreement between Canada and the United States provide that in the future Canadian broadcasts will be kept out of the United States, and that the United States broadcasts will be kept out of Canada, and that in so far as possible Canadian stations will be established at such a distance from the border that their signals will not be received in such a way as to interfere with American stations?—A. There is nothing I know of to stop the hearing of broadcasts in one country which originate in another. There are stations for example in Detroit which are listened to plenty in Canada.

Q. I am talking about the future, stations which will be established subsequent to this agreement. I do not mean that Canadian stations close to the border must not be heard south of the border, but that if there is an American station already established which is close to the border, then the Canadian

station will have to have some sort of apparatus so that it will not interfere with that American station in that part of the country south of the border, in other words, in the United States?—A. I think that is part of the whole pattern that you have to have in this agreement, so that it will not interfere with agreed locations in each country. But I think the Department of Transport could deal with that point much better. I know of nothing which will prevent a listener in one country from listening to a broadcast originating in another country, apart from the essential need to preserve the use of the channels which are allocated to each country, and to protect adequately the approved use of them.

Q. The reason I raise this is that my information is that we are observing that agreement with respect to not interfering with American stations—partly because we are not proceeding very rapidly with the establishment of Canadian television stations—whereas the Americans are proceeding with the establishment of television stations which are bound to interfere with Canadian stations which may be established later.—A. My understanding is that there will be no such effect. This is a set plan agreed upon between the two countries, and the Americans cannot establish a station which will have the effect of interfering with a reception on any of those channels in the combined area in Canada. In the same way, Canada cannot have a station which will interfere with an American station under the agreement, nor can the Americans establish a station outside of the agreement.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. I have a supplementary question. The distance between stations on the same channel, is not uniform in the United States and Canada. It is greater in Canada than it is in the United States?—A. I believe so.

Q. What is the position with respect to those potential stations which might conflict with the stations on each side of the border?—A. That is the whole point of the plan.

Q. Does the Canadian station have to be at a greater distance than 220 miles away from the American station on the same channel, or can it be located at a lesser distance?—A. I am not sure. You will have to ask the experts.

Mr. GOODE: Are not both those distances outside of the range of the present known television orbit? If there was an American station 170 miles away from the border of British Columbia, for instance, you could not receive it in Vancouver.

The WITNESS: You could not receive it in Vancouver, but a station can create interference at a much greater distance than it can be received as a program.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): Is that not all worked out?

The WITNESS: It is all worked out to make the best possible use of those 12 channels.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Was there an application for the establishment of a television station at Kitchener, Ontario, on channel 6 which came before the board?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what decision was made?—A. The board recommended against it. I can give you the actual wording of it. The board recommended that the application as proposed be denied. Our note was that the station as proposed, with very wide coverage would to a large extent duplicate services from other stations. The board does not believe that for this purpose it would be justified in recommending the transfer of a channel allocated to the Toronto area. The

board does believe that it would be desirable to have a station serving more immediately the area around Kitchener. At the same time it wishes to point out that cognizance must be taken of channel availabilities.

Q. What other stations did you have in mind in that reference?—A. Toronto, Hamilton and London.

Q. Channel 6 has been allocated to those places, has it?—A. No. They are all on different channels. They would have to be in such a close area. Channel 6 on the allocation plan has been allocated to Toronto.

Q. There would probably be interference between Kitchener and Toronto? —A. No. Channel 6 has been allocated for use in the Toronto area. No VHF channel is available in the Kitchener area under the plan. This application was to build a station in the Kitchener area using channel 6; in other words, moving it from Toronto and using it in the Kitchener area.

Q. Would that run counter to the international agreement?—A. I think it would require modification of the agreement in that detail.

Q. But that might have been arranged if the board had viewed with favour the application itself?—A. Yes, we understand so. It would be a question of the Department of Transport taking it up.

Q. I do not know the geography of this part of Ontario very well, but would the problem be that if the Kitchener station was on channel 6 and the Toronto station on channel 6, they would interfere because they are within 220 miles of each other?—A. Not at all. It was that there were no VHF channels allocated at all to the Kitchener area. It was simply that channels are very scarce in all of western Ontario because of the large population, and the fact that there are American stations so close. There are just no VHF channels allocated to the Kitchener one and to reduce Toronto to two, or, alternatively, to give Toronto allocated to Toronto and use it in the Kitchener area.

Q. Could they not both have had channel 6?—A. Oh no, they would be far too close.

Q. Then Kitchener has no VHF channels at all?—A. None at present is allocated to that area.

Q. Whereas Toronto has three?—A. Yes.

Q. What are the factors which determine that it would be unfair to give Kitchener one and to reduce Toronto to two, or, alternatively, to give Toronto a new one, if that is possible?—A. I think the feeling of the board is best expressed in what I said. We did not think we would be justified in recommending this transfer of the channel particularly when the station as proposed to a large extent would duplicate other services. That does not say that the board, under other circumstances, might not recommend the transfer of a channel.

Q. As to that other part of the board's decision to the effect that it was giving too wide a coverage, am I correct in saying that was one element in the decision?—A. Yes. We stated that the station as proposed would have a very wide coverage and we said the board does not believe for this purpose it would be justified in recommending the transfer of a channel out of the Toronto area.

Q. I am concerned about the application of that first reason. Does it imply that a person applying for a licence for a station in an urban area such as Kitchener should apply for one for a station so designed that it would only cover the actual urban area in which such station was to be located?—A. Not necessarily, no. But the whole idea of single coverage has been to extend coverage and not to duplicate it. Our board has no rigid ideas about cutting down applications whatsoever. But we do feel there should be a good deal more extension of coverage rather than the creation of duplication. The general desire is to extend the coverage and not just to duplicate it.

Q. Is Kitchener at the moment covered from any Canadian station?—A. It can get Toronto to some extent and will, we think, get a fairly good service from Hamilton, possibly be able to hear Hamilton fairly well and also get some service but not as good from London.

Q. Is it a fact that most of the channels which are reserved in those areas open to private stations, are UHF channels?—A. That is absolute nonsense.

Q. Then what are the facts?—A. The facts are that if you will look at the Canadian allocation plan, of which you have a copy, you will see there are a great many VHF channels in Canada, in many places in Canada.

Q. I do not know if any one of those can be taken as typical. But I see, for instance, that Hamilton has five channels, of which one is VHF and four others are UHF, while the Ottawa-Hull area has five channels, of which three are VHF and only two are UHF. Is it not the case that Hamilton is an area where private stations can make application for licences, but that Ottawa is not an area where private stations can make applications for licences? The point I am trying to deal with is this: Are those areas, in which private applicants are now open to proceed, allocated predominantly UFH channels?—A. In the first place 7 applications have already been approved and all have VHF channels. And there are a good many other areas open for applications for VHF channels. In many places it is because of the shortage of VHF channels in relation to the principal areas to be covered. Would you like to hear from Mr. Ouimet on that point?

Q. Yes.

Mr. OUIMET: If we start from the west coast we have in the city of Vancouver three VHF channels, eventually two of these are for the use of other stations. Victoria has one. Nelson has one. Kamloops has one. Chilliwack has one. Calgary has four VHF channels. Edmonton has four. Lethbridge has one. Medicine Hat has one. Lacombe has one. Red Deer has one. Grand Prairie has one.

In Manitoba, Dauphin has one. Brandon has three. Flin Flon has one. Winnipeg has four. I do not know if I need to go all across the country, but there are many.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): I think you should give them all.

Mr. OUIMET: In the case of Saskatchewan, Moose Jaw has two; North Battleford has one. Regina has three. Saskatoon has two. Watrous has one. And Yorkton has one.

In the case of Ontario, where congestion is more marked because of densely populated areas, Fort Frances has one. Kenora has one. Kirkland Lake has one. London has one. North Bay has one. Ottawa-Hull has three. Orillia has one. Owen Sound has one. Pembroke has one. Port Arthur-Fort William has two. And Sault Ste. Marie has two. These are only the VHF channels. Sudbury has two. Timmins has one. Toronto has three. Windsor has one.

In the case of Quebec province, Chicoutimi has two. Montreal has five. New Carlisle has one. Quebec City has four. Riviere du Loup has one. Rimouski has one. And Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere has one, which is on channel 13.

In the case of New Brunswick, Campbellton has one. Edmundston has one. Fredericton has one. Saint John has two. And Sackville has one.

In the case of Nova Scotia, Antigonish has one. Halifax has three. Sidney has three. Yarmouth has one.

In the case of Prince Edward Island, Charlottetown has one, and Summerside has one.

In the case of Newfoundland, Cornerbrook has one. Gander has one. Grand Falls has one, and St. John's has three.

Mr. FULTON: They are all VHF channels in Newfoundland.

Mr. OUIMET: That is right, they are all VHF channels.

Mr. GOODE: If my memory serves me correctly, Vancouver has six, eight and ten. Is that right?

Mr. OUIMET: No. It is two, eight, and ten.

Mr. GOODE: What happened to the original six? Where did that go?

Mr. OUIMET: It went to Victoria.

Mr. GOODE: Where are channels 2, 8, and 10?

Mr. OUIMET: Frankly, I cannot tell you from memory, but we can give you the information later.

Mr. GOODE: Have you not got it in your lists?

Mr. OUIMET: It is probably more than 220 miles away.

Mr. GOODE: And where would it be?

Mr. OUIMET: I might check the assignments in Canada. I am trying to find where it went.

Mr. FULTON: I think that 2 is in Vernon.

Mr. OUIMET: It might also be used in Portage la Prairie and eight might be allocated in the United States nearby.

Mr. FULTON: There are no other 8's or 10's in British Columbia.

The WITNESS: My understanding is that those who worked out the plan did not necessarily try to allocate all possible channels in the more remote areas where they might not be used. But in the more sparsely populated areas I am sure more channels could be fitted into the scheme when there is a demand for them.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Why did you allocate six to Vancouver and then change it to Victoria and then bring in two?—A. The change was made chiefly to avoid interference with reception from Seattle which would be on 5.

Q. No, 9.

Mr. OUIMET: It is adjacent at any rate to 6.

Mr. GOODE: It could have been in Bellingham.

Mr. OUIMET: No, it was Seattle.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Further on this matter of the question of private stations as against the C.B.C. stations, on March 30, 1953, the minister said as reported at page 3393 of *Hansard:*

> . . . We understand that private applications have been under development in the five provinces where no C.B.C. station is now under way, and the government does not want to discourage immediate establishment in these areas of private stations which will further extend national service coverage. For that reason licences granted for private stations in those provinces will contain a provision that, before establishing a competing station, the C.B.C. will ascertain whether the area is likely to afford adequate financial support for two stations. If not, it may offer to purchase the private station at a fair and reasonable price rather than set up a new one.

Mr. Dunton, have you got any principle or policy laid down, or are you working on one at the moment, as to how you will go about ascertaining whether an area is likely to afford adequate financial support for two stations? —A. No, Mr. Fulton. But this is a question which comes before our board

quite often. There are applications for new stations and we have had a good deal of experience in at least trying to make up our minds on what the merits seem to be, and whether or not an area will support a second station.

Q. In the case of an application coming from the C.B.C., the board would not be dealing with such an application from the C.B.C. in the same way as if it were made from outside the C.B.C.?—A. Not in the same way.

Q. If you decide to go ahead and establish a station in a certain area, the only people you would have to submit your application to are the Department of Transport?—A. Yes, and to the government as a whole.

Q. So it would rest within the decision of the Board of Governors as to whether or not an area would afford adequate financial support for two stations?—A. I suppose, from a recommending point of view, that is the case, but the government makes the final decision as to the licence.

Q. I am thinking of a situation where a private station has been established and you are now going through the process of deciding whether or not you wish to establish a station, and perhaps you have decided to go ahead and establish a station there and you are considering whether or not that area is likely to afford adequate financial support for two stations. My question is: That decision is a decision of the Board of Governors, is it not?—A. Primarily the decision is, I presume, but we would still have to get a licence from the government.

Q. I am dealing now with a question on this part of the minister's statement which reads:

> . . . the C.B.C. will ascertain whether the area is likely to afford adequate financial support for two stations.

I asked you who made the decision and you told me earlier that that decision as to whether it is likely to afford adequate support for two stations is a decision of the Board of Governors on that point.—A. I did not say that decision; it would be a conclusion of the Board of Governors.

Q. A conclusion as to whether or not the area will afford two stations is a conclusion that the Board of Governors comes to.—A. In the past we have never had to deal with a situation as outlined in this statement.

Q. Then, when you conclude that it is not going to support two stations adequately, according to this statement of the minister, you will proceed to buy up the private station?—A. It says "it may offer to purchase".

Q. It may offer to purchase the private station for a fair and reasonable price rather than to set up a new one? And how would you say that would be worked out?—A. I suppose in the same way as it has occurred in one or two instances in sound broadcasting, a good deal by negotiation.

Q. Can you give us an example?—A. One example was CKY in Winnipeg which was bought by a process of negotiation; and there was an earlier instance under the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission, I think, sometime ago. We have just recently taken over and purchased a station at Prince Rupert which we had leased before. But now we are acquiring the full title. There again it was done by negotiation.

Q. How do you determine a fair and reasonable price?—A. I cannot think of anything more than by negotiation under what is envisaged here.

Q. I was wondering if you had decided that the same policy should apply with respect to television as applies with respect to radio broadcasting, and that in connection with the rights or otherwise of a private station, it has no absolute right to a channel which may have been allocated to it.—A. I think that applies in respect to the use of any broadcasting channel in any country.

Q. The fact is that the allocation or requirement of a channel is under the control of the government under the advice of the Board of Governors. Is that not so?—A. That is right.

Q. Therefore in the case of negotiations the private station is somewhat at a disadvantage, is it not?—A. It might be, although in any negotiations we have had before, they are always pretty good bargainers.

Q. What are the factors which relate to the establishment or the determination of a fair price in those cases to which you refer?—A. There was not any formula established. It was simply worked out by bargaining and negotiating.

Mr. KNIGHT: Would arbitration be used?

The WITNESS: I do not think so. None has been needed in recent years, nor do I think at any time.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): I suppose there would be different factors, and that would be the same with any station?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

By Mr. Breton:

Q. How much money has been spent on the CBFT programs in Montreal each month?—A. Between $85,000 and $95,000 a month.

Q. And what proportion of that amount to French?—A. Most of it.

Q. And I understand in the preparation of programming it is about 50 per cent French and 50 per cent English programs?—A. That is the way it has worked out.

Q. Does it cost more to televise French programs than English programs? —A. Not necessarily, but of course a great deal of the English programming comes from Toronto by means of recording or on film.

Q. That is the reason that you have so many English programs?—A. No, one of the chief reasons is we try to provide a fairly adequate service for the English people in Montreal. We do not try to work it out on a direct percentage basis, but to try to give the best service we can in each language, and we are able to give some service in English largely because we have facilities for bringing programs from Toronto.

Q. Yes, but do you receive complaints from French people about the poor proportion of French programs?—A. Yes, we do, and we receive about an equal number of complaints from English people that there is too much in French.

Q. But I understand that about 80 per cent of the population in Montreal is French, in the area served by the C.B.C.?—A. I am not sure. My own recollection of Montreal is that the proportion of English speaking people is higher than that.

Q. But the C.B.C. coverage extends to more than the city of Montreal, it goes far beyond Montreal?—A. Yes, the proportion would be higher there. I do not know if the figures you mention are right or not.

Q. Can we expect more French programs in the near future?—A. Yes, we already told the committee that we hope during next winter to have two transmitters operating in Montreal, one with French language service and one with English language service.

Mr. BRETON: Thank you.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. At the present time the microwave relay system from Toronto to Montreal and from Buffalo is entirely owned by the Bell Telephone Company? —A. That is right.

Q. And it is used on a rental basis?—A. Yes, it will be.

Q. What type of contract, or what type of agreement exists? Is it based on a flat rate, or is it according to how much it is used? Perhaps Mr. Dunton could make a general statement with regard to that. As a supplementary

question, when these microwave relay systems are extended in the future, has it already been decided who will own them, say, some other company?—A. I can answer the last part very quickly. No, it has not been decided. It will be by tender. Mr. Ouimet has been working on that.

Mr. OUIMET: Our contract with the Bell Telephone Company has been awarded on the basis of tenders received from the two systems who could supply the service. Our contract with the Bell Telephone Company provides for two things: a flat amount for the service on an eight-hour daily basis between Toronto and Montreal and also between Buffalo and Toronto, and a tariff to be applied when we use the service in the other direction, from Montreal to Toronto, and in both cases the service is to go through Ottawa. I believe those are the essentials of the contract.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): What other company tenders on a contract like that?

Mr. OUIMET: The other companies are the Canadian National Telegraphs and the Canadian Pacific Telegraphs, who work together for the supply of broadcasting circuits.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Does that answer your question?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes. That answers that question. Up to the present how much, approximately, has the link from Toronto to Buffalo been used, or has it been used? What is the status with regard to that?

Mr. OUIMET: First of all, as you know, the Montreal-Toronto part has not been used. It will be used. The Buffalo-Toronto link came into use first, I think, on January 18 and, if I remember correctly, it has been used about somewhat less than one hour a day. I have not got the exact figure for the total use.

The WITNESS: I think it is about five programs a week at the present time, on the average.

Mr. MACLEAN: What is the rental cost at present?

Mr. OUIMET: The rental cost of the Buffalo-Toronto link is not a separate contract, so therefore it is included in the flat rate for the whole service, which is mainly Toronto to Montreal. It works out to something of the order, I believe, of $2,000 a month, roughly, if you work it pro rata, but it is part of the same contract. I am not suggesting that you can have the Buffalo-Toronto service alone for that amount. It is part of an over-all sum paid for all the service.

Mr. MACLEAN: Now, in connection with these microwave relay stations there is nothing exclusive about the contract? It is possible to transmit more than one program at the same time over them, I suppose?

Mr. OUIMET: As far as our contract is concerned, we contract not for the facilities but for the service. In other words, the telephone company agrees to supply the service, that is, to transmit our programs from one location to another. Now, they have facilities, I believe, to provide more than one transmission at a time.

Mr. MACLEAN: And in that connection in the future it might be possible that private stations might use a part of such a chain, might be able to rent a service or part of such a chain from the company that owns it, presumably?

Mr. OUIMET: That is quite correct, technically.

By Mr. Gauthier (Sudbury):

Q. Is it going to be the policy of the board to ask for more tenders whenever channels across the country are expanded?—A. Yes, I mentioned the other day we had hopes and general plans for expanding the service in Ontario and Quebec as quickly as possible and we will call for tenders for that.

Q. So it could be that for other locations in other parts of the country these channels could be provided by the telegraph companies?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. With regard to cost of establishment of stations, were any questions asked last time as to the comparative cost of construction of C.B.C. stations and that of any station or stations of the United States?—A. No, I do not think so.

Q. I have been given information that there is a gentleman in Bloomington, Indiana, who claims he can construct a television station of the average size required in a small city, of 200,000, and he will be able to build and sell a package TV station for $150,000, and it was suggested that the contrast between these figures and what appears to be our cost for our television stations is something we should ask you to comment on. I see Mr. Ouimet is anxious to do so.

Mr. OUIMET: In comparing costs the first thing to do is to compare the facilities provided, the power of the station, and also the studio equipment that is used. A five kilowatt transmitter with the antenna that goes with it, with the test equipment that goes with it, installed, without the building—I am talking just about the equipment—costs in the neighbourhood of about $180,000 or $200,000, depending exactly on the make. Now you can see that is just for a five kilowatt transmitter. That is the kind of stations that are being built in Canada, five or ten kilowatt transmitters, but there are also 500 watt transmitters, which may cost one-third of that in the United States.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): Would you recommend such a transmitter?

Mr. OUIMET: No, they are of much more limited power; they will not be heard so far away. Furthermore, the cost of a mobile unit, such as we have, is in the neighbourhood of $100,000. If you are ready to work without a mobile unit, and thus not be able to pick up any outside broadcasts, and if you are ready to work without any studios and thus not be able to make any live programs in the studios, and have only film equipment which may cost in the order of $25,000, I could see a station which would cost, with that low power of 500 watts and with only film equipment and a very short antenna, at the minimum, perhaps, of the order of $200,000. By the way, in the United States the costs are less by about 40 per cent. Let us put it the other way. The Canadian costs are about 40 per cent higher than the American costs.

Mr. FULTON: Would the Minister of National Revenue have anything to do with that?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): He will, in time.

Mr. FLEMING: Why are they higher, Mr. Ouimet—is there a reason?

Mr. OUIMET: Yes, my figures may not be exact, but I believe there is customs duty on transmitting and studio equipment of the order of 20 to 25 per cent. There are excise and sales taxes.

Mr. FLEMING: That fully explains this 40 per cent difference, does it?

Mr. OUIMET: That is right.

Dr. MCCANN: There is also greater volume of manufacturing such equipment in the United States.

Mr. GOODE: How much of a staff would a station of that kind require? Say, we are on the air four hours a night. How much of a staff would a 500 watt station have to have?

Mr. OUIMET: In order to answer that question I would need more information. Are you intending to have studios or just a transmitter? It all depends on how many studios you have and how many mobile units.

Mr. GOODE: Well, referring to that station that you just described, a 500 watt station which might cost, as you said, a total of $200,000. Now just with the description that you gave, how much of a staff would it mean, no live studios, just exactly the things that you have told us about.

Mr. OUIMET: With a mobile unit?

Mr. GOODE: Yes.

Mr. OUIMET: Well, the question would be: would you use a mobile unit all the time outside. If you did then it would need a crew of about ten for the mobile unit. You would require three or four men at the transmitter and you would require, I imagine, a staff of about five or six more, technicians, at the studio, with the film equipment, doing maintenance work, and so on.

Mr. GOODE: A staff of twenty-five all together?

Mr. OUIMET: That is the purely technical staff. And then you need your announcers, your producers, your manager, and you will need salesmen.

Mr. GOODE: Could they do it with fifty people?

Mr. OUIMET: I would say yes, for a very small installation.

Mr. GOODE: Let us say thirty-five. What would be the monthly cost, assuming most of these people would be technical?

Mr. OUIMET: For a very small station.

Mr. GOODE: Yes.

Mr. OUIMET: I imagine $20,000 to $25,000 would do. By the way, this is on the basis of no live programs.

Mr. GOODE: Yes, that is what I said.

Mr. OUIMET: There are no artists' fees in this, nor scripts.

Mr. FULTON: Then there is no such thing as a "small" television station from the point of view of operating costs? That is what it amounts to.

Mr. OUIMET: I would agree.

Mr. MACLEAN: I have figures here which say it is estimated the equipment necessary to telecast in Canada would cost a quarter of a million in Canada as against a cost of $167,000 in the United States. Do you consider that a reasonable relationship?

Mr. OUIMET: That looks correct.

Mr. GOODE: What are the wages paid in Canada in comparison to the wages paid for technical staff in the United States?

Mr. OUIMET: For technical staff in the United States there is no one uniform wage rate. The wages paid by the large networks in the large cities, like New York, Chicago and Los Angeles, are considerably higher than the wages paid technicians in the larger cities in Canada. On the other hand, in the smaller centres of the United States I believe the differential to be much less. I am not sure there is even a differential.

Mr. GOODE: What would be a cameraman's salary in Toronto in comparison to the same job in C.B.S., New York? Have you any idea?

Mr. OUIMET: The Canadian rate would be about 50 to 55 per cent of the American rate.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. As far as the C.B.C. is concerned, when it establishes a station, is not the difference in cost due chiefly to taxes? They would be in a comparable position except for the fact that the United States gives the taxes back, returns the taxes to them, I mean partially.—A. That has not been our understanding.

Q. I am referring now to this new arrangement, the estimate you have of an income or revenue of $6 million in the coming year—will that $6 million be partially made up from expenditures you yourself make for the purchase of equipment, I mean the taxes that you pay on the purchase of your equipment?—A. It had not crossed my mind.

Q. Is it or is it not so? I am just looking for information.—A. I understand it to be a tax on receiving equipment.

Q. Will it be on transmitting equipment as well?

Mr. OUIMET: By the way, may I just add to what I said before in giving the differentials between costs in the United States and in Canada. I was giving you the differential between the cost of American equipment in the United States and American equipment landed in Canada. Of course this does not apply necessarily to Canadian made equipment or to equipment coming from Great Britain or from other countries. In the case of equipment made in Canada, of course customs protection taxes do not apply, and from Great Britain it may be a different customs arrangement.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. I realize that. I was referring to sales tax.—A. I understand, Mr. MacLean, it will apply only to receiving equipment, not transmitting equipment.

Q. The same sales tax will be on the transmitting equipment, but it won't be diverted to the use of the C.B.C.?—A. In the first place, we do not get the sales tax on anything; it is the excise tax, and the excise tax we will get applies only to receiving equipment as I read the suggested changes in the Excise Act.

By Mr. Gauthier (Sudbury):

Q. Would these arrangements apply to private stations, too?—A. Which arrangements?

Q. On purchasing equipment.—A. There is no arrangement. Mr. MacLean was suggesting we might get some money back, but I see no possibility in that.

Mr. MACLEAN: I was not clear on that. The excise tax on transmitting equipment will go into the treasury and will not be diverted to you?

The WITNESS: As I read the suggested revision for the Excise Act.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. I was late in arriving today, Mr. Chairman, and the questions I ask I hope will not be repeating what has already taken place. I would like to make a few general inquiries concerning policies. The other afternoon it seemed to me, as I listened to replies to questions concerning policy, that the policy regarding TV is still not too clearly defined. Specifically, I am wondering, for example, is there any change in emphasis between the policy in radio sound broadcasting and telecasting in regard to commercialization, Americanization, education versus entertainment, and so forth?—A. No, our fundamental approach to all those things is the same.

Q. But commercialized telecasting would be resorted to, I imagine, in order to defray your huge expenditures?—A. As we see it, it will be essential to have a fair amount of financial support for television, as we have a fair amount on sound, but we hope to keep a sensible balance and not have too much of it. The difficult thing will be to try to attract a reasonable amount of Canadian support for commercial production. That is the hard part, particularly in TV.

Q. But in regard to this attitude towards Americanization, it almost looks, due to the terrific costs of television, that we will be more dependent on American sources for programs.—A. We hope not, Mr. Dinsdale, but, as we say, that is the great challenge that faces Canada today, and not just facing the C.B.C.; the challenge to build up a reasonable amount of Canadian programs. That is going to be the hard part. A natural pressure on everybody to use American programs will be very, very great, even stronger in TV than in sound. We feel it is very important that the national system build up a good measure of Canadian production, and we hope we will be able to succeed, but a lot just depends on the economic factors and support for the system.

Q. In regard to the educational emphasis versus the entertainment emphasis, I noticed the other evening when we viewed "The Big Revue", the preliminary explanation indicated that entertainment and education were indivisible, particularly in the TV medium, that you have to sort of sugar in educational emphasis with entertainment as well. I noticed the program particularly made that emphasis. In radio there has been programming which has been exclusively educational in its emphasis.—A. What kind of programming are you thinking of in sound broadcasting?

Q. School broadcasts, citizens' forums, programs like that.—A. With regard to Citizens' Forum, we have now a program of a similar nature on TV. With regard to school broadcasting, nobody in the world is yet sure how effective television will be in school broadcasting. The B.B.C. are experimenting with it now. There are experiments going on in the States and we are working out some experiments with educational authorities in Toronto. There are a great many factors to be taken into account, especially on the use in schools of receiving equipment. The cost of sets, for instance, is a big factor. So that people, students, can usefully see it, it will require receiving equipment. We are trying to find out in Canada if it can be useful. Apart from that, one difficulty is that we avoid using the word "educational" as a rule. "Educational" is associated with school work and we try to see that a good proportion of our general programming is of value to people one way or another, using "educational" in a very broad sense. The drama on Thursday night we hope is entertaining or interesting to a great many people, but when you put on Shakespeare, from many points of view that is educational. It is more a question, we feel, of having a good sensible balance of programs, including the things which are informative in value, which bring people new insights and new appreciations of beautiful things, than to say 75 per cent of our programming is entertainment and 25 per cent is to educate people. You can do it more if you try in general to have a good over-all balance.

Q. I imagine, then, that the C.B.C. TV when in operation will be emphasizing more the type of thing you have outlined. A program like "The Big Revue" will perhaps be more emphasized by private telecasters, being primarily an entertainment program, very well done, but it seems to be somewhat akin to the spectacles that the Roman Empire used to provide and it seems to be a little outside the field of government broadcasting.—A. We do not say we do government broadcasting. We try to serve the Canadian public and we are sure the Canadian public wants a good proportion of entertainment. You suggest that would be the private stations' lot. I can see no economic chances at all of a private station in Canada putting on that kind of program. It is not because they would not want to, but there is no economic support for it. We are trying to develop good entertainment of our own. I think that can be a very important part of the life of a country as well as the heavier and more serious things. We are trying to develop good Canadian light entertainment and perhaps also material of a lasting value. It is important to the country that we do help to develop good dancers and good Canadian comedy.

Mr. KNIGHT: Would it be heresy to say that we are fortunate in having a Chairman of the Board of Governors who thinks along those lines and who has those ideas.

The WITNESS: The job is to carry them out.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Just before I finish I would like to know if there is going to be any close tie-up between N.F.B. programs and C.B.C., or will you just use whatever facilities are available from N.F.B., documentary libraries, and so forth. Is there going to be any co-ordination?—A. Yes, we have arrangements for co-ordination with them. We will project some of their material, which is available to us, and we will pay them for what we use. We also have arrangements under which they may carry out services for us, again on a businesslike basis, and possibly we for them. Our plants are so busy now there is not much opportunity for us to do anything for them, but we hope to co-operate where it is sensible and useful, always on a businesslike basis of payment.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. Just one question related to what Mr. Dinsdale has been questioning about. Is it the practice anywhere, do you know, at the present time, or might it be the practice for one studio to broadcast one program on TV and on sound at the same time, let us say perhaps a musical program?—A. Yes, there are programs that are broadcast that way in the United States, and I think some in Britain.

Q. Would there be a possibility that any production of your TV studios would be broadcast on the sound network?—A. It is always possible. There is a fundamental difficulty that they are different media and we tend to feel in the long run it is not satisfactory because you have different requirements on each network.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. I have some specific questions regarding your television experience, Mr. Dunton. I would like to ask you how many programs you are producing in Toronto and Montreal at the present time?—A. I think Toronto is a little higher, but 32 hours a week in each place. In each case the Canadian content is running around 60 per cent, and most of that is our own production.

Q. I was thinking more of a list of separate programs. Perhaps you could give those offhand.—A. Yes, I can.

Q. And have you got a breakdown showing the cost of talent for each of these?—A. This is Toronto, starting Sunday: Five o'clock, a half-hour of children's films; at 5:30, C.B.C. produced children's show, by kinescope from Montreal; six o'clock, a film, half-hour television show on film from the United States; 6:30, the Leslie Bell Singers.

Q. I did not realize there was going to be such an extensive list, but I suggest, if the committee members agree, that a list be produced showing the programs in Toronto, the amount paid for the talent on those programs, and the audience covered by those programs according to your latest surveys on both Toronto and Montreal stations.—A. We have no surveys of our own. We subscribe to one or two and we have reservations about them. I personally would not like to produce in writing their figures relating to any audience of ours.

Q. You mean you would not like to produce your own rating figures?—A. No, they are not our figures, they belong to other people. Actually we get them on a confidential basis, and there are a good many reservations about them, and I simply think it is not proper to produce them.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: That question has been asked in committee before, not this committee, but two or three years ago, and I am sure Mr. Dunton gave exactly the same answer.

Mr. FULTON: I do not remember that occasion. But surely these facts are public knowledge are they not?

The WITNESS: It is curious but the copies we received are marked "for confidential use".

Mr. FULTON: We have had them produced in committee before, perhaps not by Mr. Dunton.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I remember Mr. Dunton was asked the same question before, and he gave the same answer.

Mr. FLEMING: We have had them, though I would not say that Mr. Dunton has produced them, but I remember one time we had officials from the survey here to describe their methods.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: On previous occasions Mr. Dunton gave exactly the same answer as he has given now. I remember that.

Mr. FULTON: I am not questioning that, Mr. Chairman, but I simply say that I do not remember it, and I was wondering whether we could get these figures produced in relation to the programs for which I asked Mr. Dunton for a list. Did I understand Mr. Dunton to say that these figures are not available for general public purposes?

The WITNESS: I understand not. They come from other organizations, and I just do not feel competent to speak about them.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Do you pay for a survey from time to time? Is it provided to you on a paid basis?—A. Yes, we subscribe to them.

Q. Surely if you subscribe to them you may make whatever use you like of them?—A. The copy I see says "for the confidential use of A. D. Dunton".

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: If they are confidential you cannot use them here.

Mr. FLEMING: One sees them frequently in the newspapers.

The WITNESS: Of course they are, I am not saying they are not.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. If I obtained the latest survey for Toronto and Montreal and produced them to you on the basis that there is authority to use them, would you then relate them to the list I am asking you for?—A. Yes, certainly.

Q. Have you figures which would show how many of your programs are produced in the average week which you would classify as cultural or programs of national importance?—A. We try not to use these labels because we do not think they are important. The Big Review has a national importance from one point of view, the program of Press Conference has a national importance from another, and a really good drama is of national importance from another, and a hockey game from another point of view.

Q. I know the words "programs of national significance" and so on, have been used in discussion here, and what I want to get is cultural on the one hand, as against purely entertainment programs on the other. You can use your own words if you like to describe that differentiation.—A. We think it is much sounder program thinking and broadcasting thinking not to try to build up these strong classifications.

Q. Well, how do you break down your television programs yourselves? Into what classification do you break them down for your own purposes, if you object to that special division?—A. We have made a breakdown or

coding. We have light variety, talks and so on. I think the best way Mr. Fulton would be to take a program for a week perhaps, and we can supply copies of the C.B.C. *Times* which will give you an indication of what each is, and where it is not clear we can explain it to you.

Q. You certainly have not programs broken down under television in the last annual report?—A. It was a little early Mr. Fulton. We have some copies of the C.B.C. *Times* here which gives the programs.

Q. This would be quite a lengthy business, and it seems to me that what I would have to do is to take each of 12 programs, for instance, which you have listed under Toronto, and ask you what these programs are. I do not want to detain the committee long enough to do that.

Let me ask you again, have you any classification which you can furnish to the committee showing your programs broken down by types—whatever classification you yourself care to use—for say an average week, or an average day.—A. We can give you one breakdown on musical programs and then subdivide it into opera, symphony, choral, ballet, light variety and so on. Would that be of use to you?

Q. It would I think.—A. The figures we have are rather old. If you like I could take this other material and prepare a sample week under these classifications for the next meeting.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. May I ask about that word "culture" which does not seem to be in popular use with the C.B.C. It was used in the Massey Report, and as I recall, some of the recommendations in that report were designed to increase the Canadian content with a view to expanding Canadian culture. Do I understand that the C.B.C. has not adhered to the expressions in the recommendations at that time whereby its activity should be related to the aims indicated in the report, in that you are not attempting to classify your programs with any such labels.—A. We are not attempting to put the label "culture" on some things and not on others.

Mr. KNIGHT: Is it not impossible to draw a line between entertainment and education as such. Education may be entertaining, and I do not see that you can get the breakdown. That program which we saw, I imagine it had educational features and entertainment features, and you could almost relate anything to it, because all life is education. We are being educated here, I hope, this afternoon in contact with our fellow men, and so forth, and how could you label a thing as purely educational and purely entertainment. I do not know. I want to make education entertaining.

The WITNESS: That is one of the things we try to do.

Mr. DINSDALE: There is a difference in emphasis which would make possible a definite classification as to what you are trying to do.

Mr. GOODE: How are you going to divide entertainment and education? You could classify education as something which may be entertaining to you, but which may be classified as education to me. I think we have given Mr. Dunton a most difficult task.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. I have asked Mr. Dunton to give us a breakdown using such words or classification as the C.B.C. wishes to use, and I imagine the C.B.C. must have an idea of what they mean by an educational program.—A. We very seldom use that word except as applied to broadcasts directly for use to schools.

Q. I think that might be an acceptable definition of what you mean by educational programs. Could we understand it in that light, and let us have your classification in that way.

Have you the figures as to the total number of staff in the C.B.C. now devoted to the production of television programs, and the total of salaries. I do not want individual salaries, but the total salaries.—A. The total television staff on a regular basis—the last figure is 333.

Mr. GOODE: My notes say 384.

Mr. FULTON: What was that figure again?

The WITNESS: The latest figure I have is 333 on a regular permanent basis on television.

(The Chairman resumed the chair).

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Does that mean excluding artists?—A. Yes, and in addition to that, there are a number on hourly pay arrangements who work quite regularly.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. My notes say 384.—A. It would be that or a little higher, but that would probably vary although many of them have regular work.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. And their total salaries or wages?—A. For that 333, the total is approximately $92,000 a month.

Q. Have you the figures as to the average number of artists employed, say a week, or whatever is your convenient way to present these figures.—A. I have not got that breakdown by the week.

Q. How do you have them?—A. The total artists used up to the middle of March, who were Canadian artists, actors, variety artists of various kinds were about 630. Canadian musicians over 200, orchestra leaders 26, Canadian writers 5 and the number of newcomers used in television, in the sense that they were not used in sound radio before, is 260, and that includes about 150 amateurs.

Q. You have not got it broken down by month or day?—A. Would you like the average number of artists used in a week?

Q. Yes.—A. We could get that information for you for the next meeting.

Q. Then the other part of it, the cost. I think perhaps the feasible way is to ask you what is the total cost to date for producing all the television programs that you have produced; or what is the most convenient way for you to indicate that? Would you be able to give me the figures say of the total cost of producing a day's television programs in Montreal and Toronto?—A. It would vary a great deal. Perhaps the best figure is from the statement we gave of the total expenditures for the last financial year which would give you the total operating expenditure of $2,781,000 for the past year on television, and the major portion of that of course is related to programs. I think we might get a further breakdown by the next meeting, but the major part of that is for programs.

Q. That would be what you would call production costs?—A. The cost of operating our television services last year.

Q. Is that satisfactory or would you like to produce something more.—A. It is useful as a figure because you will find that otherwise you will get involved in what is programs and what is not, and I do not think it is terribly helpful. This is all for putting out television programs.

Q. I think we have had information as to the line charges on the Buffalo-Toronto line?—A. Yes.

Q. How many programs are being received or being carried over this line at the present time?—A. I think 5 or 6 a week at the moment.

Q. Have you got any figures showing the commercial revenue you derive from these programs?—A. I do not think we have here. We could get you an estimate of them. You mean on a weekly basis, or a monthly basis?

Q. You said 5 or 6 a week. Could you get it on a weekly basis?

Mr. Chairman, have we dealt with the budget for television for the coming year?

The CHAIRMAN: I was rather surprised when I came back to find that we are apparently asking questions on the financial aspect of television. I asked yesterday if there were any further questions on that, and I understood there were none. That aspect of the matter seemed to have been completed yesterday.

Mr. MUTCH: In the last hour we have been repeating.

Mr. GOODE: I think it should be said for Mr. Fulton, if it need be said, that he has not been here lately. He has had other work to do, and I would suggest that if we are to be enabled to complete our work, this kind of information should be given to Mr. Fulton. We are quite a long way behind at the moment with the printed evidence, and I do not think it is his responsibility. He has not been here, and I have been surprised in the last 15 or 20 minutes listening to answers to questions that were asked two or three days ago, and the reason for that is because Mr. Fulton has not been here all the time.

Mr. MUTCH: There is no point in stating the fact that Mr. Fulton cannot be here. The fact remains that for the last half hour we have been threshing old straw. There is no finality to it.

Mr. FULTON: I have missed one meeting on television, and I recall that I asked that if I was covering ground that had already been covered before it should be drawn to my attention, and it has not been, so I assumed that I was not.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I left the chair, I indicated that apparently we had completed questioning on the financial aspects, and we had proceeded to a general discussion, as I understood it, on television. Now, I have no desire to stop questioning in any way, but I do think members of the committee wish to proceed with the work in an orderly manner, and unless we can complete one subject at a time we are certainly not going to get our work done. Now, have we or have we not finished questioning on the financial aspects of the television picture?

Mr. FULTON: I asked at the outset whether the earlier financial questioning had been related to the cost of television program today in Canada, and I understood that it had not been covered. I was not dealing with the financial aspect of the development of facilities at all. My last question was dealing with an outline of the financial cost of current program production, and if the answer is that that has been gone into thoroughly already, then I will not pursue it; but I do not believe it has.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is a part we did not previously cover, the cost of programming. Are there any further questions on the cost of programming? That refers to television, because we have already covered sound broadcasting in our work.

The WITNESS: Could I ask, in regard to that return which I am to give to Mr. Fulton on the cost of programs, if he would mind if there are some items deleted from it, because some will relate to business arrangements with sponsors, and it might not be fair to them. Would it be satisfactory to give you enough of the figures to give an idea of what the programs cost?

Mr. FULTON: Yes. I have a number of questions on finance now, and I will just put them to you, and if they have been answered, perhaps you will say so, and if they have not been answered, perhaps you would care to give

me an answer later on, and that will be the best way of saving time. What is the estimated operating budget for the two television stations presently operated by the C.B.C., and what is the expected commercial revenue for these two stations?

The WITNESS: It has been covered.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. How do these figures compare with the commercial rate first published by the C.B.C.? Have you changed your estimate or budget?—A. We have been forecasting and there have not been any changes because of changes in rates, there is no relation between any budgeting or forecasting and the advertising rate.

Q. You have no change to report?—A. No.

Q. On what method do you base your commercial rate for advertising on programs?—A. I would say roughly the same as most television stations. To a large extent on which we think the traffic will bear.

Q. I suppose you use whatever survey information is available to you in assessing that?—A. Yes.

Q. Listener-audience figures would have a bearing on the commercial rate? —A. It is more the size of the area which can be served by the station that is used by most.

Q. The potential rather than the actual audience you mean?—A. Yes.

Q. You have a set factor? If your station can cover 100,000 people, say, do you have a factor of so much per unit of so many people?—A. There is no definite factor. You can draw graphs on how the rates go, and the population covered as in the States—there is a lot of variation—and we have done a good deal of study on station rates, but we have to take into account the different factors as between the States and Canada.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Then the cost of production would have to go into it?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. What you are saying is that you have no set of rules?—A. I do not think there are any. I know there is a lot of discussion in the industry in the States about such rules, but I do not think anyone has any.

Q. Can you tell me what percentage of the total time on the air, with respect to your two television stations, consists of directly Canadian talent?— A. I think I answered that a few minutes ago. The figures have been running around 60 per cent to Canadian production, and most of that consists of our own live production; 60 per cent is Canadian material and a bit over, and most of that is our own production.

Q. Alive?—A. Yes, alive. And in the case of Montreal, part of it would come from Toronto by recordings.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. I was struck with the weather broadcast the other night. I thought it was extremely well done. Was the man who gave it an employee of the C.B.C.?—A. No. He is a meteorologist by profession.

Q. I thought it was excellent.—A. We think he is very good. He is not only a good weather man but he is a good telecaster as well.

Q. Is it anticipated that arrangements will be made for the broadcasting of recordings which are made in other than French and English speaking countries, apart from Canada and the United States? I had in mind the BBC and perhaps some French or Swiss?—A. Yes, we hope so. We already have

broadcast some kinescope records of B.B.C. shows, but there are a number of obstacles, in the way of rights and union restrictions and so on. We would like to broadcast a good deal more of them and we would do so if it were not for those obstacles which are in the way. In the case of the French, we have had discussions with them and we wish to bring in programs, but there are a number of obstacles there as well. We hope, as television develops all over the world, that this exchange will grow. We think it is important and we regret that there are those restrictions on the development with respect to international exchange.

Q. I feel that the programs which originate in other countries which might be considered purely entertainment in their own countries would be very educational here.—A. Some of them are very educational, I think.

Q. They might be of more benefit here perhaps than in their country of origin.—A. Yes. It would add a lot of variety to our programs to have them as they are developed.

Q. In connection with the broadcasting of musical programs, I suppose this applies to sound as well as to television; but are there any restrictions on the broadcasting of military bands and that sort of thing? Do you run into difficulty with the unions or with the professional musicians?—A. Very often there have to be special arrangements made.

Q. What are they?—A. I have not got the details in my mind, I am afraid, but very often there have to be discussions with the musicians' unions and the federation of musicians.

Q. It would seem to me that they are a potential source of very good programming, and upon occasion if they would be exploited fully, it would perhaps be economical as well as very entertaining.—A. I think we found out that for some reason or other it does not work out economically, particularly. I think in the union discussions that is taken care of.

Q. That is what I meant.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, it is half past five. As you know, the subcommittee on agenda is meeting as soon as we rise and I was wondering if we had completed our work on television, or whether any member of the committee had any further questioning which would require the re-attendance of Mr. Dunton. There have been several questions asked which I said could simply be answered by a return. Are there any members who have questions which would require Mr. Dunton's continued attendance with his officials?

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, on this problem of talent. Under the radio set-up there is a tendency for talent to gravitate to the big metropolitan centres. I come from an area which suffers from this loss of human resources because of the process of centralization. It looks as if we are going to be faced with the same problem in telecasting, and perhaps to a larger degree, because the production centres are going to be located only in the large areas, and whenever local talent is developed and begins to show any promise, it often goes to the two biggest cities, Toronto or Montreal, or to British Columbia. Now, the difficulty there has been largely because there has been no outlet through local facilities. It is a network problem. If a local station operating a small TV unit develops a program, are we going to have the opporunity of making use of that talent on a nation-wide scale? Before you answer the question, it seems to me that the metropolitan, the urban influence, is the closest we come to Americanization in Canada; the urban process is essentially an American process and it seems to be defeating our purpose there.—A. We know this problem very well. The Canadian system is making provision for more regional production than any other system developing in the world at the present time. In the States all the major productions come

from Hollywood, and New York, with a little from Chicago, but it stops there. In Britain it is almost entirely from London. We, in the beginning, are making fairly liberal provision for production at the main production areas. In TV, as in sound broadcasting, we would only be too delighted to have a private TV station make a production that we could use.

Q. I hope some emphasis is given to that point. I know as soon as we produce a good announcer, a singer of promise or any local talent, off it goes and sometimes it is disappointed when it gets to the big cities, because only the top levels are selected.—A. I am afraid that it will be a process that will be tending to go on to some extent. There has always been some concentration of talent in the larger centres.

Mr. GOODE: If Mr. Dunton is going to leave, Mr. Chairman, will he kindly inform me when arrangements are completed in Vancouver for television? I want to know.

The WITNESS: We will do that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MUTCH: Somebody ought to thank him for his patience.

The CHAIRMAN: Then gentlemen, does that complete our questioning of Mr. Dunton on television?

Mr. FULTON: Subject to what has already been said, there are some other questions. I know one of our members would like to ask, and he feels also that after we have had a presentation from the other people whom the committee will be hearing that there may be further questions that arise, so could we leave it that if there are any questions which arise and which have not already been covered, we might ask Mr. Dunton to come back at a later date?

The CHAIRMAN: Well, it has been, of course, usual to give Mr. Dunton an opportunity to come back after we have heard, for instance, from the Canadian Association of Broadcasters and other representations to the committee. It might be quite possibly at that time, of course time of the session permitting, to do some further work with Mr. Dunton.

Mr. MUTCH: I would suggest that since there will be another opportunity of hearing Mr. Dunton that Mr. Dunton be excused subject to recall by the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

Agreed.

Mr. FULTON: On the understanding that if other questions do arise, and time permits—

Mr. MUTCH: I made it subject to recall by the chair, and the Chairman put that, and it was agreed. I move that we adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

Agreed.

Mr. GOODE: I think thanks should be offered from the committee to Mr. Dunton and his staff. He has done a fine job.

The CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

Agreed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Seventh Session—Twenty-first Parliament
1952-53

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. ROBINSON

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 8

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1953

Bill No. 340, An Act to amend The Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936

Submission by the Canadian Congress of Labour

WITNESSES:

Mr. Kenneth Taylor, Deputy Minister of Finance; Mr. H. J. Kealey, Assistant Secretary of Excise, Department of National Revenue; From the Canadian Congress of Labour: Mr. Donald MacDonald, Secretary-Treasurer, and Dr. E. A. Forsey, Director of Research.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1953

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, April 28, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presided except for a brief period when the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Pierre Gauthier, was in the Chair.

Members present: Messrs. Beaudry, Boisvert, Carter, Courtemanche, Decore, Dinsdale, Fleming, Fulton, Gauthier *(Portneuf)*, Gauthier *(Sudbury)*, Goode, Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk *(Digby-Yarmouth)*, Knight, MacLean *(Queens, P.E.I.)*, Richard *(Ottawa East)*, Robinson and Whitman.

In attendance: Mr. Kenneth Taylor, Deputy Minister of Finance; Mr. H. J. Kealey, Assistant Secretary of Excise, Department of National Revenue; and from the Canadian Congress of Labour; Messrs. Donald MacDonald, Secretary-Treasurer, Norman S. Dowd, Executive Secretary, Eugene A. Forsey, Director of Research, and C. J. Williams, Director of Public Relations.

The Chairman reported that the subcommittee on agenda had agreed as follows:

1. That Bill No. 340—An Act to Amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, be considered on Tuesday, April 28.

2. That the Canadian Congress of Labour be heard by the Committee, if time permits, on April 28.

3. That the Committee hear representations from the Canadian Association of Broadcasters on Wednesday, April 29.

4. That the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association be heard on Thursday, April 30.

5. That Mr. J. Sedgwick, a representative of Station CFRB be heard on Thursday, April 30.

6. That copies of the policy statement of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce be distributed to Committee members.

7. That a letter from the Canadian Marconi Company—CFCF—be read into the record.

8. That the brief of the British Columbia Association of Broadcasters be distributed on April 30, 1953, and that Mr. Bill Rea be heard on that date if time permits.

On motion of Mr. Boisvert,

Resolved,—That the report of the subcommittee on Agenda, presented this day, be now concurred in.

Copies of extracts from the policy statements of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and the Ontario Chamber of Commerce were distributed to the Committee.

A letter from the Canadian Marconi Co. (Station CFCF, Montreal) was read into the record.

The Committee considered Bill No. 340, An Act to amend The Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936.

Messrs. Taylor and Kealey were called and questioned.

Clause 1 was called.

74270—1½

Mr. Fleming moved,—That Clause 1 be amended by inserting, before the words "The Minister of Finance" in line 7, the following "Subject to annual vote of Parliament,".

The motion was negatived on the following division:

Yeas: Messrs. Carter, Courtemanche, Fleming, Goode, Hansell and MacLean *(Queens, P.E.I.)*. (6).

Nays: Messrs. Beaudry, Boisvert, Decore, Gauthier *(Portneuf)*, Gauthier *(Sudbury)*, Henry, Jones, Kirk *(Digby-Yarmouth)*, Knight. (9).

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were adopted.

The preamble, title and Bill were adopted and the Chairman ordered to report the Bill to the House without amendment.

Mr. Donald MacDonald was called and read the Congress' brief.

Copies of the brief of the Canadian Congress of Labour were distributed.

At 5.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 8.30 o'clock this evening.

EVENING SITTING

The Committee resumed at 8.30 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Beaudry, Boisvert, Breton, Carter, Decore, Dinsdale, Fleming, Fulton, Gauthier *(Portneuf)*, Gauthier *(Sudbury)*, Goode, Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk *(Digby-Yarmouth)*, Knight, MacLean *(Queens, P.E.I.)* and Robinson.

In attendance: Mr. Donald MacDonald, Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Norman S. Dowd, Executive Secretary, Dr. Eugene A. Forsey, Director of Research, Mr. C. J. Williams, Director of Public Relations.

Mr. MacDonald, assisted by Dr. Forsey, was questioned regarding the brief of the Canadian Congress of Labour.

The Chairman thanked Mr. MacDonald and Dr. Forsey and they were allowed to retire.

At 10.05 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m., Wednesday, April 29.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

APRIL 28, 1953.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum.

Your subcommittee on agenda met following our meeting on April 23rd and would like to make the following recommendations:

1. That Bill No. 340—an Act to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, be considered on Tuesday, April 28.

2. That the Canadian Congress of Labour be heard by the committee, if time permits, on April 28.

3. That the committee hear representations from the Canadian Association of Broadcasters on Wednesday, April 29.

4. That the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association be heard on Thursday, April 30.

5. That Mr. J. Sedgwick, a representative of station CFRB be heard on Thursday, April 30.

6. That copies of the policy statement of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce be distributed to committee members.

7. That a letter from the Canadian Marconi Company—CFCF—be read into the record.

8. That the brief of the British Columbia Association of Broadcasters be distributed on April 30, 1953 and that Mr. Rea might appear at that time if time permits.

Are these recommendations agreeable to the committee?

Mr. FULTON: I think, Mr. Chairman, we felt, did we not, that if these various gentlemen who are here to make representations are not finished in the afternoon meetings we might consider calling an evening meeting to enable them to finish.

Mr. GOODE: As a point of information, why are we hearing a gentleman from CFRB? Are we going to listen to representations from individual stations? I have no objection to it but I am interested as a matter of information.

The CHAIRMAN: The subcommittee considered that at their meeting. One member of the committee had made a statement which concerned station CFRB at an earlier meeting and it was felt an opportunity should be afforded to this station to make a reply.

Mr. GOODE: I have no objection.

Mr. FLEMING: Did you receive a copy of a brief from a gentleman in Hudson Heights? I received one and understood he was sending you a copy.

The CHAIRMAN: I have not received the brief and the clerk advises that he has not either.

Are these recommendations agreed to?

Agreed.

Then I will ask that these policy statements of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce be distributed now.

Then, if agreed, I will also read into the record the statement from the Canadian Marconi Company, station CFCF:

S. M. Finlayson, President of Canadian Marconi Company, tonight branded as inaccurate and unfair the statement accredited to M. J. Coldwell at the Parliamentary Radio Committee meeting today that the Marconi Broadcasting Station CFCF in Montreal is "an American station on Canadian Soil."

The statement is inaccurate said Mr. Finlayson, because the American Broadcasting Company has no control over our programming and no interest in our Company. CFCF he said, carries fewer commercial program hours directly from A.B.C. that it gives away to local charitable organizations. The alleged statement is unfair because it impugns the public spirit of the operators of the oldest broadcasting station in Canada, which is wholly staffed by Canadians and wholly controlled by Canadians.

On April 22 the following order was made by the House: That the following bill be referred to the said committee: Bill No. 340, an Act to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936.

I may say, gentlemen, while the bill is being distributed that we have with us this afternoon Mr. Kenneth Taylor, Deputy Minister of Finance, and Mr. H. J. Kealey, Assistant Secretary of Excise in the Department of National Revenue who will be available to give such information with regard to the bill as is within their knowledge and which committee members may wish.

Bill No. 340, an Act to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936, Section 1.

Mr. FULTON: I wonder if we could ask Mr. Taylor or Mr. Kealey if they would outline to us the procedure that the government has worked out for arriving at this sum and transferring it from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation?

Mr. KENNETH TAYLOR (Deputy Minister of Finance): The intention is that from time to time, presumably from month to month, the Minister of National Revenue will estimate the amount he has collected under schedule 6 of section 1 of the Act and will so inform the Minister of Finance who will then direct that a cheque be issued in that amount to the C.B.C.

Mr. FLEMING: You will breakdown the report as between revenue from radio receiving sets and television on the one hand and television sets on the other?

Mr. KEALEY: There is a breakdown in the item section 6.

Mr. FLEMING: That will be done in the office of the Minister of National Revenue.

Mr. KEALEY: It is done from the returns we receive from the radio manufacturers. In the returns made by manufacturers of radios and television sets, they breakdown on their return the tax on radios and the tax on television sets and the same with tubes for either television or radio sets and we compile our statistics accordingly from that information.

Mr. KNIGHT: Is the estimate that it will be about equal?

Mr. KEALEY: That is hard to say. I think prior to the amendment of the Excise Tax Act of this year it was all collected as one item. It has been brokendown into two items under one section.

Mr. KNIGHT: I think Mr. Abbott suggested one would bring in more revenue than the other.

Mr. FLEMING: One was $6 million. The other was $5¾ million which I believe was the estimate for the radio receiving sets and tubes and $6 million was from the television. We will sell more television sets from now on than radios probably.

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Chairman, would Mr. Kealey like to give us an example of how the manufacturer will figure out his sales tax and excise tax and how that is related to the eventual consumer price? I have not got that in my mind and I cannot seem to get any information on that. For instance, I will give you this illustration. If there is 10 per cent sales tax and 15 per cent excise tax which is 25 per cent, it would not be correct to say, would it, that on a radio costing $400, $100 of that was taxation?

Mr. H. J. KEALEY (Assistant Secretary of Excise): $400 you mean as the consumer price?

Mr. HANSELL: Yes.

Mr. KEALEY: No. The tax applies on the manufacturer's selling price.

Mr. HANSELL: That is the thing I cannot quite get. You just mean to say when the manufacturer sells a unit—perhaps he does not sell one but may sell 100—for we will say $200 to the wholesaler that the tax on that is $50?

Mr. KEALEY: That is correct, sir.

Mr. HANSELL: Therefore if the wholesaler makes a profit and perhaps also the retailer or another middle man and the radio eventually sells for $300 or $400, it does not matter what it sells for, the sales tax and excise tax is only $50?

Mr. KEALEY: That is correct, sir.

Mr. HANSELL: When I say "only" I think that is a lot. But it still remains $50?

Mr. KEALEY: That is right.

Mr. JONES: I think what Mr. Hansell is getting at is that $50 is added to the wholesale price and the retailer bases his price on the total cost which includes taxes, transportation and profit. The $50 you visualize is added to the total cost before the consumer gets it.

The CHAIRMAN: What we are concerned with is the amount of revenue that accrues to the Crown under this bill.

Mr. HANSELL: That may be a matter of procedure, but what I want to put on the record is that the people themselves who have to pay the shot should know how much they are paying for the product and how much they are paying in taxes.

Mr. GOODE: I, Mr. Chairman, would agree with Mr. Hansell which is very unusual, but—

Mr. HANSELL: Thank you, Mr. Goode.

Mr. GOODE: But I would also, if we are going to carry it that far, insist that the same thing be done with every marketable commodity. I have had some experience in the grocery business and it would be rather difficult to do the same thing there and why should we pick on one commodity?

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we are considering section 1 of Bill No. 340 and we are getting a little far afield. Can we not confine our questions to section 1 of the bill.

Mr. HANSELL: I would like to be agreeable, but the bill substitutes an excise tax for the radio licence and there is the principle involved. The people should know whether they are paying $2.50 a year licence or how much they are paying in lieu of that $2.50. That is really the principle of the bill, I think.

Mr. FLEMING: I think we have been told already that on the radio receiving sets the yield from the excise tax will be $5¾ million per annum which happens to coincide almost exactly with the revenue received of late years from the $2.50 licence fee from receiving sets and on the television side you have a new situation and this tax is estimated to yield under present conditions $6 million a year to the C.B.C.

Mr. KNIGHT: The C.B.C. would also have the use of commercial revenue which would be added to that $6 million.

Mr. FLEMING: That has nothing to do with the other sources of revenue of the C.B.C.

Mr. GOODE: Does this change the rate of excise tax as at present applied before this bill goes into the record book? Are we now collecting 15 per cent excise tax an television sets?

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes sir.

Mr. GOODE: It does not change the rate of excise whatsoever.

Mr. TAYLOR: There was no change.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am not familiar with section 6 of schedule 1 of the Excise Tax Act, and perhaps we could have some informaton on that. I presume that the schedule lists articles by their nature, and not by the use to which they will be put. What I mean is, does that schedule include equipment for transmitting as well for receiving television or radio broadcasts.

Mr. TAYLOR: Perhaps I may read clause 25 section 6 of schedule 1:

> 6. (*a*) Phonographs, record playing devices, radio broadcasting receiving sets or any combination of the foregoing and tubes therefor; any apparatus or device that enables a person to hear programmes of music distributed by any means whatsoever or radio broadcasting programmes distributed by any means whatever; but this paragraph does not include any article coming within paragraph (*b*) of this section .....fifteen per cent.

And then paragraph (*b*) of section 6:

> (*b*) Television receiving sets and tubes therefor; any apparatus or device that enables a person to see, or to see and hear, television programmes distributed by any means whatever or television radio broadcasting programmes distributed by any means whatever..... .....fifteen per cent.

Mr. JONES: That includes television aerials?

Mr. KEALEY: It does not include parts. If it was sold as a combination it would.

Mr. JONES: You cannot see without an aerial. It is quite a substantial amount.

Mr. KEALEY: It taxes television receiving sets, and tubes therefor. If it were sold as a complete unit—

Mr. JONES: "Anything that allows you to see and hear." Without the aerial you connot see or hear. I would like that cleared up.

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not know what the ruling would be. It states: "Any apparatus or device which enables a person to see or hear." That is the bill as passed by the House, though we are saying here whatever revenue is collected under 6 (*b*) will go into TV revenue, and under 6 (*a*) into broadcasting revenue.

The CHAIRMAN: That would be a matter of interpretation.

Mr. FLEMING: 6 (*a*) includes radio receiving sets and I notice phonographs and record players.

Mr. TAYLOR: That has been in the Act for a great many years, ever since this clause was in the Excise Act, and I am informed that the number of phonographs per se sold is very, very limited, and nearly always in combination either with a radio or TV sets.

Mr. FLEMING: And record players?

Mr. TAYLOR: With record players the same would be true. It is true there will be turned over to the C.B.C. a very modest amount of revenue that is in direct connection with the reception of radio programs.

Mr. JONES: Could you get an interpretation of that point regarding television aerials.

Mr. TAYLOR: That is Mr. Kealey's department.

Mr. MACLEAN: I would imagine Mr. Chairman there is quite a bit of equipment that is manufactured for the purpose of receiving programs, television sets and so forth that are required by transmitting stations for their own use in connection with radio broadcasting, and television broadcasting even more so. This interpretation will apply to that equipment as well I suppose.

Mr. TAYLOR: Well sir, I did not come here prepared to explain exactly what 6 (*a*) and 6 (*b*) cover. I presume this was passed by parliament a few weeks ago, and Mr. Kealey perhaps has information, but in our department we would not have any detailed explanation as to what exactly is or is not intended depending on interpretation from time to time.

Mr. GOODE: One other question. What about a set bought in the United States. There are some coming into British Columbia at the moment that are bought in the country to the south. What is the position as far as they are concerned in regard to this excise tax.

Mr. KEALEY: There is duty paid on them according to the value.

Mr. GOODE: But if anyone who visits the States for over 48 hours and buys a small television set worth, we will say $100, is entitled to bring that over.

Mr. KEALEY: They are not. The regulations were changed on that $100. TV sets are prohibited importation.

Mr. KNIGHT: Then I take it that a tourist or a native of Canada visiting the United States would be forbidden by regulation.

Mr. KEALEY: We have a regulation issued which states that television sets of any type and parts and picture tubes therefor are not to be permitted entry under tariff item 703(b). That is the tariff item under which people from Canada returning after a 48-hour absence from the country bring in $100 worth of goods.

Mr. GOODE: What is the date?

Mr. KEALEY: February, 1953.

Mr. GOODE: How do people in Canada know about that? How do you publish the regulations so that John Smith on the street knows that this has been changed from what it was last year.

Mr. KEALEY: This is published and sent out to the collectors of excise and the officers inform persons going across the border what they can bring back.

Mr. GOODE: I wanted it on the record.

Mr. HANSELL: That regulation only applies to television sets, and not to radios. Supposing Mr. Goode asked a question and instead of saying television sets, he made it a $100 radio, then what is the calculation of the excise tax. There will be two excise taxes then?

Mr. KEALEY: On a radio up to $100 value, you are allowed free entry after 48 hours absence from the country.

Mr. GOODE: You mean that a person who buys a radio for $99.95 will pay 15 per cent excise tax in Canada, but some Canadian visiting in the States can spend the same amount, and will not have to pay that tax.

Mr. KEALEY: He is permitted free entry.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions on Clause 1?

Mr. FLEMING: I take it the estimated amount applies to the present situation, and applies actually to both the anticipated revenue on the receiving sets on the one hand, and the television sets on the other.

Mr. TAYLOR: That was the forecast we made in the Department of Finance after consulting the other government departments concerned as to revenue for the coming financial year.

Mr. FLEMING: It is only a one-year estimate, and you have not projected beyond March 31, 1954.

Mr. TAYLOR: No.

Mr. FLEMING: I want to speak on clause 4. I do not intend to repeat what I said in the House. We all recognize the C.B.C. has to have revenue for the operations it carries on as approved by parliament. It happens that this year, according to the estimate made, the revenue estimated from the excise tax on the radio receiving sets, in other words 6(*a*), happens to be approximately the amount received this past year by the C.B.C. from the $2.50 fee on radio receiving sets. That may be nothing more than sheer coincidence, but it is made the occasion of an amendment to the Act. The revenue from 6(*b*) from television sets and tubes is anticipated this year, or estimated this year, to be $6 million. That may accord with the financial needs of the C.B.C. this year, with the supplement of the loan they are asking the House to approve. Beyond that it may bear very little relation to the needs of the C.B.C. and it should be understood that if we enact this section in its present form, the proceeds of this tax will flow automatically to the C.B.C. without reference necessarily to the needs of the corporation, and certainly without any reference to parliament. I am not going to repeat what I said in the House, but I think it is unsound legislation to set up grants in such a form that they go automatically year by year, but without any reference to parliament. When we amended the Act two years ago, we provided for parliamentary grants of $6¼ million per annum to the C.B.C. for a period of 5 years in advance. I do not think it is right. I think it ought to be on an annual basis, so that parliament has this matter before it each year, so that there will be no attempt to tie the hands of future parliaments. I think this section, which could in its present form, go on for all eternity without the slightest reference to parliament, is not sound legislation for that reason. It seems that if we pass this bill in its present form, the proceeds of these funds go directly, after collection by the Minister of National Revenue, to the Consolidated Revenue Fund and are paid by the Minister of Finance to the C.B.C. without it first coming before parliament, and I do not think this is a sound way for parliament to dispose of public money. What ought to be done is for this matter to be brought before parliament annually, so that parliament will have an opportunity of measuring the needs of the C.B.C. year by year, without the revenue estimated as likely to be received from these particular sources of that year, and if there is any deficit, parliament will then take the responsibility of meeting the deficit. If the shoe is on the other foot, I think parliament should have control of that situation. I think therefore that some amendment of this section is required, and therefore, in order to maintain parliamentary control over this annual payment, I am moving that clause 1 of bill 340 be amended by inserting in 4th line before the words "the Minister of Finance", the following: "subject to annual vote by parliament." The clause as amended would then read: "subject to annual vote by parliament the Minister of Finance shall from time to time grant to the corporation . . ." and so on.

That means that parliament will have control over the situation, and parliament will have knowledge of the situation as it actually exists, and will be able to make proper provisions by an annual vote coming up in the estimates in the same way as other votes do, and the revenue thus approved by parliament may be paid over from time to time in the manner named in the clause.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): Every year.

Mr. FLEMING: It would not come before us every year if this bill was passed in its present form.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): It does come in the budget.

Mr. FLEMING: No it does not come in the estimates. It does not have to be voted on.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): But you can speak on it, and voice your opinion anytime in the House providing you speak on the budget.

Mr. FLEMING: You can only discuss a thing like that on the budget debate, but not on the budget resolution in the committee of ways and means unless there is a specific resolution relating to it.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fleming moves that clause 1 of Bill 340 be amended by inserting in the 4th line, before the words "Minister of Finance" the following "subject to an annual vote by parliament". Any discussion gentlemen? Are you ready for the question?

Mr. KNIGHT: When does that five-year statutory period end?

Mr. FLEMING: March 31, 1956.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. JONES: I do not know what the proposer has in mind, but I do feel we should have some protection for the C.B.C. for their annual income during that period rather than have this passed, and I think we would have done better to have initiated a minimum income for that period, a minimum based on the first year's revenue if you wish, so that they can function for five years knowing approximately what they are going to get. As it is I can see the point. They may not know next year or the following year if they are going to get anything.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): It is to protect the C.B.C. and see that the C.B.C. can look ahead for the revenue it needs.

Mr. FLEMING: Cannot the C.B.C. trust parliament? Parliament trusts the C.B.C. Cannot the C.B.C. trust parliament year by year to meet its needs?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): Could you?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes.

Mr. GOODE: I rather agree with this amendment. I feel that there is no end to these matters of taking them out of the hands of the House of Commons. I think that the House has been very sympathetic—financially sympathetic—to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I have not seen in the House where they have had too much trouble receiving money. Of course Mr. Fleming has made his points well known since I have been here in 1949, but I am worried over this point of control of moneys getting away from the House, and I intend to vote for the amendment.

Mr. HANSELL: I would like to voice my opinion and it is this—in fact it has already been stated perhaps in other words—that in the amendment there is a vital principle involved. It is a principle that is very valuable and very important. It is a principle involving constitutional government; it is a principle that is inherent and one of the basic reasons for our present parliamentary system—that parliament should at all times control expenditures; and for that reason I am in favour of the amendment. I do not believe that it would affect the C.B.C. They will get their revenues. There may be an interim period when they may need money, and I do not doubt that, but I do not think it seriously affects them. In any event suppose it did slightly affect them at first, we cannot sacrifice vital principles for a little inconvenience.

Mr. FLEMING: On that point may I remind the committee that the way I am proposing here is the way the Canadian National Railways operate. They come to parliament annually, and I do not see any reason why the Canadian Brodcasting Corporation should not be prepared in the same way to come to parliament for an annual vote to meet their needs for that year.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): I do not believe this would affect the discussion of that item at any time when the budget resolution was on.

Mr. FLEMING: You would not have an item in the estimates on this basis.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): There is nothing to stop anybody in the House from asking questions.

Mr. FLEMING: The House has no opportunity unless we have an item before us to say whether the money shall be voted or not.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): This is based on the estimated revenue for one year?

Mr. FLEMING: For this year.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): If we find it is out of kilter altogether there is nothing to stop the Radio Committeee bringing in a resolution to amend this. I am not too fussy about adding all kinds of legislation on the order paper every year. It is something that should be handled by the department. It is clear the finance department are collecting the national revenue to finance the C.B.C.

Mr. FLEMING: You do not give money to government departments that way. Every cent has to be voted.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the questions?

Mr. FLEMING: Could we have a recorded vote?

The CHAIRMAN: Those in favour of the amendment?

(At this point a recorded vote is taken.)

The CLERK: Yeas 6, nays 9.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the amendment lost.

Shall clause 1 carry?

Mr. HANSELL: There is an interesting thing here. I do not quite understand why the clause "in the opinion of the Minister of National Revenue" is there. It seems entirely superfluous. It is not a matter of the opinion of the minister; it is a matter of an acturial calculation.

Mr. TAYLOR: It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the exact amount is not necessarily known with precise accounting exactitude. There are refunds; there are a variety of things of that sort. The Minister of National Revenue, it is my understanding, said he would be unable to make it exactly to the last cent every month and he would therefore estimate as closely as possible the amount being collected under this clause.

Mr. HANSELL: When the year ended he would not in his opinion be paying out more than the excise tax?

The CHAIRMAN: The section reads, Mr. Hansell, "are equal to the taxes collected."

Mr. HANSELL: The answer as I understand it is that the minister does not know from time to time what that amount will be. Is it possible he may also have a greater expenditude?

Mr. TAYLOR: It is my understanding he will know within a few dollars or few tens of dollars and avoid making detailed or exact accounting records.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 1 carry?

Mr. FLEMING: I would like to raise another point on this section. We were told in the budget speech of the Minister of Finance and in the resolution

leading up to the introduction of this bill that the funds from the two parts of section 6 of schedule 1 were to be allocated to respective uses. In other words that the revenue from section 6 (*a*) was to go to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for its use in connection with radio broadcasting and the revenue from section 6 (*b*) of schedule 1 was to be used by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for its work in the field of television.

Now, the C.B.C. has indicated to us that their finances on the two sides, radio broadcasting and television, are going to be kept quite separate. This section does not make any attempt whatever to carry out the promise of the budget speech or the later discussion on the resolution stage: it simply merges the revenue from section 6 (*a*) of schedule 1 to go to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for its use in connection with radio broadcasting and the revenue from section 6 (*b*) of schedule 1 to be used by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for its work in the field of television.

It simply merges the revenue from section 6 (*a*) and 6 (*b*) of schedule 1 in one lump and hands it out without any earmarking to the C.B.C. That was certainly not the intent put forward by parliament. I think this section should be recast by the drafting officials of the House to separate the two sources of revenue and devote them respectively to the approved uses.

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not think I can make any comments on Mr. Fleming's statement there. Our department did not draft this bill and I could not give any reasons for drafting it in this way rather than some other way.

Mr. FLEMING: I think the point is quite clear. I would suggest Dr. Ollivier be asked to recast this section. I think all members of the committee understood it was perfectly clear in the budget speech and in the speech of the Minister of National Revenue on the resolution stage preceding the introduction of this bill that there would be two sources of revenue to work with, that that from 6 (*a*) was going to the C.B.C. for radio and that from 6 (*b*) was going to the C.B.C. for television. There was some criticism by the Auditor General on the matter of the C.B.C. keeping its accounts of the two activities strictly separate and Mr. Dunton laid very proper stress upon the fact that the corporation is keeping its financial accounting strictly separate between the two activities. If this bill is passed in this form it simply means that there is no restriction laid by law on the C.B.C. to keep the sources of revenue separate and apportion them to their respective uses. There is nothing more than a reference by the Minister of Finance in the budget speech and that is not law.

Mr. TAYLOR: It was with that in mind that the Excise Tax Act when being amended was split in two parts, 6 (*a*) and 6 (*b*). 6 (*a*) roughly speaking covers broadcasting revenues and 6 (*b*) covers television revenues.

Mr. FLEMING: That just emphasizes what I was saying. I am suggesting we ask Dr. Ollivier tomorrow to bring us a draft of the section that will separate these two sources of revenue and apportion 6 (*a*) to C.B.C. for sound broadcasting revenue and 6 (*b*) for television revenue.

Mr. TAYLOR: The National Revenue Department will inform us month by month what amount of revenue is under 6(*a*) and the amount under 6(*b*) and we will transmit that to the C.B.C. in two separate amounts.

Mr. FLEMING: There is nothing there that obliges you to do it in two separate amounts.

Mr. TAYLOR: It might be one cheque but it would be accompanied by a statement.

Mr. FLEMING: There is nothing that obliges the C.B.C. to separate those and apportion them in the way mentioned. That we thought was fundamental to the whole approach to this question and I think that for the protection of

the C.B.C. that ought to be clearly stipulated and made a matter of statutory law. If you are a member of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and you receive this amount from time to time there is nothing in the law that tells you how you are to split it. You happen to know that part comes from 6(*a*) and part from 6(*b*) of Schedule 1, but you have no legislative direction as to how you are to use that.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): That is what they are doing.

Mr. FLEMING: No.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): That is what Mr. Dunton is doing.

Mr. FLEMING: He and the rest of the Board are entitled to be told the revenue from 6(*a*) is to be used for sound broadcasting and the revenue from 6(*b*) is to be used for television.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): They are doing it just the same.

Mr. FLEMING: They do not have to, but they are setting up the accounting with a view to keeping the two operations separate and they are entitled to the protection of a legislative Act to tell them how they are to apportion and use the sources of revenue.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fleming has raised a very interesting point. He has also suggested that we might defer consideration of this matter until tomorrow. I might point out that we have agreed to hear the Canadian Association of Broadcasters tomorrow and I would like to get this bill back to the House. I shall be glad to communicate Mr. Fleming's remarks to the minister and perhaps consideration might be given to them before the matter reaches the committee of the whole. I should like to have this bill reported this afternoon.

Mr. CARTER: I do not see the need for this. The C.B.C. has to make a report every year and that report will show what revenue was received and what the expenses were, and how they spent the amount proportionate for each purpose. I cannot see why we should bind them with all sorts of little two by four regulations. If we see they are not doing that—if they are overspending on one thing and underspending on another then it might be time to give direction.

The CHAIRMAN: I feel sure that consideration will be given to Mr. Fleming's suggestion before the bill reaches the committee of the whole.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): Have you not been told by the chairman of the C.B.C. that it was their intention to set up their expenditures in such a way—

The CHAIRMAN: That is quite correct. We have the statement not only from the C.B.C. but from the minister that revenues from 6 (*a*) will be devoted to radio and revenues from 6 (*b*) will be devoted to television.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): If that is not done the Auditor General will probably refer to it in his report to parliament.

Mr. FLEMING: The Auditor General will not have any right to do that whatever. It is not a matter of law; it has nothing more than the status of a remark made in the House of Commons by the Minister of Finance without any legislative sancton behind it, unless we put it in here.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Chairman, it appears to be your desire to report this matter back to the House, and I think we should appreciate the reasons for it, but I do think it would be not quite safe to report the bill back to the House without comments and have the comments raised in the House. If it is reported back we should then decide whether or not the committee feels that such a provision should be written into the Act, and we could then report it back to the House with a recommendation from the committee. I

certainly feel that if it just goes back from this committee without any recommendation it is going to be extremely unlikely, with the pressure of business down there, that it would be amended in committee of the whole House.

The CHAIRMAN: What Mr. Fleming, as I understand, is actually stating is that consideration be given to the points which he has raised. Now, I am suggesting that without any additional recommendation we can report this bill back to the House and Mr. Fleming's remarks will be brought to the attention of the minister and consideration will be given in that way. He is perfectly at liberty to raise the same point when the matter reaches the committee of the whole.

Mr. FULTON: But the bill was referred to us for our action and if we do not take any action, either by way of actually amending it or by sending it back with a report recommending an amendment, then the House is going to say, "Well, the Radio Committee has considered the bill and sent it back in the form in which they received it; therefore that is the form in which it will be passed."

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I call the clause?

Mr. FULTON: Could we not give consideration to sending the bill back? If we do not feel that we are qualified to work out the technical details of what is a legal point here, and you are in a hurry to get the bill back, I am suggesting that we cooperate with your desire by sending the bill back but with a recommendation from the committee that such an amendment be incorporated when it has gone before a committee of the whole House. Then in the meantime the law officers can be working on that, and the amendment can be ready.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether the committee would be willing to accept such a recommendation; it has not been advanced in a way in which the committee can express an opinion.

Mr. FLEMING: If we cannot take long enough to refer this matter to Dr. Ollivier, I will draft an amendment.

Mr. HANSELL: There is this observation I might make. I am in agreement with the chairman that we communicate these observations to the minister with a request that he bring in some amendment and, if he does not, the way is still open to make an amendment in the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Quite right.

Mr. HANSELL: What we are liable to do is to defeat the purpose by proposing an amendment here now; then the minister will have a perfect right to say, "No, we are not going to change it because the committee refused to recommend it."

Mr. FULTON: That is my point. And I said rather than refer the bill back with a report that this point was discussed we should decide whether or not we are going to refer it back with a request from the committee that such an amendment be considered.

Mr. HANSELL: If you take it back to the House with a request or an amendment that is what it would amount to—to the committee approving.

Mr. FULTON: Approving the principle but saying that we have not actually drafted such an amendment ourselves. I do not know whether that would satisfy Mr. Fleming, but it would satisfy me because I would be afraid that if we move a formal amendment here it would be defeated and that would be the end of it.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): The chairman has said that you have a right to submit the point raised by Mr. Fleming.

Mr. FULTON: As a request from the committee, or merely as a report that this was discussed here?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): Coming from the chairman. He submits that to the minister because he has had something to do with it in the committee and the minister will take it into consideration.

Mr. FULTON: I think the minister will be entitled to say: what did the committee do about that point raised by Mr. Fulton?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): Mr. Robinson will tell the minister what the committee thinks about it.

The CHAIRMAN: At the present time I understand that Mr. Fleming is going to give me an amendment, and I shall find out what the committee thinks about it.

Mr. FLEMING: I might mention, Mr. Chairman, that this suggested amendment has been drafted hurriedly. I would rather have seen this matter referred to Dr. Ollivier. I do not think it would have involved any delay. We all want the business of the House expedited as far as it can be done with due regard to our duties to review this bill and improve it as far as we can; but if the amendment is to be drafted at short notice, that is my idea.

The CHAIRMAN: I will read the suggested amendment:

> That clause 1 be amended by adding thereto the following: 'And that the taxes collected under clause (*a*) of said section six of schedule 1 be devoted by the corporation to sound broadcasting, and the taxes collected under clause (*b*) of said section six of schedule 1 be devoted by the corporation to television'.

Mr. FLEMING: I want to make it quite clear that I do not want to force a vote on the amendment. I would much rather see this go forward along the lines suggested by Mr. Fulton as a recommendation that the minister, before moving this into committee of the whole, could give consideration to an amendment along these lines.

Mr. BEAUDRY: I will make this observation with regard to the amendment of Mr. Fleming, that it might—I say might—defeat the very purpose of this bill by trying to embody such an amendment as you are now voicing, for this reason: we are not granting C.B.C. by this any other resources than those in the case of radio already existing and those foreseen for television. Should the estimates be wrong or should the result of sales of TV and radio sets be vastly different from what they are estimated we would then, by law, force the C.B.C. to, perhaps, definitely vary from the job it has to do in either radio or television, which I do not think is our intent or purpose, and by law C.B.C. would be compelled to operate in a very peculiar fashion until the next session of parliament. I appreciate the intent behind Mr. Fleming's amendment, but I wonder if we would not be courting serious trouble if we were to implement it.

Mr. DECORE: I agree with the observations made by the last speaker. After all, the amount of revenue anticipated from section 6(*a*) and section 6(*b*) is only an estimated amount, and it could very well be that the amount of revenue may be more or may be less under 6(*a*) and I think that both the minister and the C.B.C. should be given a freer hand, because these are the only funds they will have at their disposal, and I think the wording of this section as it now stands should remain as it is.

Mr. MACLEAN: It seems to me in following the debates in the House, and the budget speech by Mr. Abbott that the whole purpose of this was that the people who enjoyed sound broadcasting should pay the cost roughly, and the people who have the benefit of television broadcasts—and it should be remembered they are not all Canadian people by any means—that they

should pay the major cost of television. If one were to follow these last two suggestions, the implication is that the C.B.C. might use the revenues collected from the sale of sound receivers on television and vice versa, and in that way I think you would be introducing an injustice as far as certain people are concerned. You might end up in the position where people who have ordinary radio receivers only are paying part of the cost of television, or you may have the reverse situation. I think the whole purpose of this was that the people who benefit from the television service should pay for it, and the people who benefit from the ordinary broadcasting service should pay for that, insofar as this bill is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

Mr. GOODE: I would hope that Mr. Fleming would withdraw this amendment. I agree with Mr. Hansell again in this case that by bringing this amendment to the committee he is going to defeat his own object. I am going to have to vote against this amendment, and I would expect the majority of the members of the committee would do likewise, which would leave you, Mr. Chairman, in the position of not having to mention this matter to the minister at all. Why not withdraw this amendment? We have full confidence in the Chairman. He has told us that he will mention the matter to the minister. There is an opportunity in the House to present an amendment should it be thought necessary, but I would certainly suggest, and I hope Mr. Fleming will accept the suggestion, that this amendment be withdrawn at this time.

Mr. JONES: I agree with that because I think at the moment, the amendment would defeat its object. I would be opposed to it, but it could be modified, and may be made acceptable if you inserted in that, "75 per cent should be devoted to television" and 25 per cent to the other, leaving the C.B.C. free to decide on the transfer of 25 per cent from one to the other. You may have a surplus in one, and a deficit in the other, but rather than handicap them entirely, they should have this leeway if you want to make sure that they each get the share they are entitled to.

Mr. FLEMING: I wonder if honourable members have considered the position in which the board of governors of the C.B.C. would be left if the bill was passed in this form, or the form suggested by Mr. Jones. Who would want to take the responsibility in the C.B.C. for mingling these funds or taking the funds raised for one purpose and using them for another. They are entitled to the benefit of legislative direction from parliament on this matter.

Mr. DECORE: Which they have.

Mr. FLEMING: No they have not.

Mr. DECORE: It will be up to them to decide how much is raised for television and how much for radio.

Mr. FLEMING: Do you want to put them in the position where parliament will be putting $12 million in their hands this year, but will not tell them how it is to be divided between television and sound broadcasting. I do not think it is fair to the C.B.C. They are entitled to know what is the will of parliament in this matter. Surely that is the minimum obligation we owe them. Do I understand that Mr. Beaudry is suggesting that the C.B.C. should be free to take some of the revenue derived from the sale of television sets and use it for development of sound broadcasting or vice versa.

Mr. BEAUDRY: I am not suggesting that at all.

Mr. FLEMING: That is implicit in what Mr. Beaudry has said. If it is your intent and understanding that the C.B.C. should have for the purposes of

sound broadcasting the revenue derived from the sale of radio sets and tubes, and if it is your intent and understanding that the C.B.C. should have for the purposes of the development of television the revenues derived from the sale of television sets and tubes, I think it is your duty to the C.B.C. and to parliament to say so in this bill, and not to pass one fund without it being earmarked at all.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not know whether it is advisable to call Mr. Dunton so that we can hear an expression of his views on that, but it seems to me surely there are two matters involved, and I did not think we were discussing it quite so far as Mr. Fleming's amendment goes. I thought we were discussing the matter of bookkeeping and whether or not the two accounts should be kept separate.

The CHAIRMAN: We have been assured by the C.B.C. that the two accounts would be kept separate.

Mr. HANSELL: This amendment goes further, and restricts them to spending on television the amount of money received in the sale of television sets, and that they must spend the amount of money received on the sale of radio sets on sound broadcasting. I am wondering whether that is altogether practicable. To give an illustration. Supposing the C.B.C. decides to remodel a building, and create studios that can be used for either radio or television, what are they going to charge it to? What fund are they going to take it from. There may be several matters which could be included in that category.

Mr. FLEMING: They do it all the time now. They are apportioning the items of expenditure now, as Mr. Dunton said within the last week, partly to sound broadcasting and partly to television. They are trying to keep a completely separate system of accounting on the two operations.

Mr. HANSELL: I agree that accounting should be kept separate, but to say they cannot spend any money they receive on one account on the other is a different matter altogether, and I do not quite see how they can operate that way.

Mr. FLEMING: That is what the minister said in the House in proposing this in the first place.

Mr. MACLEAN: As I recall the minister's statement in the House, he gave figures based on the expected sale of television receiving equipment, and he estimated, I think, an amount of $6 million in this year, and I think it was also estimated that that would also be an equivalent on thousands of television receivers to approximately $15 per set, and the implication that seemed to be carried in all the statements of the minister—I do not remember that he actually said it point blank—but the implication was that the revenue received from the sale of television sets should be applied to the development of television broadcasting in this country, and the C.B.C. should be limited to that, and if that is the intention of the minister I think the committee has a responsibility and an obligation to the C.B.C. to give them some direction so that they have it in black and white that this is the intention of parliament.

Mr. DECORE: The figures given by the minister are all estimated figures as to the amount of revenue, and I do not think that the hands of the C.B.C. should be tied down to the extent where they could not use the funds at all from the amount of revenue they get under section 6 (*a*) and 6 (*b*) of schedule 1 of the Excise Tax Act.

Mr. FULTON: The figures used by the minister may be estimates, but my understanding of the statements of the intention of the minister was that it was not an estimated intention, but a firm intention, and it was also my understanding on evidence given by Mr. Dunton earlier in this committee that it

would be their intention to apply the revenue derived from one source to the one type of activity, and from the other source to the other type of activity, and I think a committee of parliament also should decide as to whether this is their intention, and I certainly hope it would be their intention, because I do not see why those who enjoy sound broadcasting, with no hope of getting television for perhaps 25 or 30 years or more, should pay taxes on the purchase of radio equipment which will be devoted to the development of television broadcasting which is only going to benefit other sections of the population. I think parliament should clearly state its intention.

The CHAIRMAN: As I said before, I think Mr. Fleming has raised a very interesting point. At the same time, I think he would be the first to agree that it is a point which would require very careful draftsmanship by our legal officers, and I think he would also be prepared to admit that the amendment which he drafted in several seconds—good lawyer though he is—may not be drafted in a form suitable to the statute books of Canada. I was wondering if my original suggestion might be acceptable, namely that I will draw Mr. Fleming's suggestion to the attention of the minister in order that it may have his serious consideration, and consideration by the law officers. The matter will be before the committee as a whole, and if the minister decides that no action can be taken, Mr. Fleming can be ready with an amendment in which he would have, possibly, more confidence than the one which he has drafted so hurriedly this afternoon.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): I think that should be acceptable to Mr. Fleming.

Mr. FLEMING: Why?

The CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to withdraw your amendment?

Mr. FLEMING: I am leaving it to you Mr. Chairman on that basis. If something is not done on that section, I should certainly raise it in the House, and I reserve my rights in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Quite right. I take it you have not moved the amendment. Shall clause 1 carry?

Mr. FLEMING: I have given notice what I think ought to be a suitable amendment under the circumstances, and I will leave it there for the moment.

Mr. GOODE: One other question. I would like to ask why radios brought over from the United States were not included in the regulation Mr. Kealy read to us.

Mr. KEALY: I cannot answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 1 (minister to grant amounts) carry?
Carried.

Shall clause 2 (minister to grant amounts) carry?
Carried.

Shall clause 3 (coming into force). (Repeal) carry?
Carried.

Shall the title carry?
Carried.

Shall the bill carry?
Carried.

Shall I report the bill.

Mr. FLEMING: With reservations.

The CHAIRMAN: Agreed.

Now gentlemen, we are to hear Mr. MacDonald of the Canadian Congress of Labour and I will ask that the brief be distributed.

Mr. Donald MacDonald, Secretary-Treasurer, Canadian Congress of Labour, called:

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, Mr. Donald MacDonald, secretary-treasurer of the Canadian Congress of Labour. Mr. MacDonald has with him several other gentlemen and I am quite sure you would like to have them introduced to you.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to introduce first the executive secretary, Mr. Norman Dowd; our research director, Dr. Eugene Forsey; and director of public relations Mr. Jack Williams.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed please Mr. MacDonald.

The Canadian Congress of Labour welcomes this opportunity to appear before you. The Congress holds stong views on broadcasting, which it has stated many times. It placed them before the Massey Commission emphatically and at some length. The congress' policy is substantially what the Massey Commission recommended, what every parliamentary committee on the subject has recommended, and what every government for the last twenty years has followed.

It may be asked why we can't just leave it at that. There are three main reasons. First, though our basic policy remains "unrevised and unrepented," some new aspects of the subject have appeared, or become important, since the Massey Commission reported. Second, in the last year or two, two of our affiliates have been organizing C.B.C. employees, and the corporation's attitude has left a great deal to be desired. Third, the private broadcasters have recently renewed, and intensified, their offensive against the present national policy on radio and television broadcasting; and this, we think, makes it imperative for us to reaffirm our support of that policy, and to give our reasons for the faith that is in us.

The essentials of our position we stated to the Massey Commission as follows:

"The congress believes in public ownership of radio broadcasting. Its conventions have repeatedly passed resolutions asking that the whole system should be publicly owned, as the Aird Commission originally recommended; and the persistent campaign of the private broadcasters against the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has only strengthened the congress' convictions on this point. None the less, the congress recognizes that the existing system enjoys a wide measure of popular support, that it has been approved by numerous parliamentary committees, and that it works reasonably well. The congress' most immediate concern, therefore, is that the existing system should be preserved and strengthened.

"But it is essential to be clear about what the existing system is. The private broadcasters and their friends never tire of drawing an analogy with railway transportation. There we have public enterprise competing with private enterprise. But the board of directors of the public enterprise, Canadian National Railways, has no control over its competitor, the Canadian Pacific. On the contrary, both are equally subject to regulation by an independent public body, the Board of Transport Commissioners. In broadcasting also, they argue, we have public enterprise competing with private enterprise. But in this case, the board of directors of the public enterprise, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, has complete control over its competitor. This, the private broadcasters argue, is a monstrous anomaly, which would never be tolerated in railway transportation. It should be ended in broadcasting.

The vice-chairman assumed the chair.

"But the analogy is wholly false, for reasons which have been fully and admirably placed before you by the C.B.C. itself. Public policy in railway transportation is to have two competing systems. Public policy in radio broad-

casting has never been anything of the sort. It has been to have one publicly owned system; with relatively small private stations ancillary to the national system. This is made perfectly clear in the report of the Aird Commission (whose members, incidentally, certainly were not socialists). It is made perfectly clear in the Broadcasting Act. It has been made perfectly clear time and time again in the reports of successive parliamentary committees. As the C.B.C. has explained in its brief, any attempt to create in broadcasting a system parallel to that in railway transportation would mean a complete reversal of the public policy of the last twenty years, and the destruction of the distinctive system which Canada has built up. The apparently harmless plea for an independent regulating body is in fact a demand that the C.B.C. should be done to death; slowly, perhaps, but none the less surely. If this demand is granted, our Canadian system of broadcasting will ultimately disappear and we shall have in its place a carbon copy of the American system, and a carbon copy made in the United States at that.

"If that is what the Canadian people want, they are entitled to have it. But they are also entitled to know what it is they are being asked to do. They should not be led to suppose that granting the private broadcasters' demand for an independent regulatory authority would be only a minor change. If it were, the private broadcasters would never have kept hammering away at it as they have, year in and year out, in the face of repeated rebuffs by successive parliamentary committees.

"That the ultimate aims of the private broadcasters do in fact go far beyond any minor changes in the existing system is manifest from statements made to this commission by the chairman of the board of directors of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters. Judging from the Canadian Press report, Mr. Guild was remarkably frank.

"First, though disclaiming any intention of asking for creation of a private trans-Canada network, he was careful to make it clear that the private stations could operate such a network without assistance from the C.B.C.

"Second, he declared his belief that the private stations were 'in fact providing the primary radio service and that the national system should function as an outgrowth of their services'. The first part of this is a case of the wish being father to the though. The second part is ominous. For it makes unmistakably clear that what Mr. Guild wants, and presumably what his organization wants, is to turn our system upside down. Instead of a publicly owned system with ancillary private stations, they want a privately owned system with ancillary public stations. They want the tail to wag the dog.

"Third, Mr. Guild appears to have engaged in an interesting play of words on the expression 'public interest.' The C.B.C. brief had drawn a sharp distinction between the public interest and pursuit of profit. Mr. Guild was, naturally, anxious to prove that this distinction was false. He denied that 'the prime consideration of the privately-owned radio stations is commercial . . . In practical operation, commercialism does not precede public interest. It follows it. Any operator of a privately-owned station knows that he cannot secure commercial revenue until after he has secured listeners.' But 'public interest' and '*the* public interest' are not the same thing. The public may be greatly interested in a program which is not in the public interest. So Mr. Guild's happy harmony between the pursuit of profit and the public interest is based on nothing more substantial than verbal sleight-of-hand.

"The Canadian Congress of Labour, like the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, believes that present public policy in regard to radio broadcasting is basically sound. It believes that the C.B.C. should continue to enjoy its present powers or regulation over private stations. It strongly opposes

the creation of an independent authority to regulate both the C.B.C. and the private stations. It is convinced that the creation of such an authority would sooner or later, and perhaps rather sooner than later, mean that Canadian radio would be swallowed up by American. The effect of that on the development of the arts and letters in Canada needs no elaboration. If we want a genuinely Canadian culture to flourish and grow strong, we must preserve our genuinely Canadian radio. Weakening the C.B.C. is not the way to do it.

"The development of television only reinforces this argument. The private broadcasters are trying to secure recognition of a privately owned radio system, operating on an equal footing with the C.B.C., and treating with the government, the regulatory authority, the C.B.C. and the public de puissance en puissance. If they can get that, it will be easy to do the same thing for television. But the amount of capital required for television is so large that in fact there cannot be two competing systems. The economic waste would be colossal and flagrant.

"Here, again, Mr. Guild's frankness is most revealing. The private broadcasting stations, he says, are prepared to go ahead with the development of television; and they believe that the licences for television stations should be for at least ten years because of the investment involved. Nothing could be clearer. All the private stations want is a ten-year start. They know that if they get that, the taxpayers, or the licence-fee-payers, simply will not tolerate duplication of the private facilities by the public enterprise. The result will be a television system completely commercialized and largely under the thumb of American interests. Such a system will be very nearly useless for the development of the arts and letters in Canada.

"The Congress is not anti-American. It recognizes that under any system, Canadian radio and television are bound to be powerfully influenced by American. Much of this influence will be healthy, stimulating and proper. But the congress is convinced, none the less, that Canada has, and should have, a culture of her own, and that outside control of radio and television is incompatible with that ideal.

"It would be more correct to say that Canada has two cultures of her own, English-Canadian and French-Canadian, interacting, we hope, to their mutual enrichment. Outside control of radio and television would be bad for our English-Canadian culture; it would be infinitely worse for our French-Canadian culture. English-Canadians have a big stake in the survival and strengthening of the C.B.C., and its control over television. But French-Canadians have a much bigger one. Their special interests, institutions and traditions would, necessarily, get short shrift from outsiders operating solely for profit. Under a publicly controlled system, on the other hand, those interests, institutions and traditions are bound to receive careful consideration and to carry great weight, if only because of the great, and often decisive, political power of the French-speaking electorate.

". . . (the Congress) is opposed to making the C.B.C. dependent on an annual vote by parliament, because that would undermine its independence and impartiality. It is also opposed to any increase in the amount of time devoted to commercial programs. If anything, there is too much of this sort of thing already, certainly more than the founders of our Canadian system contemplated."

We still feel exactly the same way. But the C.A.B. has apparently raised its sights. In the latest statement of its case, under the attractive title, "The Case for Freedom of Information," it appears to have abandoned the demand for an independent regulatory Commission and substituted two much more drastic alternatives to the present national policy.

The Canadian Congress of Labour is just as much in favour of freedom of information, and, it may be added, freedom of discussion, as the C.A.B. or anyone else; if anything, more so. Nobody has more to gain from those freedoms, or more to lose by restrictions on them, than the trade union movement. If we thought the present national policy meant restriction, we should be the first to protest. Indeed, when one of the C.B.C.'s proposed new regulations, a few months ago, seemed to present dangers to freedom of discussion on the air, we did protest, strongly, in a public hearing before the C.B.C. Board of Governors. We are not here to argue that all is for the best in the best of all possible broadcasting systems; on the contrary, we shall be presenting a variety of criticisms, and suggestions for improvement. But our criticisms and suggestions will start from an unwavering conviction that, in general, the present national policy on radio and television does provide for freedom of information and discussion, and certainly provides for it better than the C.A.B.'s proposed alternatives.

What are those alternatives?

First, to treat broadcasting just like other forms of publishing: "newspaper, pamphlet, platform, pulpit." "No one type of publisher, including broadcasting, should be singled out for specific discretionary controls." "All . . . should be governed equally by the established law of the land, especially the existing laws relating to libel, slander, false advertising and misbranding." ("The Case for Freedom of Information, " pp. 1-2.) In other words, anyone who wants to start a radio or television station should be free to do so, and free to broadcast whatever will bring him in the biggest profits, subject only to the law of libel, etc.; just like newspapers.

But broadcasting isn't just like newspapers, or pamphlets, or platforms, pulpits. There aren't just so many newspapers or pamphlets or platforms or pulpits to go round. But there *are* just so many broadcasting channels to go round. Provided the supply of paper and ink and type holds out, there is no physical limit to the number of newspapers and pamphlets. Provided the supply of building materials holds out, there is no limit to the number of platforms or pulpits. But there *is* a definite physical limit to the number of broadcasting stations. When a certain number of channels have been taken up, there just aren't any more.

Nobody has to decide whether Mr. X shall be allowed to start a newspaper, because his starting one doesn't prevent anyone else from starting one too. But somebody *does* have to decide whether Mr. X shall be allowed to start a broadcasting station, because his starting one of those may prevent anyone else from starting one too.

Treating broadcasting just like newspapers simply means handing it over to whoever gets there first with the most money. That is the CAB's first alternative.

Its second is that "if there be any merit in or need for, . . . specific discretionary controls, they should become part of the general law of the land as enacted by our representatives in parliament, should apply equally to all citizens, and be enforced in the courts." ("The Case for Freedom of Information," pp. 1-2.) If radio and television must be regulated, let parliament do it itself; put it all in the Act; no regulatory Board or Commission.

The only policy that would meet these requirements would be state monopoly. That would be "enacted by our representatives in parliament." It would "apply equally to all citizens," by excluding them all equally. It would be "enforced in the courts."

Short of that, the CAB's second alternative is a sheer impossibility. If there are to be private stations at all, then, since there is only a limited number of broadcasting channels, somebody has to say who shall get which. Parliament can't do it. So there must be a board or commission to do it. No

Act can possibly provide for all the circumstances, and parliament can't be perpetually passing new Acts to deal with new circumstances as they arise. So the board or commission must have a certain discretionary power.

Both these two CAB alternatives to the present national policy rest on an analogy between broadcasting and other forms of publishing. But that analogy is false. Broadcasting is publishing. But it is a special form of publishing. It is necessarily confined to a relatively small number of owners. It is not precisely a natural monopoly, since there is room for more than *one* station in a given area. But there is room for only a *few* stations in a given area. This applies to both sound and television broadcasting, but with special force to television.

Putting it another way: broadcasting is publishing, yes; but it is also a public utility. As a public utility, it must be subject to public regulation like other public utilities. Other forms of publishing are not public utilities, and so do not require such public regulation and control.

Putting it another way again: broadcasting exploits the public domain. Other forms of publishing do not. So broadcasting calls for special measures which other forms of publishing do not.

There is another flaw in this argument that broadcasting (and presumably television also), is just one form of publication. If anyone is attacked in a newspaper or pamphlet, he can at least get hold of a copy and find out exactly what it said. Can he get hold of the broadcast or television script? If the attack appears in a newspaper, he can write a letter to the editor, and most editors will publish it (even though often with an editorial note containing a fresh attack). If the attack is in a pamphlet, the victim (if he can afford it) can issue a pamphlet reply. But how much chance has he of being able to reply to an attack from a private radio station over the same station? How much chance will he have of being able to reply to a television attack? And if the newspaper, the radio and the television are all controlled by the same person or corporation, where is he? This is not hypothetical or theoretical; we can give concrete examples.

When the C.B.C. is drawing up its television regulations, this question of the right of reply is one it ought to consider.

Sir Richard Livingstone, the former vice-chancellor of Oxford University, in an article on "The Meaning of Civilization," in *The Atlantic Monthly* of March 1953, says: "In many ways I mistrust the state and I should scrutinize carefully any extension of its powers. But I should like to put under its supervision, or rather under the supervision of independent public corporations, those cultural activities which have great educational importance. I would not leave them to chance or to exploitation for private profit.

"To come to a practical point, I should like to see radio, TV, and the films controlled, not by the state directly, but by some public body. These three are today probably the most influential instruments of public education, for they are at work on most of us throughout our lives; the artists and technicians who produce them are gifted people who know their job thoroughly; they move us, as unfortunately education in school and college often does not; and their influence is the greater because for the most part we do not realize it. I do not think that forces of this kind should be directed in the last resort by motives in private gain."

In this country, it is obviously impracticable to place the movies under public control. But it is not impracticable to put radio and TV under public control. We have done it. We are now being asked to undo it. The Canadian Congress of Labour does not want it undone. There is more than enough of the "motive of private gain," more than enough commercialism, more than enough advertising, in broadcasting now. "The motive of private gain" is responsible for these repeated assaults on our public radio and television system.

It is responsible for the advertising which is a pest and a nuisance on radio and will be worse on television, and which would be worse still if the private broadcasters succeeded in their aim of giving us a radio and television system the very image and transcript of the American.

This plague of advertising is something we on this continent are apt to take for granted. Our attitude is like Prince Albert's to the weather: "We should not complain about it, for we cannot change it, but we must leave it as it is." But we don't have to take it for granted. We can change it. We don't have to leave it as it is; and we certainly don't have to take any more of it.

A writer in the London *Spectator,* March 6, 1953, describes his feelings after having seen, by invitation, an example of American commercial television: "a half-hour American film, starring Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., and Constance Cummings and other celebrities with whom I am more slightly acquainted, at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of which a very well turned-out gentleman proclaimed, with many ingenious variations of voice and action, the merits of a beverage called Rheingold beer. I give it a free advertisement here," the article proceeds, "to compensate for the expression of a fervent hope that I shall never see it or any other commodity, liquid or solid, advertised on a British television screen."

It is doubtless too late to express such a hope here; but it is not too late to express the hope that advertising on Canadian radio and television, especially television, will be kept to a minimum.

But if the private broadcasters get their way, advertising will not be kept to a minimum; it will be pushed to the very limit that a long-suffering public will stand. The CAB waxes lyrical over what it calls "publication of commercial information, called advertising, which enables competitive merchandise and services to be made known to the public, successful business to expand, goods to be mass produced and marketed, to the advantage of consumers and producers alike. Unnecessary restrictions on advertising damage the producer and the consumer, reduce the value of businesses and diminish tax collections." ("The Case for Freedom of Information," pp. 4-5.) Not a hint, of course, of the appalling social waste involved in puffing one brand of stuff against others; not a hint that in our own homes we ought to have a chance to be let alone, ought to be able to turn on the radio or television set without having our ears and eyes assailed by the advertising which pursues us everywhere else. No: the earth is the advertiser's, and the fullness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein.

But the CAB is only asking for the removal of "unnecessary" restrictions on advertising. Yes; but who decides what is "unnecessary"? Presumably the radio or television station owner. And what criterion will he use? Nine times out of ten, almost certainly, the simple "Will it pay?"

If this seems unduly cynical, look at the particular examples of advertising which are not allowed now and which the CAB thinks out to be. First, "any program or spot or flash announcement sponsored by any person for the purpose of promoting the sales of interests of any bonds, shares or other securities, except the securities of the government of Canada or of any province, municipality or other public authority," and any program, etc., promoting the sale of interests of "any mining or oil property or any interest in any mining or oil property." "The Case for Freedom of Information," p. 10.) So we ought to allow unlimited share-pushing over the air, subject only to the laws against fraud, etc.? We let newspapers do it; why not radio and television? There is at least one simple reason: newsprint is not, for practical purposes, limited in quantity; radio and television time is. If a newspaper chooses to give a couple of pages to advertisements of shares, that doesn't mean it must cut the space it allots to other things. But if a radio or television station chooses to give an hour to advertisements of shares, that *does* mean it must cut the time it allots to other things.

What other restriction on advertising does the CAB single out as "unnecessary"? The prohibition of "any advertisement or testimonial for any article to which the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act or the Food and Drugs Act applies unless the continuity of the advertisement or testimonial has been approved by the Department of National Health and Welfare and by a representative of the corporation" (the C.B.C.); "any recommendation for the prevention, treatment or cure of a disease or ailment unless the continuity thereof has been approved by the Department of National Health and Welfare and by a representative of the corporation." ("The Case for Freedom of Information," p. 11) This, says the CAB virtuously, "imposes a limitation on broadcasting that does not exist upon any other form of publication. One of the basic principles of democracy is freedom of choice for the individual, subject always to punishment of abuse of that choice. This principle applies to such advertising in all forms of publishing other than broadcasting; and we suggest it is valid here. Even if the principle of prior inspection by the Department of National Health and Welfare be accepted, there is no public need requiring prior approval of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation." (The case for Freedom of Information p. 11.)

Once again, the same old argument that broadcasting is just one form of publishing; just like newspapers; and the more examples the CAB gives, the hollower it rings. Certainly the present regulations impose a limitation on broadcasting that does not exist for any other form of publication. So they should; and for telecasting the case is even stronger. Quackery in print is bad enough; quackery over the air, "with many ingenious variations of voice and action," is infinitely worse. An inflection of the voice, or a lift of the eyebrow, can give added, or even very different, meaning to a sentence which in cold print would be relatively harmless; and radio and television programmes will reach people who would never look at a printed advertisements for these nostrums. That is why prior approval by the Department of Health and Welfare is necessary. But even if that department has passed the programme as harmless from its point of view, there is still the question of taste and decency. It is one thing to read, in small print, in a newspaper, highly coloured, or even realistic, descriptions of diseases or certain physiological processes; it is quite another to have the same thing howled or crooned at you over the radio, or to see it on television. How many people really want to have this sort of thing thrust at them when they turn on their radio or television set? We are not as fussy as the Victorians; but there are still some things that are not done or talked about in polite society, or in the presence of ladies and children. That is why prior approval of the CBC is necessary for this type of advertising.

It may be asked, "What is the congress driving at? Does it think radio and television should be used simply for uplift, simply to give the people what the intelligentsia think they ought to hear and see?" No. But we do not think radio and television should be treated as just two more industries, two more forms of entertainment, two more ways of making money. They are industries. They are forms of entertainment. They can be ways of making money. But they are also means of education; very important means of education. Television may even turn out to be the most important single means of education. That is the decisive thing about radio and television, the thing that marks them off from other industries and forms of entertainment. It ought to be the decisive factor in public policy on this subject.

The congress is not asking that Canadian radio and television should present a steady stream of symphonies, instructive lectures and edifying sermons. Our members, like other people, listen to the radio and watch television at least partly for fun. They want entertainment, and they have a right

to it. But they also want some other things, and have a right to them. What the Congress wants is a reasonable variety of programs to meet various tastes and needs. Untrammelled free enterprise is bound to give us too little information and too much soap, because soap pays. (1)

We think the C.B.C. is, in general, doing a good job. So are some of the private stations. But some aren't, and we question whether the C.B.C. is doing all it might to stir them up in this respect. When licences come up for renewal, the C.B.C. is supposed to satisfy itself that various requirements, including public service requirements, are being met. Does it? If it does, the fact is not evident: if it doesn't, it should. The Massey Commission found that many of the private stations left a great deal to be desired on this point. There should have been a marked improvement since. Has there?

The C.A.B. wants to have the regulations on political broadcasting loosened up. It wants "such useful devices as interviews, question and answer programs, quiz shows and similar program mechanics" allowed. It wants "procedure in provincial and municipal elections... left to the authorities concerned." It wants "publication by broadcast... permitted in connection with political views and political statements during the course of elections or otherwise on exactly the same basis now existing for all other forms of publication." ("The Case for Freedom of Information," pages 8-9.)

The congress suggests that these proposals should be treated with the greatest circumspection, not to say the greatest suspicion. The present system of handling political broadcasts has, in general, worked well. It should be changed only if those who want it changed can prove that it works grave injury to the public interest. The congress is not convinced that "interviews, question and answer programs," and so forth are desirable in political broadcasting. It is strongly opposed to the suggestion that broadcasting in provincial and municipal elections should be left to the provinces and municipalities. This means no control at all, for neither the provinces nor the municipalities have any legal power to touch broadcasting. The result would be to hand over broadcasting in municipal and provincial elections entirely to the individuals and parties with the longest purses. This is the delightful system that prevails in the United States, and the congress is unequivocably opposed to it. Money talks too loud in elections as it is. The congress is particularly opposed to a "let-'er-go-Gallagher" policy in provincial election broadcasting, since much of the jurisdiction over labour questions belongs to the provinces, and provincial elections therefore mean a lot to labour. Besides, it is convinced that taking off the controls in municipal and provincial election broadcasting would be used as an argument for taking them off in dominion election broadcasting also. This would be bad enough even with radio. It would be infinitely worse with television, because it costs so much more. If political telecasts are not handled in the same way as political broadcasts are now, then the party with the biggest war chest will simply swamp everybody else. In the last presidential election in the United States, the Republicans, who had the big money, got the big telecasts, and left the Democrats at a very serious disadvantage. This is not the sort of thing we want here.

But it is apparently precisely what the C.A.B. wants: to permit "publication by broadcast . . . in connection with political views and political statements during the course of elections or otherwise on exactly the same basis now existing for all other forms of publication." This just means auctioning political broadcasting and telecasting to the highest bidder; and in the case of telecasting, it also means the virtual exclusion of any but very high bidders. Just as a party buys space in a newspaper or on a billboard, or hires a hall, so it would buy radio time or television time. But, while even a poor party can buy some space in a newspaper or on billboards, or hire some halls, a poor party won't be able to buy any television time at all. And, to make

matters worse, television will probably knock the stuffing out of public meetings and make hiring halls a waste of time and money; so that, for all practical purposes, the C.A.B.'s policy would leave the poorer parties naked to their enemies. Effective electioneering would become a virtual monopoly of big money.

Besides, the more thoroughly we adopt the policy of free enterprise in radio and television, the more completely these great media of information will fall under the control of commercial interests whose enthusiasm for labour, and for new ideas and policies, is (to put it mildly) very moderate. For these people, things as they are have worked out well; it would be asking too much of human nature to expect them to allot much time on their radio or their television to people who want to make changes, at any rate unless those people are prepared to pay through the nose for the privilege, which they won't be able to do.

To make matters still worse, there is a distinct tendency for certain interests to gather into their hands the control of newspapers, radio stations and television stations. As long as newspapers are competing with radio and television, and these with each other, the poor party may have some chance of a hearing. But when the same people control the local paper (and in more and more places there is only one local paper now), the local radio station and the local television station, then, for the poor party, all three of them have the same device written over their doors: "All hope abandon, ye who enter here."

The C.B.C. is trying to see that all stations shall broadcast a certain proportion of Canadian programs. The C.B.C. objects. Its objections are worth examining, for the light they shed on the minds of the people who make them.

First, "the desires of the listeners are what should count." ("The Case for Freedom of Information," page 13.) This is just a flat repudiation of the educational function of radio and television.

Second, "Not the desires of a handful of precious esthetes fearful of competition." (page 13.) This is a confusion of ideas. Canadian programs are not necessarily programs which will appeal to the "precious esthetes." Some Canadian programs might make the "esthetes" sick. "Canadian" and "high-brow" are not interchangeable terms.

Third, the C.A.B. politely suggests that the C.B.C.'s effort to get a certain proportion of Canadian programs on all stations results from "the timidity" of a "largely self-appointed . . . 'cultural elite'," which "may be due to a desire for hothouse security and its unhealthy, artificial atmosphere of forced growth," or "to a desire to force acceptance of their works or performances by artificial control because they know these cannot find acceptance on merit." ("The Case for Freedom of Information," page 13.) This is linked to the assertion that "Canada's limited population and short history have not yet offered us full opportunity for the development of a great volume of Canadian creative material." (pages 13-14). True, but doubly irrelevant: (*a*) because "Canadian programs" need not consist wholly of "Canadian creative material," and (*b*) because the C.B.C. proposals provided for only 30 to 48 per cent of broadcast time to be devoted to Canadian programs. It is open to anyone to argue that these figures are too high; but the C.A.B. does not argue that. It argues that there shouldn't be *any* figures, or that if there are, they should be "part of the law of the land and... applied to all forms of publication—newspapers, magazines, books, pamphlets and films" (page 14), and garnishes the argument with sneers and innuendoes. Much the same argument, with much the same sneers and innuendoes, could have been applied against our whole tariff and railway policy, or indeed, against having a Canada at all.

As for other forms of publication: we have, at one time or another, tried to protect Canadian magazines and books; it is hardly necessary to protect Canadian newspapers; and it is impracticable to protect Canadian films. It is practicable to give reasonable protection to Canadian radio and television, and the C.B.C.'s proposals are an attempt to do it.

Fourth, the C.A.B. asks: "Must we eliminate Shakespeare, Beethoven, Chopin, Haydn and Gershwin because they were not Canadians? Shall we bar Holy Writ because it was not 'originally produced' in Canada? Shall we bar all the thousands of works that bring us pleasure, comfort, or solace because they were produced outside Canada?" ("The Case for Freedom of Information," p. 13.) The answer, of course, is no, and nobody has suggested we should. What the C.B.C. was talking about was programs originating in Canada. A play by Shakespeare performed in Canada is a Canadian program; so is a symphony by Beethoven performed in Canada. A reading of Holy Writ in Canada is a program originating in Canada. The C.A.B. could have saved itself a good deal of anguish at this point by taking the trouble to read what the C.B.C. said, and perhaps by consulting a dictionary.

Fifth comes a series of purple passages on the theme, "True Culture is Never Inbred. Canadian Culture Will Benefit by Learning From Others and Teaching Others." ("The Case for Freedom of Information," pages 14-16.) True, but irrelevant. Nobody is proposing to develop Canadian culture in a "vacuum," "quarantined" from the influence of the United States; no one is proposing to make us "live our life in a vault," "cut off by the artificial bars of a State created vault." All that the C.B.C. is proposing is regulations to give Canadian programs a fair chance against the otherwise overwhelming temptation to private stations to load their programs overwhelmingly with outside material.

All this, we must repeat, is even more important for television than for sound broadcasting, because television channels are fewer and television is so much more expensive.

We turn now to the question of the C.B.C.'s dealings with unions.

The C.B.C. ought to be a model employer. It certainly ought not to give private employers an object-lesson in how to sail as close to the wind as possible without getting caught. But that is precisely what it did when the National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians (CIO-CCL), generally known as NABET, applied for certification for a unit of C.B.C. employees.

The Canada Labour Relations Board ordered a representation vote, to be taken January 2, 3 and 4, 1953. On December 29, 1952, the Corporation sent to each employee concerned the following letter, signed by Donald Manson, General Manager, and J. A. Ouimet, Assistant General Manager:

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

MONTREAL, December 29, 1952.

Mr.
Toronto Studios.

Dear Mr.

As you know, the National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians (Head Office: Chicago—Canadian Office; Ville Saint-Pierre, P.Q.) which is known at NABET, applied to the Canada Labour Relations Board to be certified as the bargaining agent of a unit of employees of Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to which you belong.

At the conclusion of the application and after considering all facts presented to it, the board ordered that a vote be taken to ascertain whether or not a majority of employees in the bargaining unit favoured

having the National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians represent them in their dealings with Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

The National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians is a trade union. The function of a trade union after certification is the negotiation of contracts with an employer respecting working conditions of employees in the bargaining unit. In such negotiations the local of an international union such as NABET is represented by a bargaining committee. A bargaining committee must be composed of at least two of the employees in the bargaining unit who are usually accompanied by an international representative of the trade union. The employees should realize that certification of a trade union as bargaining agent for a unit of employees to which they belong places in the hands of a third person (the trade union) the right to contract on their behalf for what, in some cases, is an entirely new contract of employment. It is, therefore, clear that an employee should make an exhaustive study of the facts and exercise his best judgment in the selection of a trade union. Once a trade union is certified it is a technical and difficult procedure to decertify it.

National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians has carried out an extensive campaign among the employees in the bargaining unit. It was evident at the hearing before the Labour Board that the bargaining unit was also the subject of a campaign by a rival trade union. The Corporation has rigidly maintained a neutral position throughout these campaigns, it has no knowledge of the methods used by the trade unions in their campaigns and does not know what, if any, promises or allegations they made. Some employees may have been subjected to great pressure by their fellow employees or trade union representatives, but that is passed and the time is now at hand for you to express your wish with the freedom that is accorded you by the democratic process of a secret ballot.

The vote at hand is to determine whether or not you wish to be represented by National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians. In casting your vote, you should consider your own interest and your part as an employee of Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in discharging a public service. Your vote should be an intelligent one based on facts. Consider the following:

1. Is there any reason why you should elect National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians to represent you in your dealings with Canadian Broadcasting Corporation?

2. What, if any, condition of your employment can National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians improve that you could not improve by yourself or by means of some other organizations which you may prefer?

3. If there is some other organization you prefer which could improve conditions of your employment, is there any reason why you should vote in favour of National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians?

4. What is the cost of membership in National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians? Have you studied National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians' constitution in that regard? you should not rely on rumour. What benefits do you receive by the cost of membership in National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians?

5. What are the aims and purposes of National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians? Have you read its constitution in this regard? you should not rely on allegations made by any person. Do you accept their aims and purposes? Does the history of National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians reflect the practice of its aims and purposes?

6. Has National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians made a completely full and accurate disclosure of the matters referred to in questions 4 and 5?

7. What is the background and history of National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians? Who are its officers and executives? Where are these executives from? Have you met the international executives of National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians and if not, have you studied their background sufficiently to be satisfied that they are fit and proper persons to represent you as an employee of Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

8. Has National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians been certified to represent any group of Canadian employees and if so, what success did it enjoy in securing additional benefits for those employees?

9. What voice will you have in the affairs of National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians, particularly in forming its policy on both a local and international scale?

10. Has the international office of National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians the power to disapprove of any contract which you might prefer to enter into?

11. Are you prepared to strike against the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation if called upon to do so by National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians? What is the history of National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians as far as striking is concerned?

12. What disciplinary powers will National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians exercise over you?

13. Are you prepared to give up any or all of your personal rights in matters of your employment to a trade union:

The corporation recognizes the right of an employee to join a trade union of his choice and wishes to assure that your position with Canadian Broadcasting Corporation will not be affected by either joining or refusing to join a trade union. Membership in a trade union is not a condition of employment. The corporation recognizes your right and is sincerely interested in your welfare. Whether or not you wish to join a trade union or be represented by a trade union is entirely your own affair. The corporation does not intend by this letter to endeavour to influence your vote. This letter is merely for your information and guidance.

You will be notified of the time and place at which the vote is to be taken. The important thing is that you cast a vote since failure to vote will injure your cause. Vote, but vote intelligently.

The corporation takes this opportunity of expressing to you and your families its best wishes for the New Year.

(DONALD MANSON)
General Manager
(J. A. OUIMET)
Assistant General Manager

(The punctuation and spelling are as in the original.)

For sanctimonious and slimy sinuosity, this letter can have few equals even in the long history of employers' efforts to beat unions. Fortunately, the letter was as incompetent as it was nasty, and met the fate it deserved: the employees voted for the union. But the mere fact that the attempt was made does not augur well for future relations between the corporation and the union, unless the corporation's management repents and brings forth fruits meet for repentance.

One of the most alarming features of the letter is its ignorance of the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act under which the vote was being held. The statement that "a bargaining committee must be composed of at least two of the employees in the bargaining unit who are usually accompanied by an international representative of the trade union" is completely without foundation. The Act does not even mention a bargaining committee, let alone specify its composition. Before the C.B.C. starts bargaining with NABET, or any other union, its officials had better read the Act.

The corporation says it maintained rigid neutrality up to the time of the hearing before the Canada Labour Relations Board. So it should. But it was even more important that it should maintain the same neutrality after the hearing, when the vote had been ordered. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the management maintained neutrality as long as it had any hope that it could beat the union without even a vote, and dropped neutrality when it found it couldn't. Hence the letter. Hence the hints about NABET's "promises or allegations", the "great pressure" it "may" have used, the suggestion that the individual employee, or "some other organizations", might be able to strike a better bargain, the exhortations to ferret out every detail of NABET's constitution and history, with the repeated injunctions not to "rely on rumour" or an "allegations", and the sly hints that there is something shady about the union and that it is up to no good. The crowning touches are the disclaimer of any intention of trying to influence the employee's vote, the assurance that the letter is "merely for your information" (it gives almost no information, and the main item it does give is wrong) and "guidance" (so different from "influence"), and the "best wishes" to the employee and his family for the New Year.

The Canadian Congress of Labour takes this opportunity to register its emphatic protest against this performance. It is reprehensible in itself. It is doubly reprehensible in being manifestly inconsistent with public policy as laid down in the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act. It is triply reprehensible because it is done by a Crown corporation, with money provided by the Canadian people. The congress has repeatedly supported the C.B.C. against attacks. It has done so again today. It will do so in the future, whenever it thinks it necessary. But it would be derelict in its duty to its members, and to the people of Canada, if it did not condemn in the strongest terms this utterly inexcusable attempt to interfere with what the C.B.C. itself acknowledges is "entirely (the employees') own affair", and to frustrate the employees' efforts to exercise rights expressly conferred upon them by the law of the land. The congress hopes that your committee will not fail to include in its report a suitable passage on this subject.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I thank you very much Mr. MacDonald. Is the committee ready to sit at 8:30 this evening when we can question Mr. MacDonald on his brief.

Agreed.

EVENING SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum.

Mr. MacDonald finished the brief this afternoon and if there are any questions we can take them now.

Mr. Donald MacDonald, Secretary-Treasurer, Canadian Congress of Labour, recalled:

By Mr. Decore:

Q. Mr. Chairman, referring to page 16 of the brief, I notice Mr. MacDonald says as follows: "But the mere fact that the attempt was made does not augur well for future relations between the corporation and the union, unless the corporation's management repents and brings forth fruits meet for repentance." Now, I wonder if Mr. MacDonald would tell this committee just what kind of repentance he expects from the corporation?—A. Actually, I think the inference is clear that what we would like to see is a change in the attitude of the management towards the employees who are organized in the affiliated unions of our congress. The reference to which you have referred might be said to be semi-factetious, but nevertheless as far as the intent is concerned there is nothing facetious about it. We would like to see them from here in adopt a proper attitude toward our organizations.

Q. Is not this laying it down on the line that unless the corporation repents things are not going to go so well between the union and the corporation?—A. No. If the suggestion is that there is any implied threat, certainly nothing of the sort is contemplated, but our suggestion, I think, is based on our experience in that field, that certainly the beginning does not augur well for the future unless there is a change in the attitude.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, there are some words at page 16 which I think would have been far better left out of the brief, "For sanctimonious and slimy sinuosity". I think Mr. MacDonald should tell the chairman they are going to strike that out of the brief.

Mr. FULTON: No. I think you should tell the chairman where you got the inspiration for the remark.

Mr. GOODE: Let us look at the words. I do not think there was any necessity to put them in the brief. It is a good brief. It expresses your views. I do not agree totally with them, but it is a good brief, and I think in your last page you are going to spoil it if you leave those words in.

The WITNESS: Have you read the letter?

Mr. GOODE: I have read the brief twice since we left here tonight and personally I do not think you should ever have written the words, but having written them I would suggest you strike them out.

Mr. DECORE: May I first of all say that I agree with what Mr. Goode has said. I think you have a good brief. But I think it is an insult to this committee when you are referring to the C.A.B. as "garnishing the argument with sneers and innuendoes," and farther down that they should have consulted the dictionary. The C.A.B. have the right to express their views and they have the right to an opinion and I do not think they should be treated in this fashion. I do not agree with the C.A.B. completely, but I do not think they should be referred to the way they have been on page 13.

The CHAIRMAN: May I point out we are at the question period.

Mr. FULTON: And not the observation period.

The WITNESS: First I should, in view of what has been said, make it clear for the record that the Canadian Congress of Labour has no desire whatever, completely the contrary, of insulting this committee. There was no threat in their mind and still is not. The congress has nothing but the utmost respect for this committee.

Mr. DECORE: Why use this type of language?

Mr. FULTON: You hold rather strong views on the matter?

The WITNESS: The C.A.B. is entitled to its opinions and with that we do not quarrel, but we also are entitled to ours.

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Chairman, as a constant upholder of the C.B.C. in most things I was very surprised when a letter particularly came into my possession a few days ago and I suppose the proper person to ask about this would be Mr. Dunton. And I would like to ask you if and when Mr. Dunton appears, as I presume he will to reply to whatever material the C.A.B. brings, if we will have an opportunity then of questioning Mr. Dunton as to certain assertions in this brief and particularly as to this letter which is an astounding thing to me.

The CHAIRMAN: Of course in that I am in the hands of the committee. This week we will be hearing representations as you know in our other meetings. I should think the committee would wish to have an opportunity of further questioning.

Mr. KNIGHT: I was called from the room this afternoon and did not hear the brief read. Perhaps I could ask a question or two.

Mr. GOODE: May I have an answer from Mr. MacDonald first? I would like to know whether he is going to leave these words in the brief. I would like to have an answer to that.

Mr. KNIGHT: I did not know you had asked a question; I thought you had made a statement.

The WITNESS: We see no good reason, in view of our stated position with regard to the letter that is in there, why we should change the wording.

Mr. GOODE: You want to leave the word "slimy" in the brief?

The WITNESS: Well, it is according to what you take out of it.

Mr. FULTON: Apparently the word stands unless the chairman rules it out.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Fulton, I am not asking you. I am asking Mr. MacDonald. He is responsible for writing this brief.

The WITNESS: I have already said I see no good reason for changing the wording. It expresses our views.

Mr. GOODE: Whose views?

The WITNESS: The Canadian Congress of Labour views.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. I preface my remarks by saying I suppose we should ask these questions of Mr. Dunton, but I might ask Mr. MacDonald a general question or two. I might ask him what in his opinion is the relationship at the moment between the people who are in your union in respect to programming and technical people—what in his opinion is their personal relationship with management. Is it good; is it bad; is it deteriorating; is it improving; or what about it?—A. Frankly, I do not think I am in a position at this time to give a very intelligent answer to that. I have not been in touch with either one of our affiliates with respect to the C.B.C. operations for well over two months and I have heard nothing new in the meantime.

Q. There was some suggestion in my information of a backlog of overtime pay. Do you know anything about that? That certain of your union members had complained they had not been receiving their pay with respect to some overtime? I think it was earned last September and their complaint was they had not been paid by March?—A. I am sorry I am not familiar with that at all. Quite often our affiliates carry on their internal affairs and negotiations with their employers without including us in them or advising us what they are doing, and we have actually two affiliates who have employees

in the C.B.C. We have the National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians and the American Newspaper Guild and I would not know to which one of these groups or both the question would apply.

Q. Do you know if there is in the upper brackets of management in the C.B.C. a hostility to trade unions? In my opinion this letter certainly proves there is in that report. Have you any other reason for making that assertion? —A. Nothing other than the letter and my discussions, of course, with the officers of the organizations.

Q. And in your opinion of course it was an unpardonable thing for people in the position of Mr. Manson and Mr. Ouimet to issue such a letter as this in view of the fact that negotiations were taking place?—A. Very definitely. Actually, it was not negotiations, but it was on the eve of the representative election being held.

Q. One would naturally suppose that the reason for issuing the letter was to influence the election?—A. That was very definitely our opinion.

Q. That was your opinion and it is my own as well. One reading it cannot have any other opinion in regard to it. I think that is all. I would like to get Mr. Dunton to answer some questions and I hereby serve notice that I would like to have an opportunity of asking one or two questions in that direction when the time comes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Mr. Hansell.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. On page 1 and at the top of page 2 of your brief you refer to the argument that the Canadian Association of Broadcasters and other people have advanced for a regulatory body, namely, that the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways have the Board of Transport Commissioners as their regulatory body. Now you say: "But the analogy is wholly false, for reasons which have been fully and admirably placed before you by the C.B.C. itself. Public policy in railway transportation is to have two competing systems. Public policy in radio broadcasting has never been anything of the sort." Do you think that public policy is immutable?—A. I did not get your last word.

Q. I said immutable?—A. Oh, not at all, not at all. If it is necessary to change it, all well and good, if it is a change for the good; but certainly if the change is not for the good we feel that it should be opposed.

Q. One other question. In that same paragraph towards the end of the paragraph on page 2 I read: "The apparently harmless plea for an independent regulating body is in fact a demand that the C.B.C. should be done to death; slowly, perhaps, but none the less surely."

In what way would an independent regulatory body alter the function of radio in Canada to the extent that the C.B.C. would be done to death?—A. Well, sir, the rest of the argument in support of that follows on pages 2 and 3. I would suggest that certainly if an independent regulating body had control of it, there would not be the same protection and support that there is at present, and it would be subject to influences which perhaps cannot affect the situation at the moment.

Q. Are you not there assuming that the independent regulatory body would take certain action? We do not know what action they would take. They may strengthen the C.B.C. rather than weaken it. We do not know and nobody knows. May I read a bit: "If this demand is granted, then our Canadian system of broadcasting will utilmately disappear and we will have a carbon copy of the American system and a carbon copy made in the United States at that."

Mr. FULTON: On what page is that?

The WITNESS: Page 2.

Mr. HANSELL: I spoke of that to Mr. Ouimet and I asked this question: "Do you not think that a separate regulatory body would guard against such an adventure?"

Dr. FORSEY: Mr. MacDonald suggested I speak to this, if it is agreeable to the committee. This is a quotation from our brief submitted to the Massey Commission, for whose drafting I had some responsibility. Mr. MacDonald was not at that time our secretary-treasurer. I think the whole point we are trying to make here is, as Mr. MacDonald has said, explained on the rest of the page and on the following couple of pages, namely, that if you establish a separate independent regulatory body, you will be changing the whole basis of the present policy. Instead of having one system as we have now, with the C.B.C. as the backbone of it and the private stations playing a subsidiary role, perhaps the smaller ribs, to carry the metaphor farther, you would have the kind of thing we have got in railway transportation, with two equal powers, the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific (or, in this case, the C.B.C. and the private stations) lined up opposite each other and treating, as we have said later on, "with the government regulatory authority, the C.B.C. and the public, *de puissance en puissance.*"

To that we are totally opposed. We are convinced that if you reproduce in the field of radio, which is very different from the railway system, the kind of situation you have got there, then the importance of the C.B.C. will be very definitely diminished. It is bound to be diminished, and it will become merely one of two systems; not the central part of one national system, but merely one of two systems. It would be steadily played down. The independent regulatory body, even with the best intentions in the world, would be compelled by the very fact of its existence to do that. That would be its raison d'être. It would be compelled to treat those two separate systems as equals, just as the Board of Transport Commissioners has to treat the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific as equals. That would be a revolutionary departure in Canadian public policy in broadcasting and television. It is one in which we do not believe. We are convinced it would be disastrous. We believe it would result in the weakening probably the fatal weakening, of the C.B.C. At any rate it could not fail to have the effect of making the C.B.C. something totally different from what it now is.

Mr. HANSELL: That I think is just a matter of opinion. We may differ on it. I think that depends on the terms of reference given to the independent regulatory body. If one were set up, they would have their terms of reference and their responsibilities would be stated. They may take the attitude that the C.B.C. is getting public funds to the tune of $10 million to $15 million a year, therefore they should function this way or that way and regulate accordingly. But in any event the argument I fancy should not be used, that radio policy is for the protection or the setting up or the establishment of machinery. The object of radio policy is to give the people of Canada the best type of radio that is possible. Personally I cannot see that an independent regulatory body would fail to do that. However, once again, that may be a matter of opinion.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Forsey, in your brief on that subject you are giving the essentials of your presentation to the Massey Commission. Has your thinking along those lines changed in any respect since the C.B.C. is actually in operation with television?

Dr. FORSEY: Not as far as I can recall. I do not remember the exact wording of everything that we said in the brief presented to the Massey Commission. It is possible that somebody going through it with a microscope might find some word that we might want to change. But I cannot recall a single syllable that we want to change. As I have said, our policy is "unrevised and unrepented", to use the words of a distinguished friend of mine.

Mr. KNIGHT: Would you believe that it was even more necessary in the field of television since it has more potential in the making of good and evil?

The WITNESS: We have said that.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fulton.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether Mr. MacDonald cares to answer this question. It is immaterial whether he or Dr. Forsey answers it, but I would like to ask whether or not it is a fact to be gathered from the last two or three pages of the brief, particularly on page 14, where they refer to the letter, that the congress is prepared to admit that the C.B.C. may be extremely wrong in following the policy that it has followed.—A. We have not said the policy is wrong. We certainly say the management is wrong in the attitude they have adopted towards our union.

Q. Perhaps I should say, in the implementation of policy the C.B.C. may make very grave errors?—A. In administration.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): They are human.

Mr. FULTON: You admit that in your view they may have made a very grave mistake in the application of the policy they have followed?

Dr. FORSEY: In this instance yes.

Mr. FULTON: Would you admit that they may be equally inclined to make a very grave error in the application of any of the policies they are attempting to follow?

Mr. BEAUDRY: Do we want to look at the brief, or at outside considerations?

Mr. FULTON: I am asking questions of the witness, and if Mr. Beaudry wishes to give his own answers—

Mr. BEAUDRY: That is not my answer. We are discussing a brief, Mr. Chairman, which is there, and the question is whether we want to have it changed or implemented.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the question is on the brief.

The WITNESS: We think it is a perfectly sound question, and in so far as we are concerned we believe that any human being or human agency can err, including governments and all branches of government, and all individuals in them, and everybody else, including ourselves.

Mr. KNIGHT: Even the opposition.

The WITNESS: I did hope that would be gathered from my remarks, without me saying so specifically.

Mr. FULTON: Even the Canadian Association of Broadcasters may err in the statement of the case they are trying to put forward.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): They are human.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Would you admit that?—A. I admit that all error is possible.

Q. Dealing with the suggestion of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, which you attack in your brief, that is with the suggestion of the independent regulatory body, I was interested in what Mr. Hansell had to say, and I had marked some passages on which he asked questions. I will turn to page 8 of your brief, and I hope you will permit me to make certain preliminary observations and if you do not agree with me, then you can correct them. First in advancing the idea of an independent regulatory body,

those who advance it do not suggest that there should not be public control of radio and television. Is that a fair statement? Do you accept that as a statement of fact?—A. I do not know. I have seen nothing to support it, but if you say so, I will accept it.

Q. You have dealt with it on the basis of a comparison with the existence of the Board of Transport Commissioners. Would you suggest that the Board of Transport Commissioners does not control transportation in Canada, and that it does not lay down policy to which the two railways must conform in transportation in Canada. Would you mind saying yes or no?—A. Yes, they do.

Q. Would you agree or admit that if there were an effective public regulatory body in Canada, apart from the C.B.C., it could lay down a policy to which all radio and television broadcasting in Canada must conform?—A. The C.B.C. is a regulatory body.

Q. It is at the moment, but I am talking about an independent regulatory body. Would you admit that it could lay down a policy to which all broadcasting agencies, whether television or sound broadcasting, must conform?—A. If it was established under the authority of the Canadian government as a regulatory body, certainly; but I do not get the point of it.

Q. I was going to question you further if we could get agreement on that point.

Dr. FORSEY: I have two questions which would help make your questions clear to me, Mr. Fulton. One is that as far as I can see in these representations from the Canadian Association of Broadcasters which we have been discussing, there is not one syllable from start to finish about an independent regulatory authority. They seem to have dropped that idea completely.

Mr. FULTON: If you will remember the answers to questions I asked earlier, we agreed that people may err—to err is human—and therefore we can admit that the C.A.B. may have over-stated their case in discussing the question of radio in Canada. But I was attempting to discuss the position of an independent regulatory body; and in asking if the C.B.C. may have erred in relation to their labour policy, I wonder if we should not admit that the C.A.B. may have over-stated the case from the point of view of private broadcasting generally in Canada.

Dr. FORSEY: But the other question I wanted to ask you, that may help clear up your question, was, what exactly is this independent regulatory authority supposed to do. It seems to me we have not been given any specific information on that. It seems to me it must be set up to do either one of two things: either to do what the C.B.C. is doing now, but have a different set of people doing it, in which case what is the point of it; or else, to do something very different from what the C.B.C. is doing now, in which case you are going to get back to what I mentioned in reply to Mr. Hansell.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. You seem to be viewing the independent regulatory body—and I say this with respect—from your own preconceived notion that it is a bad idea; but I am trying to make an analysis of the situation with respect to the setting up of an independent regulatory body. You have attacked the C.A.B., or the views they have presented, throughout your brief. I am not bound by any C.A.B. presentation, but I am interested in the idea of an independent regulatory body, and in your brief you have discussed the position with reference to that by analogy to the position of the Board of Transport Commissioners. I think that is a fair statement. You have admittedly attacked the C.A.B. and whether you think they have over-stated their case or whether they have gone completely off the rails, I think that is your right. That was the reason for my question. Possibly they may have erred or left out a number of considerations, but I am interested in the presentation of your congress which, it

seems to me, has attacked, not only the Canadian Association of Broadcasters' presentation, but also attacked the very idea of an independent regulatory body, and it is that particular aspect of the subject I would like to pursue with you and Mr. MacDonald this evening. If it is admitted that there is no fundamental reason why an independent regulatory body could not lay down standards of broadcasting in the field of both television and sound broadcasting to which all broadcasting in Canada must conform, I would ask you why you are so interested that the idea of setting up an independent regulatory body necessarily means an abdication of public control of broadcasting in Canada I cannot follow your reasoning, quite frankly.

Dr. FORSEY: As far as I am concerned, I cannot add anything to what we have said in our brief, and to what I have already said in answer to Mr. Hansell. It seems to me, however, that your independent regulatory authority is going to become a fifth wheel to the coach, simply having a different set of people doing what the C.B.C. is doing now, in which case I cannot really see what there is to be gained by multiplying bureaucracy. Or else, on the other hand, it is going to do something totally different, and cut the C.B.C. down to size. From what the C.A.B. has said, and what propaganda I have seen on the subject, that is the whole point of it.

Mr. FULTON: You are dealing with propaganda, if you want to call it that, put out by the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, and I am prepared to admit they have an axe to grind, but I am interested from a different point of view, from the general point of view of the best interests of broadcasting in Canada. Now, I am not going to quarrel with you or snap you up on your statement of a multiplying bureaucracy, although I think I could do so, particularly in relation to the C.B.C. and the government's idea of how broadcasting should be controlled in Canada, but I am not going to do that. But I do want to see if we can arrive at a common ground of discussion at least as to why this idea of an independent regulatory body is so repugnant to your congress. I take it that your congress wishes to see the standards of broadcasting in Canada controlled by parliament. I agree with that 100 per cent, but I do not see why it necessarily follows that in order to control the standards or to regulate or lay down the standards of broadcasting in Canada, it must necessarily be argued that the same body which lays down the standards should also control the activities of its competitors, as is the case with C.B.C. to-day.

Dr. FORSEY: Our position, I think, is fundamentally different. We simply deny the whole basis of the position that you seem to be talking up, Mr. Fulton, namely, that here you have the C.B.C. and its competitor. We say, here you have the C.B.C. and its tributaries.

Mr. FULTON: I will take you up on that. Must the C.B.C. in order to control its tributaries, must the regulatory body in order to control the activities of the tributaries of the C.B.C., which is the operating agent, be at the same time the body which lays down the regulations and standards to which broadcasting in Canada must conform and the operating body of the government or national broadcasting system?

Dr. FORSEY: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: Why?

Dr. FORSEY: Because otherwise you won't have a national system. The national system to our minds means not simply the C.B.C., but the C.B.C. plus the private stations, one national system.

Mr. CARTER: I was wondering—

The CHAIRMAN: If Mr. Fulton is finished, Mr. Beaudry wanted to ask some questions.

Mr. FULTON: I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CARTER: I am just wondering if you think the present role of the C.B.C. should be diminished.

Mr. FULTON: No, not at all—not their broadcasting role.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I must remind you we are here to question the people who presented this brief. It is very interesting to hear the views of the committee, but we can hear them in our discussion period.

Mr. FULTON: Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I would like—it is difficult not to get into a discussion of the sort that Dr. Forsey and I are getting into.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that you are arguing mostly with yourself. Doctor Forsey has stated his position and says he cannot go any further.

The WITNESS: It actually places us in the position, if I may say so, of fencing with the atmosphere. If we were to hear some of the reasons advanced in a positive way as to the desirability of a public regulatory body, we would be able to cope with them, but we have stated our position and it is quite clear.

Mr. FULTON: Yes, that is quite true, but I think you stated it surrounded by a number of positive assertions, which do not seem to me to stand up on detailed examination, and I would like to question you or Doctor Forsey with respect to those statements. Now, you have stated, for instance, on page 8 of your brief—or rather I will put it this way, that I take it to be inherent in your argument on page 8, and particularly with respect to the second last paragraph, starting:

"But the C.A.B. is only asking for the removal of unnecessary restrictions on advertising."—that the existence of an independent regulator body necessarily means the end of public control or regulator of broadcasting. Might I make it clear again I am not arguing in support of the position taken by the C.A.B., but only with respect to the existence, or the efficacy or otherwise of an independent regulatory body which I think is the thing your brief is directed against.

Dr. FORSEY: This part of the brief is not discussing that at all. This part of the brief is discussing this yellow document in which there is not one syllable about any public regulatory body.

Mr. FULTON: You refer to a yellow document. It happens that the outside cover of the submission made by the Canadian Association of Broadcasters was coloured yellow, but surely that is immaterial.

Dr. FORSEY: I used the word "yellow" simply to identify this document.

Mr. DECORE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Do we have to listen to this type of questions from Mr. Fulton?

Mr. FULTON: I am glad to have it established that the word "yellow" is with reference only to the colour of the cover of the submission.

Dr. FORSEY: It could be orange, if you like.

Mr. FULTON: With respect to the argument which is advanced on page 8 of your brief, which when boiled down to its essentials is, if the C.B.C. does not have the exclusive power to regulate all broadcasting in Canada then there will be no control over broadcasting, I want to ask you this question. Do you think that the mere fact that if the C.B.C. itself were no longer the controlling body, that it would necessarily mean that there would be no regulation of broadcasting in Canada?

Dr. FORSEY: Oh, no, but our opinion is it would be much less satisfactory for reasons we have tried to explain. This document, I might add, was submitted to the C.B.C. Board of Governors, and not to this committee.

Mr. FULTON: But I am dealing with the arguments in your brief.

Dr. FORSEY: Those arguments are presented in relation to this document, though.

Mr. FULTON: Then perhaps we may begin to make some progress. I take it, then, that your brief is not an argument against an independent regulatory body.

Dr. FORSEY: Wait a moment. I am afraid I may have been speaking so fast that there may be some confusion here; but, Mr. Chairman, the first part of the brief, running to almost the foot of page 4, is directed to the question of an independent regulatory body, which was the position put by the private broadcasters before the Massey Commission. We then go on to discuss the later, more recent position which the private broadcasters put in this beautifully coloured document before the C.B.C. Board of Governors, in which they did not say anything at all about a regulatory body, at least not that I can find, but in which they put forward two quite different alternatives to the present national policy. About the middle of page 5 we say, "What are those alternatives?" and then we say, first, so and so, and later on we come, at the top of page 6, to the second alternative. The brief from there on, therefore, is not addressed to the proposal for an independent regulatory authority, but is addressed to the other and much more drastic proposals which were set forth in this document presented a couple of months ago to the C.B.C. Board of Governors.

Mr. FULTON: I am glad to have an explanation of the composition and purpose of your brief, but getting back, then, to the question of an independent regulatory body, do you think that the mere fact that the C.B.C. might no longer be the regulatory body but merely the body operating the national system under a regulatory body responsible to parliament, would mean there would be no effective control or regulation of the standards of broadcasting in Canada?

Dr. FORSEY: Well, that is one of those questions where the answer is suggested in the question, and I am not going to answer the question as it is put if I can avoid it. I am an old enough hand for that. We are of the opinion that a public controlling authority is not concerned simply with standards of broadcasting, as if it were a matter of the purity of food, and when you use that term "standards of broadcasting", I think you are talking about something different from what we think a public controlling authority is supposed to do. We should not be satisfied with a body which merely laid down certain standards and then said, "Now then, boys, there you are; as long as you keep within those standards you can do what you like and the private system can do what it likes; there are a few things you must not do, but otherwise go ahead."

Mr. FULTON: Do you see any reason why the independent regulatory body should not lay down requirements as to Canadian content?

Dr. FORSEY: No.

Mr. FULTON: Supposing it did lay down requirements as to Canadian content, how would it be any less efficacious in enforcing those regulations than C.B.C.?

Mr. JONES: Would you define how they would be appointed?

Mr. FULTON: By the same method as the corporation, I assume, and the Board of Transport Commissioners is appointed.

Mr. JONES: Political or how?

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, once more I must ask you to direct your questions to Dr. Forsey or Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. FULTON: I would like Dr. Forsey to answer the question I asked. Or are these questions becoming embarrassing to other members?

Mr. DECORE: On a point of order, I think there should be some regulatory body in this committee to prevent somebody monopolizing this committee and asking repetitious and foolish questions.

Mr. FULTON: You are entitled to your opinion as to foolish questions and I would expect you to give the opinion you did. I have said I will be glad to yield the floor to any other member, but I would like an answer now to the question I have asked.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fulton has asked one question; can you give him a reply?

The WITNESS: I do not know whether it is the reply that Mr. Fulton desires, but I will say this, that the position of our Congress is that we are familiar with the C.B.C. regulations and we have had experience with them and we feel satisfied that though they are not perfect they certainly are the incorporation of the right principle. In so far as this more or less nebulous regulatory body that has been discussed here is concerned, it is a matter about which we know nothing at all. We have never seen the proposal laid down and it has never been suggested to us, and we are speaking of something which exists in the abstract; and I suggest in summation that actually as far as we are concerned it is a matter of not trading the devil you know for the devil you do not know.

Mr. FULTON: But I do not think, Mr. MacDonald, that you have answered the question.

The CHAIRMAN: The question was asked—

Mr. FULTON: And the question has not been answered.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps not to your satisfaction.

Mr. FULTON: No. Perhaps they prefer not to answer it. If they do not want to answer it, all right.

Dr. FORSEY: Now, I do not want to have it said that we prefer not to answer. As far as I am concerned I am ready to sit here until Christmas to answer that question.

Mr. FULTON: So am I.

Dr. FORSEY: As far as I am concerned, I have given the best answers I can, and perfectly frank answers to the best of my ability, and I think Mr. MacDonald has done the same, and that is all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN: All you can do is answer to the best of your ability. If that answer is not satisfactory to the questioner, that is not your responsibility, Dr. Forsey. Mr. Beaudry, you wanted to speak.

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. Mr. MacDonald, how many radio stations are there in which the National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians are certified?—A. I could not give you a sensible answer on that; it changes from time to time. As a matter of fact, within the past several days I have been notified by one of our affiliates that they had application for certifications for several in Montreal, and the situation varies.

Q. Would the group of engineers in the average radio station be sufficient to suggest that they become allied with your union?—A. There is no yardstick of the number who must be in a station or who become eligible for union membership. As a matter of fact, the structure of our affiliates in a particular jurisdictional field is such that it permits even one person to be a member of an organization. I might say also, sir, in amplification of my reply to your first question that in addition to ourselves the other labour congresses have membership, and I do not know what their membership might be, in the various private radio stations across Canada.

Q. Could you not tell me in how many radio stations approximately the National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians is certified?—

A. No, I do not have sufficient accurate information at the moment. I suppose I could get it from our records, plus the information that comes in from day to day.

Q. Could you get it?—A. Yes, in as far as our Canadian Congress of Labour is concerned. You want the number of radio stations in which we have membership at the moment?

Q. I am referring to the National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians.—A. That is only one of our organizations, and it is in connection with that particular organization that you want the information?

Q. Yes.—A. Yes, I may say that we also have others.

Q. Would you care to name the others?—A. The American Newspaper Guild.

Q. Are you dealing with a type of radio technician or operator?—A. For the Guild it would not be a technician or an operator.

Q. A radio announcer?—A. No, editorial news.

Q. That would be a restricted area—the number of radio stations would be restricted?—A. Very much so, because in the majority of private stations my understanding is—particularly in the smaller ones which actually comprise the majority—quite a number of the persons now perform dual functions.

Q. I would still like an answer to be submitted to my original question.

Dr. FORSEY: I think it ought to be made clear that a local union can cover several different stations. It may cover only one, one station in a local, or it may cover several stations just as in other industries. We have in the Northern Electric an affiliated union one local of which covers Northern Electric employees over a great part of Ontario.

—A. That is what I meant by the structure of our organization in so far as the C.B.C. employees are concerned. It is set up on a regional basis more than on what ordinarily is termed a local union basis in the majority of our other organizations, and it is done for that particular reason.

Mr. BEAUDRY: I was not thinking of the C.B.C. but of the private stations.

The WITNESS: I understand your question. We have made a note of it and we will supply the information for you.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you some questions, Mr. Hansell?

Mr. HANSELL: Mine are along the other line.

Mr. FULTON: It does not appear to be a very welcome line in this committee.

Mr. HANSELL: I agree with Mr. Fulton. I do think things have been made completely clear. But may I ask this one question, on the basis of a supposition? Suppose a separate regulatory body did the same as the C.B.C. are doing in respect to the control of radio. Would you have any particular objection?

Dr. FORSEY: I do not see how it could conceivably do the same because it would be set up on the basis of the assumption that you had two systems, a public system and a private system. That is an assumption which we are not prepared to accept. We have that radical misunderstanding of the system of broadcasting which we have had in this country now for upwards of 20 years.

Mr. FULTON: Are you not assuming something which is perhaps not justified, because the fact is that even suppose you do have an independent regulatory body with the C.B.C. continuing to operate a national network, the national system, and the private stations in the same relative position to the national system they are in now, you would have no fundamental change in the relationship between the two bodies? I do not think your assumption is justified.

Dr. FORSEY: I cannot see how you could fail to have a fundamental change. It may be invincible ignorance on my part, I do not know. Your church has that useful doctrine which perhaps I may claim the protection of.

I cannot see how you can have this independent body set up unless there is going to be a fundamental change. And if there is no fundamental change, it seems to be nothing but froth and foam and superfluous bureaucracy.

Mr. KNIGHT: Could I suggest, Dr. Forsey, that the nomen or the title of "independent regulatory body" is a rather carefully chosen name from the point of view of propaganda, that is to say, in that it conjures up pictures of a big bad wolf eating up those little new lambs whose financial operations are being restricted by the large wolf in question. Would not this so-called independent regulatory body be construed then as a referee as between equals?

Dr. FORSEY: That is our point. I do not see what point there would be in having the thing unless it was so construed.

Mr. KNIGHT: Would that not assist the propaganda that the C.B.C. is just an equal, and would that idea not be in total contravention of the idea of the Broadcasting Act which was set up by the Right Hon. Mr. Bennett in 1935, or whatever year it was? Do you agree with me up to that point, Dr. Forsey?

Dr. FORSEY: I do, absolutely.

Mr. KNIGHT: Is the C.B.C. not now a regulatory body?

Dr. FORSEY: Of course it is.

Mr. KNIGHT: And is it not responsible to parliament?

Dr. FORSEY: As far as I know it is.

Mr. FULTON: But it is becoming increasingly less so under the terms of the statutory grant and the Act just passed.

Dr. FORSEY: I would not admit that for a moment. It is enjoying a certain measure of independence.

Mr. FULTON: Independence from whom?

Dr. FORSEY: Independence from the government of the day.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that Mr. Knight has finished his questioning.

Mr. KNIGHT: I want to follow up that line of thinking to its ultimate conclusion. We have to decide that this body is responsible to parliament, and that parliament is responsible to the people. I would like to ask—of course it is hardly a fair question to ask of Dr. Forsey, because he does not agree with the whole idea—but to whom would this regulatory body be responsible?

Dr. FORSEY: I suppose it would be responsible to parliament. It would be parliament which would create it.

Mr. KNIGHT: Is the C.B.C. a regulatory body now?

Dr. FORSEY: Yes, it is.

Mr. KNIGHT: So the onus is on the prosecution? It is up to those people who advocate this thing to show that their system is better than the one we have now.

Dr. FORSEY: What was that again?

Mr. KNIGHT: It is up to those people who advocate this thing to show that their system is better than the one we have now, as I assume from the point of view that Dr. Forsey has taken, and I am reasonably satisfied with the set-up from that point of view.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions. Mr. Hansell?

Mr. HANNSELL: I would like to put it this way and ask this question: whether if the power of control and regulation were taken out of the authority of the C.B.C. and placed in the hands of a separate body, in what way would

that depreciate the value of the C.B.C. in giving radio and television in Canada? would it lessen the type of broadcasting that we have?

Dr. FORSEY: I can only repeat that in my judgment it would mean that the C.B.C. would become in fact one of two equal systems, a private broadcasting system and a public system; merely one set of stations as against another set of stations.

Mr. STEWART: Why not ask the question: In what way would it improve the present system? That is the real question.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Hansell was asking questions.

Mr. FULTON: I would like to follow up that argument with respect to the railways. I believe the Canadian National is an instrument of government policy with respect to providing transportation to those areas of Canada which need it and are not served by a private railway. We have had it in the railway committee that the Canadian National Railway and the Canadian Pacific are not absolute equals from the point of view of public policy. The one that is the instrument of government policy has to provide transportation to areas of Canada which are not otherwise served and it seems to me that the C.B.C., as the operating body, is in exactly the same position. But once transportation is brought, then there is an independent body which lays down the standards to which transportation must conform. And to say that the existence of the Board of Transport Commissioners derogates from the position of the Canadian National Railways, to me is just complete nonsensical argument; and to say that the existence of an independent regulatory body in the field of radio and television broadcasting in Canada would derogate from the position of the National Broadcasting System is equally nonsensical argument.

Mr. GAUTHIER *(Portneuf)*: Surely you cannot compare broadcasting and television with railroading. They are not similar things at all. You cannot make any comparison between the two.

Mr. FULTON: I think the principle is the same.

The CHAIRMAN: May I remind you once more, gentlemen?

Mr. FULTON: I think the principle to be observed is service to the country.

The CHAIRMAN: May I remind you once more, gentlemen, that we are here this evening for the purpose of questioning the gentlemen who presented this brief. It is very interesting to hear your discussion but we will have a discussion period in our committee later on.

Mr. FULTON: It would be nice to come to grips with the gentlemen who presented the brief, on the merits of their argument.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have any questions?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, I have. I am sorry that I had to be absent for a few minutes. Therefore I am not acquainted with the discussion which went on. It has been said that we are talking about a completely theoretical thing when we mention an independent regulatory board. I have to preface my question with a bit of explanation. In Australia for a number of years the system of radio broadcasting was very similar to that which exists in Canada at the present time. Recently—I am not quite sure of the year, 1950, I think—the Australian government saw fit to remove from their broadcasting commission its regulatory powers and to bring into being a separate controlling body and so that everyone would be familiar with the purpose of that controlling body, I would like, if I may be permitted, to quote briefly from the Australian Broadcasting Control Board Act which set that body up. I read as follows:

Powers and Functions of the Board

(1) The functions of the board shall be—

(*a*) to ensure the provision of services by broadcasting stations, television stations and facsimile stations, and services of a like kind, in accordance with plans from time to time prepared by the board and approved by the minister;

(*b*) to ensure that the technical equipment and operation of such stations are in accordance with such standards and practices as the board considers to be appropriate; and

(*c*) to ensure that adequate and comprehensive programs are provided by such stations to serve the best interests of the general public, . . .

Then again it says:

(*a*) The board shall, in relation to programs of the commission—

That is the publicly-owned service.

—consult the commission and, in relation to programs of commercial broadcasting stations, shall consult representatives of licensees of commercial broadcasting stations; and

(*b*) The board shall, in particular—

(i) ensure reasonable variety of programs;

(ii) ensure that divine worship or other matter of religious nature is broadcast for adequate periods and at appropriate times and that no matter which is not of a religious nature is broadcast by a station during any period during which divine worship or other matter of a religous nature is broadcast by that station;

(iii) ensure that facilities are provided on an equitable basis for the broadcasting of political or controversial matter;

Mr. BEAUDRY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Beaudry.

Mr. BEAUDRY: I assume that we are still on the question period. Is this a question which is being addressed to Mr. MacDonald. If it is not, then I submit that it is out of order.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, certainly. It is addressed to Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BEAUDRY: Come to a question mark.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am sorry, but I have already said, Mr. Chairman, that I had to explain what I meant first at some length. "(iv) determine the extent to which advertising may be broadcast in the program of any commercial broadcasting station: and (v) fix the hours of service of broadcasting stations, television stations and facsimile stations."

As far as I have been able to learn, the purpose for setting up that board in Australia was that it was found in practice that under certain circumstances competitive positions were created between the stations owned privately and those owned by the broadcasting commission in Australia, and that therefore when the commission was in turn required to act as a regulatory body that it could not be completely unbiased, and disinterested in the case, and might be swayed by the fact that one of the participants in the argument was itself. As a matter of fact, it was likened to the position where you had two competing football teams with a member of one team acting as referee. I do not know whether that is a reasonable simile or not. My question is this, does Mr. MacDonald consider that this legislation which has been brought into existence in Australia after several years of a situation similar to what we have

in Canada is retrograde; and my other question is this, I would like to—perhaps it might be simpler if Mr. MacDonald answered that question first. I have one other question after that.

The WITNESS: When was that introduced? I think you quoted dates, but I did not catch them.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am not absolutely sure. I have not the date here, but I believe it was 1950.

The WITNESS: Yes, in my opinion it would be retrograde. In so far as it would be applied to Canada. I do not know the circumstances in Australia, and I assume there might be circumstances there that might dictate the necessity for it. I have no idea about it whatever, but I think it must be also said that the change, although it might be necessary and desirable in the circumstances that existed there, might also be a reflection of government policy in Australia.

Mr. MACLEAN: My other question was this. In the report of the royal commission on Arts, Letters and Sciences, on page 40, there appears this statement. It refers to the excellent and admirable job which the C.B.C. is doing in the general field of broadcasting—with which I think everyone agrees—

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure we are all familiar with the report in question.

Mr. MACLEAN: Then they go on to say: "less admirably does it exercise its responsibility of control". Would Mr. MacDonald or Dr. Forsey care to comment on that.

The WITNESS: Control of what?

Mr. MACLEAN: Radio broadcasting.

The WITNESS: If we could see the entire context we might be prepared to make some observations on it.

Dr. FORSEY: My recollection was that it was suggested that it left private stations a good deal too much rope, and that it was not strict enough in seeing they kept up standards. That is my recollection of some of the criticisms made by the Massey Commission.

Mr. FULTON: I was interested in the observations made by Mr. MacDonald in answer to Mr. MacLean's first question. He said—and I do not want to misquote him, because I think we should have this discussion on a sensible level—that it may have been the result of the change of government made in Australia, and might have been a reflection of the new government's policy. I want to put this as fairly as I can, but I was interested to know whether Mr. MacDonald suggested in that answer that a government which is elected, as that government was, was not reflecting or was not aware of or interested in public opinion and the public welfare?

The WITNESS: Could be.

Mr. FULTON: Could be. Yes, it could be. Do you suggest it would be likely?

Mr. BEAUDRY: May I suggest that we lack one very important premise. We are not given the premise of the original Act which was changed from the Act quoted by Mr. MacLean.

Mr. MACLEAN: I started out by saying previously that the set-up in Australia was very close to that which has existed in Canada.

Mr. BEAUDRY: Was it almost identical?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes. The only important difference was this, that on the public service in Australia they do not sell time. There is no commercial advertising allowed on the public owned system in Australia.

Mr. KNIGHT: We cannot expect Dr. Forsey to be a specialist on Australian broadcasting, but I wonder if he could tell us if it is a fact that all the A.B.C.

has to do is to provide the programs. In fact the government provides all the facilities, the general post office, for instance, provides transmission facilities. I would like to ask Mr. MacLean that question but the rules of order forbid that.

Dr. FORSEY: My recollection is, and I am certainly not an expert on Australian broadcasting, that the Massey Commission said that the Australian system then in existence was distinctly different from ours. I have not read the report over during the last few days, but I think it said it was distinctly different from ours, and I was therefore surprised when Mr. MacLean said it was, before the Act was passed, practically the same as ours.

Mr. DINSDALE: On page 3 of the brief, paragraph 3, the last tmo sentences it says:

> The Canadian Congress of Labour is convinced that the creation of such an authority would sooner or later, and perhaps rather sooner than later, mean that Canadian radio woud be swallowed up by American. The effect of that on the development of the arts and letters in Canada needs no elaboration. If we want a genuinely Canadian culture to flourish and grow strong, we must preserve our genuinely Canadian radio. Weakening the C.B.C. is not the way to do it.

Now, the implication I get from that is that under this regulatory body we have been discussing, inevitably we would be, in broadcasting or in telecasting in Canada swallowed up by American influences. Why should that be necessary under this regulatory body, and also, that any cultural influences that might emanate from broadcasting would automatically wither away under this independent body?

Dr. FORSEY: Well, the position we were taking there was—and I am afraid this is repetitive and I ask the committee's pardon for that, but we apparently did not make it plain the first time and we can only try again. The position we take there is that if you set up the kind of independent regulatory authority that we have been led to suppose would be set up—

Mr. FULTON: By whom?

Dr. FORSEY: By the C.A.B. and all the people that I have ever heard of that talked about it.

Mr. FULTON: But you said they did not talk about it.

Dr. FORSEY: No, not in this brief, but I tried to read the debates in the House of Commons on that. My impression, and I think the impression of our people generally, is that if that were set up it would have the effect of producing two competing systems. We took it in the context, and the representations that were made by the C.A.B. to the Massey Commission, for example, where the thing was presented as fully as it ever was presented before a public body, and the whole trend of the thing there was that you were going to get an independent regulatory body which would act as an arbiter, a referee, a judge, an umpire, between a publicly owned system and a privately owned system, a private network or something of that sort that you would then get. Our opinion was that from that would flow a weakening of the C.B.C. and a distinct strengthening of the private broadcasters. Otherwise I do not know why they would be asking for it. The private broadcasters would be in the thing for the money they could make out of it, quite naturally and properly, and the easy way, the very easy way, to make money would be to bring in American programs, which are popular here—no question about that. The broadcasters would save money by not producing their own Canadian programs, and this applies more to television than it does to sound broadcasting, and you would get more and more American stuff fed to the listeners in Canada.

Mr. DINSDALE: In his remarks, Mr. Chairman, Doctor Forsey said he could not see any other reason for the advocacy of this independent regulatory body. Well, do you not think it relates itself to the thesis of this so-called yellow document where they are emphasizing freedom of expression, and so forth, and that is their complaint, that they feel themselves to be under a dominating influence, which is a benevolent influence but which in time, if a certain emphasis changed in government, might not be so benevolent. I think these theses fit together, the regulatory body and the freedom of expression issue which they have raised.

Dr. FORSEY: I think this notion that freedom is being cramped and restricted, cribb'd, cabin'd and confin'd by the C.B.C. is a lot of nonsense. The more I read of this production, this submission that was made by the C.A.B. to the C.B.C. Board of Governors, this yellow-covered document with the green lettering on it, the more nonsensical their argument appears. I just marvel at the fatheadedness of the people who wrote the kind of stuff that is in there.

Mr. FULTON: I am not arguing the case of the C.A.B. May I ask Doctor Forsey one question relating to his thesis, as I see it, that the existence of an independent regulatory body would weaken the position of the C.B.C. Let us draw a parallel between that case and the case of the railways and the Board of Transport Commissioners, and let me ask about another parallel case, the existence of the Trans-Canada Air Lines, and the existence of a regulatory body called the Air Transport Board. There you have a government policy that states that the government-owned air lines, operated by an independent Crown corporation, shall be the primary air lines in Canada, and they shall be the only line to operate trans-Canada services. Now, are you suggesting that it is a weakening of that policy to require the T.C.A. to exist and operate under the Air Transport Board, which lays down the standards and regulations of air transport in Canada.

Dr. FORSEY: No, it is a different kind of industry altogether. The more I think about it, the more this comparison between other railways or air lines and broadcasting seems to me to be completely worthless. Radio broadcasting and transporttaion are not at all the same kind of activity.

Mr. FULTON: I am trying to deal with your argument that the existence of an independent regulatory body immediately weakens the position of the government-controlled operating body, because I do not see that the existence of the Air Transport Board derogates from the position of the Trans-Canada Air Lines. If I understood you correctly, you have suggested that the minute you set up an independent regulatory body in radio broadcasting, the primary position of the C.B.C. in control of the nationally owned and operated network would thereby diminish, and you said in your brief that sooner or later Canadian radio will be swallowed up by American. Now, by the same argument, then, T.C.A. must eventually be swallowed up by American air lines.

Dr. FORSEY: No, not at all. I do not think there is any analogy at all there. After all, if the T.C.A. had been set up to do the C.B.C. has been set up to do, there might be some analogy, but it has not been set up to do that, and the C.N.R. was not set up to do the job of the C.B.C. Railway policy is quite different. I take issue with the point you made earlier, Mr. Fulton, that the C.N.R. were set up to look after underdeveloped areas, remote areas.

Mr. FULTON: I do not intend to suggest that they were originally organized for that purpose, but that is one of their functions today.

Dr. FORSEY: Yes, and one of the purposes of the C.P.R. when it was set up was to do the same kind of thing. You may recall the remarks of Mr. Pope, the Minister of Railways and Canalas, when he said: "The day the C.P.R. goes bust, the Conservative party goes bust the day after."

Mr. FULTON: And the whole Dominion of Canada goes bust. too.

Dr. FORSEY: Certainly, but it was an instrument of government policy, just the same as the C.N.R. is today.

Mr. CARTER: Your contention is that the private broadcasting stations are seeking to have their relationships changed so that instead of being a supplement of the national system they will be a competitor. That would be the fundamental change in policy?

Dr. FORSEY: Yes.

Mr. HANSELL: I would like to direct this question to Doctor Forsey and Mr. MacDonald. The brief indicates here that if there were a separate regulatory body it would reduce radio to two competing systems. Now, I do not accept that, but for the sake of argument, merely for the sake of argument, might I ask this question: What is wrong with competition if a separate regulatory body lays down the rules?

Dr. FORSEY: Mr. MacDonald suggests that I should answer that. In our judgment, what is wrong with it is that it just destroys the whole idea of a single national radio system. Our conventions have gone on record over and over again in favour of the original proposal of the Aird Commission to have one single Canadian national broadcasting system and get rid of all these private stations. That has been our congress's policy. We are accepting a compromise here. We think it works reasonably well. We are practical and we are not going to be doctrinaire about this, but if you want to get the thing down to a basis of logic, then a single national system without the private station is what we would like. We do not believe in any way in this idea of competition between private and public stations. We think the private stations should be subsidiary, ancillary, tributary to the national system, and as long as they serve that purpose, all right, and if they cease to serve that purpose we think there is no point in them at all. The idea of their standing up there and being a separate empire of their own is contrary to our views.

Mr. GOODE: I have not entered this conversation for some time and I do not intend to remain in it very long, but I was very interested in what was just said. In the lower mainland of British Columbia—I am speaking entirely from memory—we have at least half a dozen independent stations, some of whom are members of the union represented by these two gentlemen tonight. I would take the view that it would be most unfortunate to take the many hundred of employees out of the labour market because it is impossible in the lower mainland of British Columbia to institute a network of stations and include all of these that are presently doing business. If I understand the statement which has been made, then it would be imperative if this one system was put into effect that at least two or three hundred men and women would be put out of jobs. Is that the understanding of the witness?—A. No.

Q. Will you kindly consider this because I think you know something about the lower mainland of British Columbia. What would you do with the people you would put out of jobs because you want to do away with independent stations?—A. Every bit of technical progress that has been made since the history of mankind has displaced people who have been engaged in some occupation, and certainly it is not a matter of being displaced permanently. As far as I can see the C.B.C. certainly could operate the system efficiently in the circumstances which you describe and the mere fact that these people could not get employment with the private stations does not exclude them from having employment in some other field.

Q. If we have the one or two C.B.C. stations without the rest of the independents which I know employ many hundreds of people, do you think that the C.B.C. as it is established for radio and television could employ those people?—A. I really do not know. It might or might not. But even if it did

not the mere fact that they did not secure employment with the C.B.C. would not preclude them from employment in the field in some other form of employment, perhaps preferable employment. Those situations have developed right down through the course of the years and will continue.

Q. I take it from your argument that you are quite in favour of the independent stations on the lower mainland of British Columbia going out of business?—A. I never made any such statement. We have stated what our policy is. It was in support of the Aird Commission Report, first of all, and we say that in so far as the principle is concerned, we have not departed from it. It does not apply only to the lower mainland of British Columbia but to the entire Dominion of Canada.

Q. You have said that you would be quite willing for the independent stations to go out of business?—A. I did not say that.

Q. I submit that you did say that.

Dr. FORSEY: I said in answer to Mr. Hansell that if you are going to get down to the question of competition, there is something else, namely, that our conventions have gone on record time and time again as being in favour of a completely publicly owned system; but that as practical and reasonable people we have said that since the existing system works reasonably well and it appears to be what the people want, therefore we are satisfied with it.

Mr. GOODE: I was listening to you just now and you said that your organization said that t would be better to do without the independent stations.

Dr. FORSEY: That is what our conventions have said time and again.

Mr. GOODE: So what I heard said was correct, and that statement was made.

Dr. FORSEY: I said that if the private stations did not fulfil their function as tributaries of the national system, we think it would be better to get rid of them. But as long as they fulfil their function, we have no objection to them.

Mr. GOODE: I shall read the minutes of our proceedings.

The WITNESS: We have no desire to put the radio stations out of business merely for the sake of putting them out of business.

Mr. GOODE: I shaill read our proceedings tomorrow to be absolutely fair to you. I want to read what is on the transcript tomorrow. I think we will then see just what was said.

Mr. MACLEAN: I want to correct something. I was asked a few minutes ago if I could give the date when the Australian board came into being. I said it was 1950 but in fact it was 1948 and I want to make that correction.

The CHAIRMAN: It is now 10.00 o'clock. This has been a very interesting discussion. Can we excuse Mr. MacDonald and Dr. Forsey?

Mr. FLEMING: Can they excuse us?

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should express our appreciation to both Mr. MacDonald and Dr. Forsey for their attendance here today.

We are now adjourned until tomorrow at 3.30 p.m. in this same room.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Seventh Session—Twenty-first Parliament

1952-53

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. Robinson

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 9

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 1953

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1953

Submission of The Canadian Association of Broadcasters

THIRD REPORT TO THE HOUSE

WITNESS:

Mr. T. J. Allard, General Manager of The Canadian Association of Broadcasters

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1953

ORDER OF REFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, April 29, 1953.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Weaver be substituted for that of Mr. Mutch on the said Committee.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.

74470—1½

REPORT TO THE HOUSE

WEDNESDAY, April 29, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting begs leave to present the following as its

THIRD REPORT

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of April 22, your Committee has considered Bill No. 340, An Act to amend The Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936, and has agreed to report it without amendment.

A copy of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence taken in relation thereto is appended.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

W. A. ROBINSON,
Chairman.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, April 29, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presided, except for a period when the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Pierre Gauthier, was in the Chair.

Members present: Messrs. Beaudry, Boisvert, Breton, Carter, Courtemanche, Fleming, Fulton, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Gauthier (*Sudbury*), Goode, Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Knight, MacLean, (*Queens, P.E.I.*), Richard (*Ottawa East*), Riley, Robinson.

In attendance: From the Canadian Association of Broadcasters: Mr. F. H. Elphicke, Chairman of the Board of Directors and Mr. E. F. MacDonald, Vice-Chairman, Mr. T. J. Allard, General Manager, Mr. Guy Roberge, Counsel, and the following Directors: Messrs. J. Craig, Brandon, Man.; W. Slatter, Guelph, Ont.; J. Davidson, Toronto, Ont.; G. Gaetz, Edmonton, Alta.; H. Crittenden, Regina, Sask.; F. B. Ricard, Sudbury, Ont.; A. Dupont, Montreal, Que.; H. Lepage, Quebec, Que.; M. Neill, Fredericton, N. B.; W. Rea, New Westminster, B.C.; J. P. Lemire, Hull, Que.

Mr. T. J. Allard read the brief of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, and was questioned thereon. Copies of his opening statement, the Association's brief and its appendices were distributed to the Committee.

At 4.25 o'clock p.m. the Committee recessed to permit members to attend a division of the House. At 4.45 o'clock p.m. the Committee resumed.

The questioning of Mr. Allard continuing, at 5.30 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 8.15 o'clock p.m. this evening.

EVENING SITTING

The Committee resumed at 8.15 o'clock p.m. the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Pierre Gauthier, presiding, except when the Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, was present.

Members present: Messrs. Beaudry, Breton, Carter, Courtemanche, Decore, Dinsdale, Fleming, Fulton, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Gauthier (*Sudbury*), Goode, Hansell, Henry, Jones, Knight, MacLean (*Queens, P.E.I.*), McCann, Robinson.

In attendance: Same as at afternoon sitting.

Mr. Allard was further questioned regarding the brief of The Canadian Association of Broadcasters.

On motion of Mr. Decore,

Ordered,—That the brief and its appendices "A", "B" and "C" presented by The Canadian Association of Broadcasters be printed as an appendix to this day's evidence. (*See Appendix I to this day's evidence*).

Questioning of the witness continuing, at 10.00 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until 11.30 o'clock a.m. Thursday, April 30.

THURSDAY, April 30, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 11.30 o'clock a.m. this day. The Vice-Chairman, Mr. Pierre Gauthier, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Breton, Carter, Dinsdale, Fleming, Fulton, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Gauthier (*Sudbury*), Goode, Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Knight, MacLean (*Queens, P.E.I.*), Richard (*Ottawa East*), Riley and Weaver.

In attendance: From the Canadian Association of Broadcasters: Messrs. T. J. Allard, F. H. Elphicke, E. F. MacDonald, Guy Roberge, J. Craig, W. Slatter, J. Davidson, G. Gaetz, H. Crittenden, F. B. Ricard, A. Dupont, H. Lepage, M. Neill, W. Rea, J. P. Lemire.

Mr. Fleming tabled a submission from Mr. Donald M. Fergusson, Hudson Heights, Quebec.

The Committee resumed the questioning of Mr. Allard and his associates, on the brief of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters.

Mr. Fleming raised a question of privilege, placing on the record an extract from *Hansard* (page 3013) which had been referred to in the previous meeting.

The questioning of the witnesses having been concluded, the Vice-Chairman thanked the Association for its presentation.

Mr. Allard thanked the Committee for the hearing accorded to him and his associates.

At 12.55 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock this afternoon.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

April 29, 1953.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum.

Today we are to hear representations from the Canadian Association of Broadcasters and I will ask the clerk to distribute some material which they have provided for the committee.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, on a matter of personal privilege, there was an exchange between Dr. Forsey and me last night during this committee's deliberations. I said that Dr. Forsey had stated that it was C.C.L. policy to eliminate private stations in Canada and at that time I said I would read the transcript today. The transcript of Dr. Forsey's remarks is as follows: "Our conventions have gone on record over and over again in favour of the original proposal of the Aird Commission to have one single Canadian National Broadcasting system and get rid of all these private stations. That has been our congress policy."

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I need to comment further.

Mr. KNIGHT: Is that question of privilege debatable? I would like to point out then, Mr. Chairman, that in what Dr. Forsey said as I heard it the word is not "contention" but the word is "convention".

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is correct. It is quite evident that it is a typographical error.

Mr. KNIGHT: I would say this: to take a mere sentence like that out of the transcript gives a completely wrong impression because when Dr. Forsey was challenged by Mr. Goode, Mr. Goode's accusation was that Dr. Forsey had said he would like to close all the private stations in southern British Columbia and put the men running those private stations out of work, and Mr. Forsey, apparently nettled by the attempt to put words into his mouth denied he had said any such thing and said simply this: It had been C.C.L. policy as expressed in their conventions that they favoured publicly owned radio. and he went on to say that while that had been their original policy and probably was the philosophy in the back of their mind that they had come to accept—as do a great many other people—the idea of having private stations which were to be subsidiary to C.B.C. as originally intended in the Act; and he went on to say that the present state of affairs was perfectly satisfactory to him. He also, I think, pointed out this—that no matter who owns those radio stations—they would be operated by somebody and consequently nobody would be put out of work. I think it is only fair to Dr. Forsey that this matter should be put on the record.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure when the printed record is ready for the members they will be able to read the entire proceedings and make such decisions as they wish themselves.

I might point out, gentlemen, that the material which is being distributed to us consists first, of an opening statement to the 1953 parliamentary Radio Committee, secondly of a brief, and thirdly of appendices to the brief which you will find in the envelope which has been supplied to you.

I will now ask Mr. T. J. Allard, General Manager, Canadian Association of Broadcasters to make his presentation.

Mr. T. J. Allard, General Manager, Canadian Association of Broadcasters, called:

The WITNESS: Might I ask if it meets with your approval that Mr. E. H. Elphicke, chairman of the board of directors, be permitted to introduce our directors who are here today.

The CHAIRMAN: That is agreeable.

Mr. F. H. ELPHICKE (Chairman of the Board of Directors, C.A.B.): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to introduce Mr. Arthur Dupont from Montreal; Mr. Bill Rea from New Westminster, B.C.; Mr. Baxter Richard, from Sudbury, Ontario; Harold Crittenden, from Regina; Garry Gaetz from Edmonton; Mr. Finlay MacDonald, vice-chairman, from Halifax; Mr. Jack Davidson from Toronto; Mr. Wallace Slatter; and Mr. John Craig from Brandon, Manitoba, and Mr. Guy Roberge of Quebec city, our counsel.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, if it meets with your approval and the approval of your colleagues, I would like to read to you an opening statement which sets forth the bulk of the major points in the brief which has been filed with the committee and enlarge to some extent on our background reasoning therefor.

Before I do this, might I draw the attention of the committee to the fact that there are two minor typographical errors in the brief itself. On page 4, paragraph 2, line 9, the figure "229" should read "230". On page 10, paragraph 4, line 6, the word "views" should read "news".

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen:

"We should like to briefly set forth the basic principles outlined in our submission to this committee and the reasons for them. Both our presentation and this preliminary statement are made solely in an attempt to be helpful and to assist this commitee in its examination of an extremely important aspect of Canada's development.

The fact that this committee is sitting and although a special rather than a standing committee has sat with great regularity for many years, is perhaps the best indication of the widespread agreement on need for constant examination and review of broadcasting's position in the community, and the need for examination of the legislation pertaining to it as that position develops.

The basic principles set forth in our presentation are these:

(1) Broadcasting like all forms of publication requires legal regulation in the public interest.

(2) The method and extent of such regulation should recognize broadcasting's degree of development and its real place in the community whilst at the same time conforming to long established democratic principles.

The task of establishing proper method and extent of regulation is made easier by the fact that there are parallel situations, resolved on the basis of experience and principle; and that the community at large has long since established basic principles and methods in the regulation of all other forms of publication.

Thus, appropriate legislation conforming to the realities of present day conditions and to basic democratic principles should recognize:

(*a*) The principle of separation of the executive, legislative, and judicial functions.

(*b*) Broadcasting's position in the community as a form of publication and an integral part of THE PRESS.

* * * *

(3) Because of broadcasting's amazingly rapid development existing legislation in relation to it is outdated and does not apply to the situation it was intended to govern.

(4) The creation of a separate regulatory body for broadcasting as advocated today in our submission to this committee is in no way an attack upon the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, nor will it adversely affect that corporation's position. On the contrary, it would encourage the full development and utilization of both forms of broadcasting within the community.

---

(1) As pointed out on pages 1, 6 and 7 of our presentation to the Committee, broadcasting is the newest form of publication. The law, quite properly, makes a sharp distinction between printing and publication. The one is purely an act of manufacture, the other is distribution.

For centuries the publishers of books, magazines and newspapers were practically alone in the field. Their sole competitors were speakers on street corners and public halls who could reach only those within range of their voices. It was a competition so small that those who used the printing press to publish became thought of as the only publishers. It is an understandable shift of emphasis but it was not and is not true.

Hundreds of years after Copernicus and Gallileo proved otherwise, we still speak of the sun "rising" or "setting". Because printing was long the chief mechanical means of producing publication we still confuse the two terms. It is not the form that counts but the act itself. Thus, broadcasting is publishing and an integral part of the press.

Long legal and constitutional experience has solved, in democratic societies, the apparent conflict between necessity for

(*a*) The requirement of the public interest for the greatest freedom from control over material published.

(*b*) The necessity for a proper degree of legal regulation in the public interest.

The reconciliation was made through means of appropriate laws passed by elected bodies but enforced by the third party judgment of the courts.

(2) These existing laws already apply in the case of broadcasting by publication. We believe that all publishers, as pointed out on pages 5 and 6 of our brief to this committee should be governed by existing laws or those created and enforced in the same fashion as existing laws, and that no one type of publication should be singled out for specific discretionary controls.

That broadcasting is not in this position is due, in large part, to the fact that every worthwhile new idea and invention has always required a period of adjustment to find its proper and most useful place within the framework of society. The attitude of society to it, especially insofar as regulation is concerned, has in each case been periodically and successively modified as the new idea or invention developed or progressed permitting full availability, utility, and freedom of use.

Regulatory development to conform to the reality of a developing idea or device is clearly evident in such cases as those of the printing press, the steam engine, and the internal combustion engine.

For instance, there was a time when it was considered proper to licence publication by printing and to require prior approval of the contents by established authority. Similarly, at one time it was considered an essential precaution that trains and automobiles should be preceded by a man on foot carrying a warning flag.

The development of these inventions and their more widespread use made it necessary to modify such restrictive regulations and controls so that the new device could be fully utilized by society and achieve its maximum usefulness. As pointed out above, we believe that recognition of broadcasting's place in our present day society should form part of the concept of regulation.

The other part, as pointed out above and on pages 11, 12, and 13 of our presentation, should recognize the principle of separation of powers. In democratic countries the separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial powers has long been recognized in theory and practice, as a sound principle sanctioned by tradition and good sense, and in one country it has been made a fixed principle of the constitution.

In the United States the President's committee on administrative management (1937) emphasized that government corporations should be separate from and subject to any governmental supervisory agency concerned with the same field, whether that agency was a board or a government department. This principle has been consistently adhered to and was recently confirmed by the so-called Hoover Commission.

In the United Kingdom the same principle has been applied in establishing state owned industries in that country. Usually a government corporation has been set up which in turn is subject to regulation by a board or a government department.

In Canada the same principle has been established in fields other than broadcasting. No one would suggest, for example, that the Canadian National Railways and the Board of Transport Commissioners should be consolidated or that T.C.A. should take over the functions of the Air Transport Board. It is thus recognized that a government corporation which is supplying goods or services should be separate from a regulatory agency which grants permits or licences or enacts regulations which affect the government corporation as well as private enterprise.

In provincial affairs the same principle has been taken for granted. For example, in most provinces a government corporation or commission produces electric power but like private power companies, is subject to one common regulating body, ordinarily a Provincial Public Utilities Board.

A striking example of parliament's adherence to the basic principle was in 1952 when it adopted the recommendations of the McQuarrie Commission, which condemned the previous structure of the Combines Investigation Commission on the primary ground that the Commission had been acting as both judge and prosecutor. In June 1952, with the approval of all parties, the previous legislation was completely revised providing for separation of functions. This was done on the ground that, even though specific examples of abuse could not be pointed out, the combination of functions gave opportunity for abuse and gave an appearance of unfairness which was contrary to the basic principles of our law.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is forced to operate within a legislative authority which clearly violates the essential principle referred to above. It performs primarily as a government corporation operating broadcasting stations. It also acts as a regulatory commission in acting quasi-judicially in recommending licenses, and legislatively in making regulations, which apply to both itself and independent radio stations with which it competes in its producing capacity.

Surely all sound principle or precedent supports the claim that the regulatory functions should be exercised by an agency independent of and apart from, the Corporation. Just as an agency should not act as both judge and prosecutor so should it not compete with and at the same time regulate private individuals.

Such a reform would be simple. It would not affect or diminish the proper powers of government by one iota. It would, however, remove the well founded complaint that the present system gives an impression of injustice and discrimination. It would remove a basic violation of principle.

(3) Existing legislation is based upon broadcasting's development and position nearly a quarter of a century ago. At that time broadcasting's rate of development and its true importance in the life of society were unforeseen and could not have been foreseen. Broadcasting has developed more in the last 25 years than the automotive industry in the last 50, or the steam engine in the last 75. Yet the legislation pertaining to the latter two has been extensively modified since their earliest stages of development.

It would be wholly unreasonable to expect that the legislators of an earlier date could be gifted with complete omniscience. They had to deal with the facts as they then saw them and to the extent these were available. That broadcasting's development has been so swift is no reflection upon their powers of foresight, but merely a tribute to the technical and social adaptability of our age.

The two major enactments today governing broadcasting are the Radio Telegraph Act and the Broadcasting Act.

The first of these, the Radio Telegraph Act, was originally passed in 1913 and was designed to regulate the use of this new medium by ships at sea. As pointed out by the Right Honourable C. D. Howe in the House of Commons on 8th July, 1947, "If my honourable friend will go back into the records of the Department of Marine, one of the predecessors of the Department of Transport he will find the Radio Act very much as it is today".

The second act, the Broadcasting Act, was designed not only at a time when broadcasting's development could not have been foreseen, but when little importance was attached to this new medium and when a great deal of confusion existed concerning it. Those who drafted the legislation were not far from the Aird Report which recommended the complete nationalization of broadcasting in Canada. Had that recommendation been accepted by the public the present broadcasting act would govern the situation it was intended to govern rather than a wholly different one.

However, it is clear from the proceedings of the 1932 parliamentary Committee on Broadcasting that the public was not prepared to accept this recommendation and that the committee found itself in a very difficult position in making recommendations. The committee, on whose report the Act is apparently based said this:

> Your committee was fortunate in having the three members of the Aird Commission appear before us to amplify and explain their report and much valuable information was thereby secured, and if we are unable to completely accept their findings it must be obvious that there has been a great change in the science of radio broadcasting, and in the financial condition of the country in the last three years.

It is interesting to note that the committee was impressed with the swift development of broadcasting even between 1929 and 1932. How much swifter and more far-reaching in its effects has been the development between 1932 and 1953.

The evidence before the committee is illuminating in the light of present conditions. Sir John Aird appearing before the committee is reported in minute book No. 12, pages 494 to 495, dated Thursday 14th April, 1932, as saying this:

> In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, opponents of the Aird Report have greatly exaggerated the estimated cost of a first class broadcasting service in Canada. Instead of such preposterous figures as $15,000,000

made in 1944 to the parliamentary broadcasting committee by the late Dr. Frigon, who was then, I believe, the chief executive officer of the C.B.C., and he said this:

> May I point out to you that the duties of whoever is in charge of our organization have become quite considerable in importance, complexity and responsibility. Our budget will reach $5,400,000 for the coming year; our employees now number 807. We have commercial dealings either through actual program bookings or subsidiary network arrangements with the majority of the 79 privately owned stations to which line facilities are available, and are responsible under the Broadcasting Act for the observance by private stations as well as C.B.C. stations of the regulations made under that Act; we have engineers designing radio equipment and engaged in extensive construction work; we have a staff of war correspondents on the battle front; we employ in our own studios some seven or eight hundred radio artists every week; we have an extensive news bulletin service; in conjunction with the radio branch of the Department of Transport we are heavily engaged in the application of international agreements and we will soon do international broadcasting.

"This suggested forward step of a separate regulatory body does not offer the hard and fast alternative of control of the C.B.C. or no regulation at all. On the contrary, it provides proper regulation by a public authority in the manner best designed to serve the interests of the public. It would encourage the maximum of service and development from both the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the non-government stations.

(5) The separate regulatory body outlined in our brief would bring the situation in broadcasting into line with all parallel and similar situations in Canada and the rest of the free world. It would adhere to the historic democratic principles of separation of the executive, legislative, and judicial powers. It would establish the proper degree of regulation in the public interest in the manner best designed to serve the public interest, and in the light of present day conditions. It would encourage the continued development of service by both the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and non-government stations.

We have already referred to the parallel accepted as the result of recommendations by the MacQuarrie Commission. The commission had said this:

> When an investigation is completed, the commissioner is required by the Act to assume an entirely different and incongruous role. He must make an appraisal, intended to be public in nearly all cases, of the situation which has been brought to light by the investigation carried out at his instance and under his direction. He is given the compromising appearance of being "at one and the same time prosecutor and judge", No matter how fully his assessment of a situation may be justified by results its value is lessened by the inconstancy of his position.
>
> Many of the criticisms we received about the present procedures and the report turned on this point. It is important that the Act receive the widest possible public support. There seems to be no valid criticism of the fairness or the vigour of the administration of the Act but as long as a single official is placed in the position of being required to perform incompatible functions there is room for a good deal of public misunderstanding. Furthermore, a separation of the two functions of investigation and appraisal would effect a logical, efficient and economical division of work.

These recommendations were adopted with the approval of all parties in June, 1952.

There is a tendency to confuse this issue of freedom of broadcasting and television with the question of public vs. private ownership. This is an entirely different question. To declare that the broadcasting or televising of views must be free is no more an attack on the C.B.C. than to declare that the filming of news must be free is an attack on the National Film Board, or than to declare that printed publications must be free is an attack on the Queen's Printer.

Bearing in mind the anticipated state monopoly when the existing legislation was drafted about a quarter century ago, it seems that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's Board of Governors was then created to regulate and supervise only the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. No alternative nor competing service was visualized.

As pointed out by Mr. Surveyer on page 395 of the Massey Report:

> The fear that an independent body would destroy the national system is based on the assumption that the private broadcasters would under the new set-up be free to make connections with the American networks or with the American independent stations, and would also be at liberty to constitute and operate at will private networks. The arrangement suggested in the preceding pages provides that the private broadcasters could not do any of these things without first obtaining the permission of an impartial Government agency, namely, the suggested Broadcasting and Telecasting Control Board. The only difference with present conditions would be that the control board would take the place of the Corporation's Broad of Governors and, in case of disagreement, would set the rates for the broadcast or telecast of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's sponsored or sustaining programmes by the affiliated private stations. The control board would also deal with any other disagreement which might arise between the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the private broadcasters.
>
> Divide? Certainly: in order to provide for a better distribution of labour and to relieve the corporation from the heavy responsibilities which it has had to assume under the existing Act. Ever since the writing of the American Constitution it has been recognized that no single body could be entrusted with legislative, judicial, and executive functions. Yet this is what the Governors of the Corporation have to do: they have drawn up a set of regulations (some of which they ignore, such as that against broadcasting news already published by a newspaper) they act as judges and decide upon pecuniary disagreements between members of their own staff and the private broadcasters; they are charged with the administration of the budgets of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the International Service (and of television, in the near future), involving yearly expenditures which threaten to reach $20,000,000 within the next two or three years. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, freed from its legislative and judicial functions, could concentrate on the operation of its broadcasting stations and of its three networks and on the production of better and more varied programmes for radio as well as for television, in accordance with suggestions made by the new control board.
>
> As explained above, there would be no duplication under the suggested arrangement; each body, the corporation and the new control board would have definite and separate functions to fulfill."

May I interpolate. The fact that a difficult job faces those charged with this dual system of administration is given some emphasis by the statement

made in 1944 to the parliamentary broadcasting committee by the late Dr. Frigon, who was then, I believe, the chief executive officer of the C.B.C., and he said this:

> May I point out to you that the duties of whoever is in charge of our organization have become quite considerable in importance, complexity and responsibility. Our budget will reach $5,400,000 for the coming year; our employees now number 807. We have commercial dealings either through actual program bookings or subsidiary network arrangements with the majority of the 79 privately owned stations to which line facilities are available, and are responsible under the Broadcasting Act for the observance by private stations as well as C.B.C. stations of the regulations made under that Act; we have engineers designing radio equipment and engaged in extensive construction work; we have a staff of war correspondents on the battle front; we employ in our own studios some seven or eight hundred radio artists every week; we have an extensive news bulletin service; in conjunction with the radio branch of the Department of Transport we are heavily engaged in the application of international agreements and we will soon do international broadcasting.

"This suggested forward step of a separate regulatory body does not offer the hard and fast alternative of control of the C.B.C. or no regulation at all. On the contrary, it provides proper regulation by a public authority in the manner best designed to serve the interests of the public. It would encourage the maximum of service and development from both the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the non-government stations.

(5) The separate regulatory body outlined in our brief would bring the situation in broadcasting into line with all parallel and similar situations in Canada and the rest of the free world. It would adhere to the historic democratic principles of separation of the executive, legislative, and judicial powers. It would establish the proper degree of regulation in the public interest in the manner best designed to serve the public interest, and in the light of present day conditions. It would encourage the continued development of service by both the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and non-government stations.

We have already referred to the parallel accepted as the result of recommendations by the MacQuarrie Commission. The commission had said this:

> When an investigation is completed, the commissioner is required by the Act to assume an entirely different and incongruous role. He must make an appraisal, intended to be public in nearly all cases, of the situation which has been brought to light by the investigation carried out at his instance and under his direction. He is given the compromising appearance of being "at one and the same time prosecutor and judge", No matter how fully his assessment of a situation may be justified by results its value is lessened by the inconstancy of his position.
>
> Many of the criticisms we received about the present procedures and the report turned on this point. It is important that the Act receive the widest possible public support. There seems to be no valid criticism of the fairness or the vigour of the administration of the Act but as long as a single official is placed in the position of being required to perform incompatible functions there is room for a good deal of public misunderstanding. Furthermore, a separation of the two functions of investigation and appraisal would effect a logical, efficient and economical division of work.

These recommendations were adopted with the approval of all parties in June, 1952.

The Board of Transport Commissioners exercises the regulatory function in the case of both the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway; the Air Transport Board in the case of both government and non-government air lines. In Australia a five-man Australian Broadcasting Control Board regulates both the government owned stations and networks and the non-government stations and networks.

Some critics of this proposed forward step have suggested that establishment of an independent regulatory body would permit infiltration of United States influence. Leaving aside for the moment the fact that the owners and operators of non-government stations have in practical fashion demonstrated their devotion to Canada and their desire to assist in the development of this country, it is obvious that the opinion of the separate regulatory body supported by the weight of public opinion would have as much or more power in preventing such a possibility as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation now has.

(6) Finally we should, with respect, like to draw the attention of the committee to the appendices filed with our brief. A statement made in the House of Commons on March 17 of this year attempted to throw doubt on the loyalty of the private broadcasters and those who thought with them in this matter of a separate regulatory body."

May I again interpolate. I must admit there was some dissension amongst the board of directors as to whether we should reply to this obviously absurd charge at all.

"Those who think with us includes a highly substantial body of Canadians who can and probably will speak for themselves, such as a majority of the members of the National Liberal Federation Advisory Council, the publishers and editors of most daily and weekly newspapers, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Young Liberal Federation of British Columbia, and many groups, clubs, societies and individuals. We ourselves do not have any doubts about the loyalty of these people. Since most of them have already spoken in their own defence and others probably will, we prefer to concern ourselves at the moment only with the broadcasters we represent.

Appendix A points out some of the contributions made to the cultural and artistic development of Canadian communities by some broadcasting stations. Bulky as it is, the list is by no manner of means complete. Even so, it shows a record of assistance in the development of the cultural and artistic life of Canada that cannot be matched by any other group in the country and has seldom been equalled.

Appendix B lists some of the achievements of some proprietors and managers and employees of some broadcasting stations during World Wars I and II. Amongst the 53 stations of 139 chosen at random there are 359 veterans to whom over 130 decorations were awarded. Broadcasting station personnel at all levels demonstrated their loyalty and faith in Canada in striking fashion during both World Wars.

As shown in appendix C the proprietors, managers, and employees of broadcasting stations have also demonstrated their loyalty to this country and their faith in Canada's present and future by an unusual, outstanding record of contribution to and participation in religious, benevolent, charitable, welfare, and other types of community activities.

Reference to this appendix will show that broadcasters are actively assisting in every legitimate society in Canada devoted to religious, benevolent, and welfare causes; that many of them are amongst the leaders of such societies, and that most broadcasters actively participate in the affairs of many such societies. We believe that it is not immodest to say that no other single group in Canada has a better record in this respect.

While we do not wish to take up the committee's time with further details, there are, in the files of our association, letters from practically every group in Canada devoted to practically any form of community welfare expressing sincere thanks for the assistance given by the broadcasters and broadcasting stations. This assistance has never been limited simply to the mere donation of free time, or facilities, but has included active wholehearted participation and leadership. We believe it fair to say that the broadcasters of Canada have tangibly and forcefully expressed their loyalty to this country and their faith in it in a manner that cannot even remotely be questioned by anyone who cares to examine the facts."

Insofar as our brief is concerned, with your permission I would like to begin reading it at the section devoted to television, since some of the material has already been covered in our opening statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Agreed.

The WITNESS: The section on television begins on page 14 half way down the page.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I take it Mr. Allard that pages 1 to 14 of your brief have already been covered, or approximately covered in your preliminary statement?

The WITNESS: Yes Mr. Chairman, that is so. The bulk of the brief has been covered in our opening statement to your committee. On page 14 of the brief, item number 9 half way down the page I begin under the heading: "television".

"9. *Television*

With respect, we should like to congratulate and commend the government on its present television policy. Announced on Monday, 30 March, 1953, by the Honourable J. J. McCann, M.P., that policy sets forth these principles:

> The principle of one station to an area is to apply only until an adequate national television system is developed. At the rate that applications for stations are now being received it may not be long before there is a sufficient degree of national coverage to justify the government and the C.B.C. giving consideration to permitting two and perhaps in some cases more than two stations in certain areas. It is anticipated that, in due course, private stations will be permitted in areas covered by C.B.C. stations, and the C.B.C. may establish stations in some areas originally covered by private stations.

This announcement brings government policy into line with the recommendations of the Massey Commission and at the same time reaffirms the general Canadian distaste for monopoly.

Our opinion is that the policy as announced is likely, within a reasonable length of time, to assist in providing the great bulk of Canadian communities with competitive television service and to assist in the sound development of a great new industry as well as helping to speed the provision—by means of this new invention—of information, news and entertainment to Canadians.

This achievement has always been the desire of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters and its member stations. These stations have for many years indicated their willingness to provide television service to the people of Canada. It is a striking indication of their faith in the future of this country and of this great new medium of communication that applications for licences in permissible areas were filed immediately upon announcement that such applications would be heard. Seven (7) of these applications were granted and television service will shortly be a reality in the affected areas as the result of the combined efforts of ten (10) existing AM licensees.

As further indication of the sincere intention of independent broadcasters to bring Canadian television service to Canadians as quickly as they are permitted to do so, we find that an additional seventeen (17) existing AM licensees have already applied for television licences or intend to apply this year in the areas where such applications are permitted. An additional group of eight (8) have their plans near completion and intend application late this year or in 1954. A third group of eleven (11) have plans well underway and will submit applications as soon as technical and other data can be properly assembled. When present government policy is fully implemented and applications are permitted for centres now reserved for the C.B.C. a fourth group of fourteen (14) existing AM licensees will submit television applications. Some of these had previously made application.

With respect, we suggest that present government policy as quoted above be expedited as quickly as economic factors will allow, and that the telecasting form of broadcasting also be subject to the operations of the independent regulatory board which we have proposed. We would like to urge also the earliest possible announcement of the regulations under which Canadian television stations are to operate."

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Allard.

I wonder if it would be the wish of the committee in questioning Mr. Allard on his presentation if I were to call the brief page by page. Would that be the wish of the committee, that I call it page by page?

Agreed.

Are there any questions on page 2?

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether that is a good method because the headings are not very clearly set out and some of the ideas run through the various pages. I was just wondering whether that would be a good way in this particular brief.

Mr. RICHARD: What are we reading from?

The CHAIRMAN: The preliminary statement.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Perhaps I can start the questioning. I want to ask some questions on page 2 and 4. I would like Mr. Allard to tell the committee exactly the type of regulations laid down by the C.B.C. in regard to independent stations and very fully what type of control the C.B.C. exercises over the independent radio stations?—A. I think, Mr. Chairman, that that is rather a large order. The present regulatory and/or control functions of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation over the privately owned stations are those as set forth partly in the Broadcasting Act and partly by regulations published by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation itself under virtue and authority of that Act. These take in a good many points, and I think the only way that a really comprehensive answer could be made would be to consult or refer to the regulations themselves.

Q. The reason I asked that question is I would doubt that too many members of this committee have ever seen the regulations. Can you not tell us in general the type of control and how it works? For instance, you have a control over a certain number of Canadian programs which must be put on the air by independent stations. You can go into the main points of control—I use the word "control" advisedly—and tell us how the C.B.C. enters into the administrative life of an independent station.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, that is the division bell. May we return as soon as the division has been completed.

The committee adjourned for a division in the House.

(The Vice-Chairman assumed the chair).

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum. I am going to replace Mr. Robinson, who is detained in the House.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, I had already asked a question of Mr. Allard. If he remembers the question I won't have to repeat is, or does he want it repeated?

The WITNESS: I think I remember the essence of your question. During the recess I took advantage of the opportunity to look up minute book No. 2 of the proceedings of the present committee, and I find, on page 16, that copies of the existing and proposed Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's sound broadcasting regulations were distributed to committee members.

Mr. GOODE: I did not get one, I know that.

The WITNESS: I also looked up the existing regulations, and for those committee members who have them available—

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: You did not get one, Mr. Goode?

Mr. GOODE: No, and I understand I am not the only one who did not get one.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: The clerk tells me that they were distributed here at the meeting first and afterwards sent individually in an envelope to every member.

Mr. JONES: When was this?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: On the 10th of April.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Well, then, perhaps I can pinpoint my question a little better. What control, Mr. Allard, does the C.B.C. exercise over financing of independent stations. Let me perhaps broaden that out a little. Is there any control over the capital construction costs? Is there any control over the financing of the station after it is in operation, and, thirdly, is there any control over wages and salaries paid by an independent station?—A. I should preface my answer in the first instance, Mr. Goode, by pointing out that we are not specifically complaining of specific regulations imposed by the C.B.C., as pointed out in our brief. We are dealing solely and entirely with the question of principle involved. In direct answer to your question, there are certainly, to my knowledge, no regulations of the C.B.C. that would in any way affect the capital expenditures made by a broadcasting station. It is true, of course, that the C.B.C. recommends to the licensing authority on whether or not a licence should be granted. Apart from that rather remote possibility, I cannot think of any possible way that capital expenditures would be affected. So far as operating costs go, I do not think that the regulations would in any way have an impact on operating expenditures per se. It is entirely possible that some of them in their effective over-all impact would have an effect on the operating revenues, which is a slightly different thing, and it is of course operating revenues that in the final analysis have a great deal to do with wages and salaries.

I should emphasize the point made in our brief—and we tried to make it with some degree of clarity—that we are not here to offer specific complaints against the C.B.C., which is operating under the authority of the existing legislation.

Q. Mr. Allard, regardless of the brief that you submitted to the committee today, there are some questions that the committee members would like to have an answer to. You are the expert and I am the amateur.

Mr. FLEMING: Don't be so modest.

Mr. GOODE: Thank you very much.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I would like to put these questions on the record regardless of the brief that the C.A.B. have presented today, for my own information. Let us talk about control a little further. What about the control of the balance sheet at the end of the year? Is there any suggestion that you must submit this to the C.B.C., or is there any control over your balance sheet made up at the end of the year?—A. There is a requirement that a balance sheet and statement of privately owned stations must be filed with the Minister of Transport, but there is no requirement, to my knowledge, that similar information shall be provided to the C.B.C.

Q. Have you any information that this balance sheet would come into the custody of the C.B.C.?—A. We have, sir, been assured, both verbally and in writing, by a responsible officer of the Department of Transport that the information is held confidential in their hands, and we have never had any occasion to doubt the truth of this statement.

Q. What about the cost of programs, Mr. Allard? Is there any control or any regulation that controls what you should pay for programs, how much you should pay for them? I am talking in regard to tape programs that you buy from the outside.—A. I can think, Mr. Goode, of no requirement of the C.B.C. that would affect the amount or type of payment made for program material.

Q. Then we can take it that there is no control over the amount paid for outside programs by an independent operator?—A. I can think offhand of no direct regulation or control that would limit an operator of a broadcasting station in his choice of program material by means of the financial proof or financial method.

Q. Have you ever known of an instance where the C.B.C. have discussed with an independent operator the cost of his programs?—A. I imagine, Mr. Goode, that they may have discussed informally at least the cost of his programming with him for reasons arising from his general operations. Certainly no knowledge has been brought to my attention, or the attention of those with whom I have talked, of the C.B.C. trying to fix the price of programs.

Q. Could you consult your officials who are sitting behind you and ask them whether there has been an instance. Some of them, I expect, operate radio stations.—A. I shall be delighted to do that, Mr. Goode. Do any of our directors here know of any such instances? We seem, sir, to be in a position of reporting a 100 per cent negative reply.

Q. Then, Mr. Allard, if there has been no control over finances, if there has been no control over the type of program, or the cost of any particular program of an independent station, what would be the advantage under those headings to an independent operator of this new suggested regulatory body? What could an independent regulatory body do in regard to the financial set-up of an independent station that the C.B.C. cannot do?—A. Mr. Goode, as far as I know, no privately owned station has ever asked the C.B.C. for financial assistance. I do not think it likely that any privately owned station would ever do so. Indeed I can report to you, if my memory serves me correctly, that at one sitting of the Massey Royal Commission here in Ottawa the suggestion was put to the then chairman of our Board of Directors that the privately owned stations might welcome some form of financial assistance from the government for the provision of certain types of sustaining programs. In reply to this, the chairman of our board, representing the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, said that the privately owned stations preferred to stand on their own feet financially, and if they did well with them, that was fine; if they did badly with them, or went broke, that, too, was fine. The privately owned stations would have no intention of asking a separate regulatory body for any financial assistance.

Q. Mr. Allard, do the regulations cover the amount of Canadian programs that must be shown or played over an independent station?—A. I think, sir, that this brings us into a slight misunderstanding. There is no such requirement in the existing regulations, but perhaps you have in mind the proposal along those lines that was recently put forward but has not been put into effect and is still a matter of negotiation between mutually interested stations.

Q. Is there no control over the number of outside programs that can be carried over radio stations or, secondly, is there no control over the number of Canadian programs that must be played or shown for a particular independent station at this time?—A. By "outside" I take it you mean programs originating outside the territorial limits of Canada?

Q. That is right, yes.—A. There is this provision, that no station may be or become part of any network without the prior permission in writing of the C.B.C.

Mr. KNIGHT: Is that easy enough to obtain?

The WITNESS: The experience is perhaps to be seen in the results. There are 139 privately owned broadcasting stations in Canada, and I am quite certain that there are no more than 5 or 6 at the utmost of the privately owned stations which have obtained such permission for even a limited period.

Mr. JONES: Do you know of any that have been turned down?

The WITNESS: I have no knowledge of any additional stations which have applied.

Mr. GOODE: I am asking for the right to reserve the rest of my radio questions until I have had an opportunity to read this brief over again. May I have that permission?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Very well.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. You have looked into the past, Mr. Allard, and I would like to look into the future. I would like to have your idea of the set-up of this regulatory body, that you propose. First of all, who would appoint it? To whom would it be responsible? Let us hear what your proposition is.—A. We have in mind something similar in many respects at least in its structure to the Australian Broadcasting Control Board. That board is comprised of five persons chosen and appointed by the Governor in Council in very much the same fashion, indeed, in almost the identical fashion that our Board of Transport Commissioners and our Air Transport Board are appointed.

What we visualize is a regulatory body which is chosen or set up in a very similar fashion and with very similar structure and powers to our present Board of Transport Commissioners, and particularly similar to our present Air Transport Board.

Q. And it would be responsible then to whom?—A. I suppose that it is an academic question in essence as to whether anybody of that type is essentially responsible to the government, or responsible to parliament, or responsible to the people to the extent that you want to draw any distinction between those various words.

Q. For the record, to whom is the C.B.C. responsible?—A. I think that the statement has been repeatedly made in this committee and elsewhere that the C.B.C. is responsible to parliament.

Q. And parliament is responsible to whom?—A. I am not going to take issue with the statement that the government and parliament are both essentially responsible to the people. But anyone who is in public life or in business, essentially and basically is responsible to the people.

Mr. FLEMING: And the same thing is true of those other boards which you have mentioned?

The WITNESS: Exactly.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. The essential difference would be that this regulatory body would have control over the private stations on the one hand, and control over the C.B.C. on the other hand. That would be the chief difference as compared with the present arrangements where the C.B.C. is in control of the private stations. Is that right?—A. Basically that is correct. It would separate the operating functions from the legislative and quasi judicial functions.

Q. And I think it would in that regard, in the minds of most people, reduce the C.B.C. to be a commercial rival on fairly equal terms with private radio stations?—A. I think not, although as you say there may be two opinions on the subject. In our opinion it would not have the effect of reducing the status of the C.B.C. in any way. Indeed, it is our feeling that it would increase its status and its effectiveness.

As we have pointed out in our brief, the C.B.C. is a pretty fair sized business and one which most obviously presents, in the minds of those experienced in broadcasting a serious problem in operation and in administration. Our belief is that if the C.B.C. were left free to concentrate on its programming activities, on the provision of service, in other words, it could do an even better job than it is now doing. Certainly it would lose none of its potential effectiveness as a programming service which I think is largely the purpose for which it would be set up.

Q. In other words, you would not permit it to do anything which would tend to strengthen it as a commercial rival to the private stations?—A. I think that the C.B.C. would continue to be a very effective rival to the privately owned stations under that set up. We have never complained about the C.B.C. as a competitor, devoid of regulatory power over its competitors.

Q. I just wanted to give you an opportunity to give us your ideas on where the division line should be. And while I am at it, I am also interested in your idea that broadcasting is a form of publication and the idea that it is almost synonymous with a newspaper. I wonder if that is quite fair, because as I see it, anybody can own a newspaper who can get the materials and go to work, if he has the money to do so. And it takes plenty, they tell me. But this business of a radio channel is a little different. If a radio channel is assigned to someone, that is the end of it, and nobody can come in on it; whereas a newspaper is free and open to untrammelled competition all across the country. What is your opinion on that?—A. Yes, as a matter of fact, Mr. Knight, one of the preceding committees was not wholly unimpressed by this point and I refer to the report of the 1943 committee which began by saying:

Radio broadcasting is a public service like publishing a newspaper. Going back to your point, you say that once a channel is allocated to a specific individual, then he and no other can use it. That is correct only with respect to the use of that channel in a given city. The same channel can be used over and over again across the country.

Now, in so far as use in one given city is concerned, nobody except the owner of the Ottawa Journal can own the Ottawa Journal, and I think the position is comparable. The owner of a corner grocery store has a fixed position in relation to that store and to the piece of property on which it stands.

A given channel can be used many times across the country; and in addition to this, developments of the last few years have vastly increased the number of channels, so that the limiting factor is now economic rather than physical.

Q. Do you suggest for example that television channels, which you estimate are going to be worth a good deal of money, are simply going to be unlimited?

—A. Not necessarily unlimited. There are now 230 television channels in Canada and I would suggest that it is extremely unlikely that there will be 230 television channels actually used in Canada, or 230 television stations actually in operation during your lifetime or mine, even though I sincerely trust that both of us will be permitted to live out our lives fully and usefully.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Have you any idea how many radio channels are actually used in Canada today?—A. Well, there are 139 privately owned stations in existence, and an additional 19 or 20 which are owned or operated by the C.B.C. This is, I think, about the maximum number of stations that economic limitations appear to make practicable at this moment. But naturally, as the population of the country grows and its economic conditions then become changed, there are still channels available for future allocation even in the AM or standard band. The FM band, as yet has hardly been touched. This theory of limitation arises from concept of the limitation of channels created in earlier broadcasting days.

I found, upon reading certain technical papers for information, that American engineers made a statement in 1933 that the United States could not provide channels for more than 600 AM stations. But today there are a little over 2,000 AM stations actually in operation in the United States, and it has not been suggested that the licensing authority there will refuse to hear further applications.

Mr. KNIGHT: With respect to the idea that radio is an integral part of the press, I am interested in how many owners of private radio stations at the moment in Canada are also the owners or partial owners of newspapers. Can you give us any information on that?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Louder please, Mr. Knight.

Mr. KNIGHT: My question was, thinking of radio as a part of the press, how many radio stations in Canada already own newspapers or are partial owners of newspapers, in other words, in how many cases have we dual operations, if I may call it that.

The WITNESS: Before I get around to a specific figure I may answer in this fashion that there are no broadcasting stations in Canada affiliated with newspapers, that have not been recommended for licensing by the C.B.C. and duly and properly licensed by the licensing authority.

The second point is, the 1947 parliamentary broadcasting committee made this recommendation. "We have this year given consideration to the question and we report we do not think newspapers should be treated in any different manner than other applicants for radio broadcasting licenses."

I imagine the C.B.C., in making its recommendation, and the Department of Transport in dealing with these recommendations, have perhaps been influenced by that recommendation.

A similar question was put forward last year, and, if you refer back to the record, we said that as far as we knew a total of some 38 broadcasting stations were affiliated in some way or another with newspapers.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Do you think it is a good thing? You are fighting against monopoly in one direction. Do you think it is a good thing for one organization to control too many avenues of public opinion, or, perhaps to be more particular, more than one avenue of opinion?—A. I think, Mr. Knight, that is the type of questions you could answer effectively only in terms of results. It so happens that broadcasting stations affiliated with newspapers are, generally speaking, amongst the best and most effectively operated broadcasting stations in Canada. Now, one of the reasons for that is simply this. That newspapers,

by and large, have a background and experience in communication that makes them eminently fitted to this particular type of operation. In the event that these stations are changed, and that there was the slightest reason to believe that newspaper-owned or operated stations were inefficient, it would be a different matter.

Q. I would like to suggest to you that it seems to me that dictatorship in government sometimes produces very efficient results, but nonetheless we do not like it and do not want it. That is merely my comment on what you have to say. It does not appeal to me that we should abandon democratic principles, I mean for the sake of efficiency. That would certainly not appeal to me, and I make that comment on your argument.

There is one last question I would like to put. If we are going to have a press, and if radio is an integral part of the press, I suggest that you and I both want freedom of that press, although we may not agree upon how it should be obtained. I would like to ask your opinion on this. I am sure you have answered it 40 times before, and may I congratulate you on the efficiency of your answers by the way, and the amount of homework you did. This question of the freedom of the press in my opinion, and I am asking you how it compares with yours, is that to obtain freedom we have to have some kind of control. It appears to be a contradictory assertion, but I claim it is not as contradictory as it appears, and, of course, the matter as between publicly controlled radio and privately controlled radio is in the matter of business, and I am finding no fault with that, but where an organization is set up for gaining of profit, and I am finding no fault with that at the moment, the tendency is going to be to give your radio time to people who have the money to pay for it, whereas when you have a publicly owned system under the control of the body I think should control it, parliament, which is responsible to the people, at least they have some redress, there you have some control in which there is an insistence that both sides of any argument be heard on the air. I am not thinking altogether of political broadcasts, although I have known of occasions where certain political parties have found great difficulty of getting on the air because they discovered that other parties had better coffers or heavier coffers and were better able to pay for time on the air. I do think that is one point where freedom is guaranteed by a control, a control that is not interested in profit, and which is responsible not only to the people of one particular party, but to all the people of Canada.

Mr. GOODE: On a point of privilege Mr. Chairman. Mr. Knight has just made a good five-minute statement. I understood we were to ask questions, not to make statements in support of something we believe.

Mr. FLEMING: On that point of order, I think the witness can dispose of the question in less than 5 minutes if he is given the opportunity.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Speaking on this question of privilege, I would like to ask members to limit themselves to questions instead of statements.

Mr. KNIGHT: That is fair enough.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I do not mind one or two or three sentences—

Mr. KNIGHT: I could have put that all in the form of a question, but I made a statement of my views, and I want to find out whether Mr. Allard agrees with that view, or whether he does not.

Mr. HANSELL: On a point of order, I do not think it has ever been ruled that one cannot make an observation when one thinks that that observation will elucidate the question.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Goode does not question that. He said that long statements should not be permitted. Statements are permitted in the committee, but they should not be too long.

Mr. KNIGHT: I agree.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Everyone agrees with that.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. We are all agreed, but what is the answer.—A. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Knight, if I may say so, the present situation reminds me of a court room situation in which the opposing lawyers in their argument brought matters to a point where the jury was dismissed, while the judge decided a lengthy argument on whether or not the witness should be obliged to answer a question which was asked on what some third party had said, and when he had decided that the witness should answer, everybody was brought back into the room and the witness said "I do not remember".

Q. I could tell a better story than that if stories are in order.—A. If I may get down to what we were dealing with which covers three separate points, let me first of all thank you very much indeed Mr. Knight for your words. They flatter me and do me, I think, too great an honour.

The second point on the co-relation between freedom on the one hand and regulatory control on the other. Let me say that broadly I agree with the philosophic outline of your statement. All freedoms are interdependent and all of us must limit certain areas of our own personal freedom in order to permit others to have the same degree of it. We are not suggesting, and would never seriously suggest, that broadcasting be a completely and absolutely unregulated industry. All other forms of publication such as newspapers and magazines are today regulated and regulated in a fashion that the people of the democracies have thought best. Where the possibility of abuse has crept in a law has been passed by the duly and properly elected legislative bodies, and these laws enforced in courts, and where necessary, punitive penalties provided. There are laws dealing with such matters as sedition, treason, libel, slander, mis-branding and false advertising which are regulatory over newspapers and which, to a certain extent, are necessary to protect other citizens from newspaper publishers.

The third point Mr. Knight, was the difference between a privately owned means of communication and a publicly owned one, and if I understood you correctly, there seemed to be some fear in your mind that a privately owned means of communication may give undue advantage to those with the largest purse. But also, there is a fear in other minds that the state-owned system of communication may be unduly influenced by those in control of the actual mechanics of operating the state, or certainly influenced by the philosophic or political opinions they hold.

Q. I would just like to ask you this. You have countered my statement with another. I am asking you for an answer to the first part of it. You said that a state owned radio might give undue favour to the party in power or government in control. That is not answering the question I asked you. Do you not think that there would be more chance of a better expression of views from the other type of ownership and a better chance to get both sides of any particular question on the record if they were not intermingled with the idea of payment for the expression of those views on the air?—A. No. As a matter of fact, Mr. Knight, I do not. On the one hand while we cannot suggest that has happened—and indeed I want to make it clear we do not think it has happened—there is the possibility that a state owned method of communication would give an undue advantage to those who held control of the operating mechanics of the state. As far as the other aspect is concerned,

it seems to me in practice there has been no undue advantage given to those who may hold the larger purse. I am in no position to tell you who may have the larger purse and this may vary from time to time, but, if we are to assume there is a difference in the state of the treasury of the various political parties, the only answer I could give you is all political parties seem to have no difficulay whatever in getting on the air and none of the political parties now represented in the House of Commons seem to have had difficulty in electing a certain number of their members. If they had had difficulty in getting radio time it may be they would not be there.

Q. What you are saying is the station, whatver it is, is liable to give the views of those who are in control of it—the philosophies of those in control? You said that in regard to the state the machinery will be used or is more likely to be used under state ownership to give the views of those who are in control. That is what you said.—A. I think I said it was possible that this could happen in the case of state owned radio.

Q. Would it not be true that exactly the same thing would happen on the other side in a privately owned system, that you are more liable to get emphasis on the philosophy of the people who own and operate that machine?—A. No.

Q. If it works in one case, why not in the other?—A. In the other we are not dealing with a monopoly. Where you have private ownership you have great numbers of owners and widely diversified viewpoints. No private owner of any method of communication would ever put himself in the position of refusing to give expression to all points of view in the community; and in the event he did, it would adversely affect his business in relatively short order.

Q. If the nation owns this thing, surely that is representative of all views and changing views?—A. The views that would be reflected would be the views of those who held the control of the mechanics.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Just a few loose ends from Mr. Knight's questioning. Do any of the independent stations have in themselves any editorial policy? I am trying to compare this with a newspaper. A newspaper has an editorial policy; they can publish opinions that the owners of the papers hold. Does any independent station have any editorial policy where they would go on the air and themselves express that policy in respect to various publications?—A. By public issues do you confine your question to political issues?

Q. No. Social issues or anything else just the same as a newspaper might editorialize about some movie start or something?

A. There is no case in Canada of the proprietor or a manager of a broadcasting station expressing a political viewpoint on the air. In the case of public issues, the practice generally is this—and it is usually confined to provincial or municipal issues: Let us say there is a dispute in a certain town about whether or not a new hospital should be built. The general practice is to sell or give—and it is usually more give than sell—two periods of time, one taken by those in favour and the other by those opposed to it.

Q. That would not be the station's editorial policy?—A. No, sir. The proprietor is careful to remain out of the discussion.

Q. All right. Then it cannot be compared to the newspaper exactly in that respect. The newspaper owners can use their own paper to their own advantage, where the radio sells time to anyone.

My next question is: Have you ever known of a case where an independent station has refused time on the air because they did not agree with the policies or the viewpoints presented by the person desiring to buy the time?

—A. I believe there was an instance during the course of the last provincial election in the province of Quebec where certain legal difficulties arose as a result of a broadcasting station in the city of Montreal refusing to sell time to the Labour Progressive party. This was in the province of Quebec provincial election. Apart from that, no other instance has come to my attention, and I do know from my experience amongst the proprietors and managers of broadcasting stations that they are meticulously careful in seeing that all political viewpoints have full opportunity to be heard.

Q. This is the only one you recall throughout history?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When buying time on the air, the buying of time on the air would be comparable to buying advertising in the newspaper?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So the editorial part can be left out as far as the expression of public opinion is concerned.

Now, if I might go on to another matter. Have you read or has this brief that was presented to the committee last night of the Canadian Congress of Labour been drawn to your attention or have you had an opportunity to read it?—A. We have rather casually at least read the brief presented by the Canadian Congress of Labour. Yes.

Q. I wonder if we might get your reaction?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether it is in order. I do not think there is one word in Mr. Allard's brief about that.

Mr. HANSELL: Oh, but I want the answers to contentions that were made by a body; I want to get the viewpoint of another body on the same contentions.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Could you not keep your questions until the end after all other questions are asked, and then ask Mr. Allard his reaction to it.

Mr. FLEMING: I think Mr. Hansell is perfectly in order. What better way can there be of drawing out opinions of witnesses who are here?

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I will put it this way. Your brief, Mr. Allard, is largely a plea for an independent regulatory body?—A. That is correct.

Q. With respect to this independent regulatory body, this contention has been made by an organization known as the Canadian Congress of Labour: They refer to the argument that has been sometimes used that the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. are two separate bodies with a regulatory body known as the Board of Transport Commissioners. But they say or contend that the analogy is wholly false. They contend that the public policy in railway transportation is to have two competing systems, while the policy in radio broadcasting has never been anything of that sort—it has been to have one publicly owned system with relatively small private stations ancillary to the national system, and the fear of those that oppose a separate regulatory body is, as stated in the evidence last night, that if there is a separate regulatory body the time will eventually come when the C.B.C. will, of course, disappear as a national system and the independent stations will usurp that particular position and the C.B.C. will become ancillary to them. Now, do you agree, and what opinion do you have on that?—A. Naturally, Mr. Hansell, we do not agree with the viewpoint which, I think, reflects a certain confusion of terms. Doctor Forsey and Mr. MacDonald did not have before them the brief that we today presented to the committee at the time their own brief was writen, nor have they ever consulted with us to find out precisely what we have in mind when we come to talk about a separate regulatory body. Had they read our brief it might have been clear to them that we visualize the situation in which the C.B.C. not only continues to provide its present service to the community, but is given the opportunity of improving still further upon that service, and that the privately owned stations would be given

the opportunity of even further improving their services to the community. This arrangement would in no way, could not possibly in any way affect or reduce or diminish the importance and usefulness of the C.B.C., in fact it would enhance all those factors—and may I point out that we are not talking here wholly about academic matters or suppositions. The C.B.C. would continue in existence and I suggest that any body which has valuable years of experience, which has immediate and continual access to networks and which is a publicly owned body, with all that implies in prestige, stature and support, could not be in the slightest danger of domination or reduction.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: As it is now 5.30, do members think we could adjourn now till 8:30, and at that time, Mr. Hansell, you could continue your questioning, unless you only have one or two questions.

Mr. HANSELL: I have more questions to ask.

Mr. GOODE: And I was going to ask if the committee could meet at a little earlier hour tonight.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: If the committee agrees to sit at eight, I am ready.

Mr. HANSELL: Sometimes when the House reconvenes at eight, there are matters that require us to be there.

Mr. FLEMING: Could we be statesmanlike, Mr. Chairman, and compromise on 8:15?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: 8:15 then?

Agreed.

The meeting adjourned.

EVENING SESSION

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I see a quorum, gentlemen.

Mr. T. J. Allard, General Manager, Canadian Association of Broadcasters, recalled:

Mr. Hansell had started to ask a few questions of Mr. Allard.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I think perhaps we pretty well established the fact that you, Mr. Allard, do not say that the effectiveness of the C.B.C. would be depreciated should there be a separate regulatory body?—A. We believe, Mr. Hansell, that its effectiveness would be enhanced.

Q. Do you visualize, or have you thought that, a separate regulatory body might be even more harsh with their regulations affecting independent broadcasting?—A. Naturally, sir, we have given a great deal of thought to this, and it is entirely possible in some or all respects such a body might be more harsh in the application of regulation to broadcasting stations. Should this happen, and should it be deemed necessary that it should happen in the public interest, then of course it is proper it should happen. You will note in our brief we referred to the report of the MacQuarrie Commission and I believe you will find that the situation there is on all fours. Certain improvements were made in the legislation and if those improvements have resulted in the legislation being more "harshly" enforced, then it is necessarily desirable that it should be so. The report of the MacQuarrie Commission pointed out these facts which are on all fours with the case we are putting forward:

> He (the Commissioner) is given the compromising appearance of being at one and the same time prosecutor and judge. No matter how fully his assessment of a situation may be justified by results, its value is lessened by the inconstancy of his position.

Then later on it says this—I think this is important:

> It is important that the Act receive the widest possible public support. There seems to be no valid criticism of the fairness or the vigour of the administration of the Act, but as long as a single official is placed in the position of being required to perform incompatible functions there is room for a good deal of public misunderstanding.

I think those same arguments apply precisely in the broadcasting instance.

Q. Very well. Now, another question following that. Would you anticipate that under a separate regulatory body that the independent stations would be able to make more money?—A. Mr. Hansell, I doubt very much that the financial position of the privately-owned stations would be affected one way or the other by the independent regulatory body we have visualized.

Q. On the basis of those two questions, could we conclude that you are not recommending a separate regulatory body for anything you can get out of it, but purely on a matter of principle?—A. A matter of principle and equity.

Q. Now, I might change the subject slightly. It has been said that should there be a separate regulatory body it might result in the independent stations, and perhaps the C.B.C. too, carrying more commercial programs or more commercial advertising. Do you agree with that?—A. No, sir. I fail to see how the creation of a separate regulatory body would bring about this particular result in the case of either the privately owned stations or C.B.C. There is this moreover to keep in mind. Should the percentage of commercial content on the C.B.C. or privately owned stations become generally offensive to the public taste, two things will happen. The adverse effect on the privately owned stations by public opinion would seriously affect their financial position. Secondly, those who wish to make representations to this regulatory body would be in a position to do so and that body would be in a position to take such action as it thought the public interest required.

Q. There is, I think, a wrong impression in the minds of some that a commercial program is an advertising program. I think a better understanding of it would be that a commercial program is a program; the only thing that is commercial about it is the announcement that is given advertising the product. Is it proper to say that?—A. This is a wholly accurate statement, and moreover a commercial program essentially is a program which has attracted a sufficiently large listening audience to capture the interest of the sponsor or advertiser who wishes to advertise his commercial message.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Is it not true, Mr. Allard, a commercial program can be called commercial in that its quality, its content, is aimed at the kind or particular type of person who buys that particular product and as such could be offensive to the whole mass of the general public? I do not want to mention any particular product or program, but let us put it this way: Is it not true that certain flippant, foolish sort of things are bought by the public and you get the same sort of flippant and foolish or moronic program aimed at that particular type, that they may listen to it and buy the article. Is that not a statement of fact in your opinion?—A. No. In our opinion that would not be the case at all. Virtually everybody who listens to a broadcasting station is a consumer and therefore a person who buys goods. The program is designed so as to attract maximum attention from the potential buyer.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Now, could you tell the committee approximately how much time we will say in a 15-minute broadcast—how much of that time would be given to actual commercial announcements? I think you get my point. If there is a 15-minute broadcast and perhaps a half minute announcement?—A. I was just going to say it is very difficult to arrive at a figure of this type. Let us assume a station has four quarter hour programs, each of them sponsored, making a total of an hour. In certain analyses this hour is listed as being commercial in spite of the fact that there is a commercial message of maybe from 40 seconds to 5 minutes involved in each of the programs.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Sometimes much too long commercials.

The WITNESS: Now, the question of the total commercial time is a question of definition. If you have two one minute announcements in a quarter hour show you have actually two minutes of commercial time. In many analyses it is listed as fifteen minutes commercial time in spite of the fact that this is not actually the fact. It would be most difficult to give a precise answer to your question. It would vary on different stations.

Q. You could not give any idea at to what an average would be, say on a half hour or hour program? Would it be four minutes? Maybe that is expecting too much for you to give that. What I am trying to put over to you is this. In the brief presented last night—I do not want to refer to it again—there was an indication that any time given over to an advertisement could not be given over to broadcasting, that is to programs, so that the more advertising you get then the less time there is for a broadcast of an actual program.—A. That of course is a misunderstanding. A commercial program is simply an effective program into which an advertising message has been inserted. Now, if you assume that 50 per cent of the programs available in a given day from a specific station have been sold, offhand I would think this might not be an unfair figure as an overall figure although the figures would vary between stations, and something under $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent of that 50 per cent would be occupied by actual commercial messages on an advertisement.

Q. Yes, but I am not referring to the commercial program, I am only referring to that almost infinitesimal amount of time that is given over to saying "This is the product of such and such a company, use it to wash your feet with and so forth..." That actual announcement is a very small part of a day's time and I am trying to get from you how many commercial announcements there might be—approximately what amount of the entire broadcasting time that would take up. Perhaps that is too much to ask. Might I ask this question, following that. If there were a regulatory body, do you visualize any drastic change in respect to the commercial programs?

(The chairman resumed the chair).

A. There is in fact no connection. The factors that apply here are purely the effect of efficiency of operation, the necessity for each station to maintain the largest possible listening audience and the desire of the management to do just that. The existence of a separate regulatory body would not affect the situation in any way, shape or form, and I do think there would be no great change.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Does the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation lay down a regulation in regard to the proportion of time to be given to program content as against advertising content? What is the proportion?—A. If my memory serves me right, it is five per cent.

Q. That is the limit?—A. Rather than leave a misleading impression I could, if I may, refer to the specific regulation and quote it for you. Regulation 11 reads:

> Spot announcements shall not exceed two minutes for each broadcasting hour, subject always to the provisions of subsection (2) of this regulation.

Subsection (2) provides that no spot announcement shall be broadcast on weekdays between 7.30 p.m. and 11 p.m., nor on Sundays at any time, provided that, where exceptional conditions prevail and owing to the geographical situation, stations may be given permission by the corporation to broadcast spot announcements on weekdays during the hours prohibited by this section. To my knowledge, that has never been done.

Q. I got the impression from what you said to Mr. Hansell that sixteen per cent of the time was what was being used commonly on the commercial part of a program. Am I wrong in that?—A. Yes, sir. I left the impression with you wrongly. I was taking Mr. Hansell's figures wrongly. Taken in the correct manner, the percentage would be considerably lower than that.

Q. A lot of these broadcasts would seem to combine the advertising with the program. I am aware they make these little rhymes and ditties about somebody's soap and those rhymes and ditties are supposed to be part of the entertainment. Is there any check-up on that sort of thing or have they carte-blanche to work the advertising into the entertainment itself? Does anybody scrutinize that sort of thing?—A. There is nobody from the C.B.C. or any official source who does. The public always is the final and the most effective scrutineer.

Q. But, of course, the public, I suggest, can be influenced. The public can actually be influenced and that is the thing I am interested in particularly, that the public can be trained into certain habits by what comes over the air. I am going to ask you the question I asked once to a rather famous newspaper editor: Do you and your organization admit any responsibility in regard to the cultivation—I hate to use this word because it is so overdone— in the education of Canadian people towards the finer things? The word that I was avoiding was "culture". My newspaper friend—and I see some smiles on the faces of my friends, and I do not blame them for that—but may I, Mr. Chairman, say what the reply of my editor friend was. He said, "Mr. Knight, we are not here running a Sunday school; we are a corporation running this newspaper to make dividends. That is my answer to your question." In other words, he admitted no responsibility for the cultivation of the public taste. He was there to sell a commodity and to make his profits and he was there to sell anything the public wanted. In other words, the paper was not going to give the public what it thought they ought to have, but to give the public what the public was prepared to pay for. What is your comment on that particular situation?—A. I find it very difficult to accept the theory that that which the public wants is undesirable or necessarily unrelated to what you call the finer things of life.

Q. I know that is a hard problem.—A. And if you will refer to appendix "C" which we have filed with the committee, you will agree with me that the contribution of the broadcasting stations to the finer things of life has been substantial.

Q. Lest I should be misunderstood in all this questioning, I want to pay tribute to the very fine services that are being rendered by radio stations throughout this country, and I am referring particularly to CFQC in Saskatoon, which is a very fine private radio station.—A. Thank you, Mr. Knight. It is very generous of you to say so. Both the stations in Saskatoon are very efficiently operated stations.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Coming back to the subject of commercial announcements, you said that there were already regulations laid down with respect to the amount of time to be given to commercial announcements, and you called them "spot announcements", I think there is a difference. Is there any difference between spot announcements and what are generally known as commercials?—A. Yes, Mr. Hansell, I see the point you are driving at. The insertion of a commercial message into a program is not what is ordinarily referred to as a spot announcement. The appropriate regulation in connection with the program material as such is numbered 9, as I recall it, yes, 9(1), and it reads:

> The advertising content of any program shall not exceed in time ten per cent of any program period; (2) notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1), any station shall upon instructions in writing from the corporation reduce the total daily advertising content of its programs if the said total daily advertising content in the opinion of the corporation occupies an undue proportion of daily broadcast time; (3) upon notice in writing from the corporation, any station shall change the quality or nature of its advertising broadcasts.

Q. I am through with that line of questioning, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Beaudry.

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. If I follow your opening reasoning correctly, you said, (1), broadcasting like all forms of publication requires legal regulation in the public interest, but these regulations should be applied by another body other than the one existing. I am under the impression at the moment the only regulations governing other publications or other means of publication are regulations as to what should be published. Is that what you had in mind when you took that original line of reasoning?—A. The original line of reasoning, Mr. Beaudry, the general outline set forth at the beginning of our brief, establishes what we regarded as the necessary informational and philosophical background to indicate the reasons why we think that a separate regulatory body for broadcasting is important.

Q. I am not necessarily in disagreement with you, but I am trying to follow your line of reasoning. You say, "Broadcasting like all other forms of publication requires legal regulation in the public interest." Do you mean by that that broadcasting should require legal regulations similar to that used in other forms of publication?—A. Yes, I think that is accurate.

Q. What regulations do you have specifically in mind as now applying to other forms of publication?—A. As I mentioned earlier this afternoon, there are already regulations in one form or another which permit or prohibit other forms of publication from doing certain things. There are punitive penalties provided for sedition, treason, libel, slander, false advertising, misbranding, and there are also certain other regulations applied by federal enactment and in one or two cases at least, by provincial and municipal enactment.

Q. Can we not agree that this would apply to the nature of what is published and not exclusively to them?—A. There are regulations which apply really more than that. I am not particularly familiar with the details of the regulations in operation in other forms of publication. But speaking from memory, I believe in order to obtain certain mailing rates, that newspapers have to conform to certain regulations in connection with their total advertising content. And of course, other forms of publication are subject to various municipal ordinances.

Q. Yes. I wonder if your reference to postal rates could be considered in this phase of our thinking? I think it is strictly a case of determining rates almost by weight or by content. However, it is not that important. You said in paragraph No. 4 on page 2:

> (4) The creation of a separate regulatory body for broadcasting as advocated in our submission to this committee is in no way an attack upon the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, nor will it, adversely affect that Corporation's position. On the contrary, it would encourage the full development and utilization of both forms of broadcasting within the community.

That may assume that the present position is such that the full development and utilization is not available. Would you be kind enough to elicit a little further why the present system does not allow for the full development of radio and television in the community?—A. I think you will find that enlarged upon in the subsequent pages. First of all, we are at pains to point out that we believe that if the C.B.C. were entirely free to concentrate on its programming services and activities, that it could improve still further the services which it gives in this respect. The C.B.C. operating as a regulatory body in addition to being a programming body must devote a large proportion of its time and money and energies to the regulatory function. We believe that some clarification of the division of labour in this connection would lead to a greater efficiency, and would permit greater programming and physical development on the part of the C.B.C.

In so far as the privately owned stations themselves are concerned, we believe it would assist and encourage them in their development along the same lines as set forth again in the reasoning of the MacQuarrie Commission. And I would refer you to our comments in that connection in the opening statement which I read earlier today, in which were mentioned again the fact which appears at the top of page 12, where I think you will find quite clearly the point we are driving at in that connection.

Q. From a more practical point of view, is it possible to make progress a little better in methods, manner or means by which this full development could be the better arrived at? Would you like to give the committee specific examples?—A. I think that in the case of the C.B.C. we have been pretty specific in both our brief and our preliminary statement. Obviously the C.B.C. is a big, far-flung and complex organization. Were it free to concentrate on its programming energies and efforts and attempts, it could do a better job. There would be more money and more time and more activity available for this purpose.

In the case of the privately owned stations, I think that something of the same nature would happen. Some of the energy that of necessity is now devoted to negotiations in the atmosphere that present legislation brings about, would be freed for the development of still better programming activity and for the extension of the individual station's services to its community.

Q. I am trying to arrive in my mind at how much time this extra work, if you call it that, which is now thrust upon the C.B.C. does actually take so far as its relationship with the over-all governing of radio in the country is concerned?—A. A great deal, I would suggest. The Board of Governors of the C.B.C. is required to administer the C.B.C. itself and is required to meet, in its regulatory capacity, at the same time it is handling its internal functions. With one exception that members of the board are voluntary or at least part-time people. They meet 3, 4, or 6—certainly not more than 10 times a year for 2 or 3 days, and in that time they are called upon not only to supervise

the operations of a very large and important corporation, but they are called upon to deal with regulations, with the giving of decisions, with the recommending of licences, as well as a great many other factors. Obviously this is going to take a great deal of their time, energy and attention.

When those meetings are held, the attendance of a great many members of the staff is required, therefore, in expenditure of time and money. I think you know that an additional and an entirely separate department is maintained to deal with the regulatory aspect of the C.B.C. in relation to the independent stations.

Q. In actual terms of time, these meetings would not consume much more than a month a year, would they? I am speaking of the meetings of the Board of Governors?—A. I am not suggesting that we should cut down the meeting time that the Board of Governors actually use in their meetings, or even the number of meetings. I am merely suggesting that at those meetings all of their time could be given to the internal affairs of the corporation itself.

Q. I appreciate that. I was trying to establish for my own satisfaction perhaps as well as that of others, exactly how much is involved by this full control by the C.B.C. outside of its own activities. So far we have pinned it down to a point of perhaps a month of meetings throughout the year on the part of the Board of Governors and on the part of some of the C.B.C. staff which is necessary in connection with those meetings.—A. Yes.

Q. And that leads me to ask myself this question: Just exactly how much control does radio in the country require beyond the control given over to the C.B.C. of its own operations in the course of a year?—A. Well, of course—

Q. I am not trying to value it in time.—A. No.

Q. I am trying to value it in terms of over-all control and over-all operational control. I am wondering if we are not making these words "control" and "abrogation of regulations" and "supervision" and so on perhaps a bit larger than what is involved in fact. It is purely a question, in my case, and I am not putting up any argument.—A. I think, as a matter of fact, that an examination of certain factors obviously requires a great deal more time and a great deal more attention than this present Board of Governors can, with all honesty and reasonableness, be expected to give to it.

Like myself, I believe you have attended certain meetings of the Board of Governors of the C.B.C. and you will have found that a full two days of their three day meetings will be occupied by the hearing of applications for licences, applications for changes of power, applications for changes of frequencies, and representations upon regulatory matters and so on. Now with that volume of the business before the Board, the board is going to be in a very difficult position because some of the matters before them should be examined in much greater detail and in much geater depth than a two day meeting could possibly permit.

Q. Throughout your brief and throughout some other briefs there has been a comparison between, or the establishment of a difference between, the operation of the C.B.C., as operating radio and also supervising radio in this country, and the operations of the Board of Transport Commissioners and the Air Transport Board, and I wonder whether we are quite right in making an analogy between the powers and the type of supervision which is required between the last two mentioned and the first. I am under the impression, rightly or wrongly, that the Board of Transport Commissioners and the Air Transport Board exercise their authority in most cases for the benefit of third parties, the passengers, the users of freight for the determination of rates to a great extent, and for matters which are much more concerned with third parties, than they are of the two you might call competitive lines in the case of the railroads and various competitive lines in the case of air lines, and it seems to me that the position is different from that of the

C.B.C. which exercises control over radio. Do you agree with this?—A. The operation of course of the Board of Transport Commissioners or the Air Transport Board is quite different from that of the C.B.C. because neither of them are operating bodies, whereas the C.B.C. is in fact an operating body. I think it is accurate to say that any regulatory body operates in a large part for the interest of, or for the protection of, third parties. It must also be in a position to adjudicate and give their adjudication is such a way that it can gain public confidence and realization that those who are adjudicating are completely impartial in the interests of third parties, where two operations are concerned. I do not think that I need necessarily disagree with you, if I say that nobody would suggest that the C.N.R.'s function be consolidated with those of the Board of Transport Commissioners.

Mr. FLEMING: May I interrupt. When you use the expression which appeared in Mr. Beaudry's question "third party" are you not meaning the public?

The WITNESS: I mean both the public and the parties which appear before the board.

Mr. FLEMING: But you really mean the public? And I take it Mr. Beaudry means the public apart from the particular company.

Mr. BEAUDRY: That is the public characterized into certain groups of individuals. It is not the same public as you would refer to in dealing with radio and TV which is definitely the public at large. You may extend the word "public" that point if you want to, but very definitely the Board of Transport Commissioners when dealing with a question of right of way in a definite spot, they are dealing with the public through one individual or a group of individuals of the public.

Mr. CARTER: May I ask a question?

Mr. BEAUDRY: I have one more question to ask, but go ahead Mr. Carter.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. I think Mr. Allard said just now that he believed that the effectiveness of the C.B.C. would be enhanced under a separate controlling body. Do you envisage any change in the role or function of the C.B.C. in relationship to private stations?—A. The change in relationship to private stations is that the C.B.C. would no longer be forced into the position of regulating private stations while at the same time competing with them, of being forced into the role that the MacQuarrie Commission described as being at the same time prosecutor and judge.

Q. Under the present set-up the C.B.C. is the backbone of our national system, and the private stations are supplementary to the C.B.C. as part of the national system. In other words the C.B.C. has the main role and the private stations have a supplementary role. Do you still envisage that would still be the same under a separate body?—A. I do not see, sir, how the position in its basic aspect could be greatly changed. You will notice we referred in our opening statement to a separate regulatory body dealing with matters as between the C.B.C. network and the privately owned stations. This of course makes it obvious we assumed the C.B.C. would continue to operate networks, and the privately owned stations might continue to carry programs from them under arrangement with the C.B.C. In the case of disagreement an adjudication would be made by this regulatory body between C.B.C. and those non-government stations serving as outlets for the C.B.C. networks and, moreover, as I said in reply earlier to a similar question to

Mr. Hansell, the C.B.C. has today, and will continue to have access to networks, which have a wide background of experience; and the prestige of a publically owned body could scarcely fail to maintain its present relative position.

Q. We do not think of the private stations so much as competitors of the C.B.C. at the present time as contributors to the national system. Now, people who appeared before us last night seemed to think if we had this separate body and deprived the C.B.C. of its controlling powers, we would then be changing it into two opposing competing bodies rather than one main body and a supplementary body.—A. With the separate regulatory body some of the privately-owned stations would unquestionably continue to be, as you have phrased it "contributors" to the C.B.C. At the same time, the C.B.C. is now and in fact in competition with the privately-owned stations, both for audience and business.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Is it altogether true to say that they are in equal competition for business? The independent stations never do business with a firm desiring network programs?—A. As a matter of fact there are two answers to this. The privately-owned stations as you know are not allowed to form national networks. There was a recommendation of the Massey Commission that the C.B.C. discontinue the practice of soliciting and accepting local business at the local level. This I believe has been done, but obviously it was done up until that time or the Massey Commission would not have made the recommendation that it be discontinued. Secondly, where a specific advertiser buys a network, he thereupon goes automatically out of the market for a series of individual programs on individual stations, and consequently the two stations are in fact competing.

Q. I think the brief we had last night implied a criticism of the C.B.C. in not exercising its control as strictly as it should. Would you agree with that?

Mr. KNIGHT: For the record, would you put in the name of those who had submitted the brief? Are you referring to the C.C.L.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. Yes, the C.C.L. brief. I think it implied that—I have not got the actual words—but that was the implication in the brief.—A. That of course would be strictly a matter of opinion. There are those who might desire to see broadcasts or any other form of publication, or any other type of business in a community, much more strictly regulated, and/or controlled than it is, and I do not think you would ever find agreement on where the line should be drawn as between people whose opinions legitimately differ.

Q. Is it your opinion if the C.B.C. exercises its present control in Canada that it puts the private station at a disadvantage or in the manner in which it is at a disadvantage?—A. If you do not mind I would like to answer the question this way. As we pointed out several times, we did not come here to complain about the C.B.C. nor to complain about specific applications of its regulations. We are merely trying to put forward our view that there would be a more fair situation and a situation which would command a wider degree of public acceptance, one which would permit the improvement still further of all kinds of broadcasting facilities, if the regulatory function were exercised by a body which is not an operator of broadcasting stations.

Q. You have no complaints about the present situation except that it is a matter of principle?—A. The point we are making is we did not come here to complain about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation or the application of its regulations either.

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. Outside of the principle itself, would the private stations—and I appreciate that they are submitting or discussing a principle and are not complaining of anything in particular—have their general life altered to any definite extent if there were a separate body instead of the C.B.C. in control of radio? I am speaking now of their normal yearly operation?—A. In certain aspects they would. The question I submit, Mr. Beaudry, is one of creating a situation where no real injustice or abuse can be permitted or the appearance of it given. If you and I were in competition together and you also have the regulatory function, no matter how fair or reasonable your decisions are there is always the suspicion in my mind that your decision may be motivated by factors to your own competitive or economic advantage, and no matter how unreasonable my suspicions, they will exist. In the eyes of the public there would always be the question whether or not this exists. When you have third party judgment you eliminate this trouble completely and command confidence and support.

Q. That I would think is from the aspect of the principle proper. From the practical aspects would you explain what changes there would be if any substantial changes in the general tenor of the private radio life?—A. While on the whole there would be no revolutionary over-all change, I think that the position of the individual privately-owned stations would be such that they could offer the provision of better service to the communities.

Q. What prevents now this aspect of better service, or what control exercised by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation prevents the full fruition of full service?—A. Not necessarily full service. An improvement, an enhancement if you like, of that type of service. I am speaking of the application of specific instances where third party judgment might take a different view and bring down a different decision than would the judgment made by a party which has itself an operating interest.

Q. I think we have covered that and I appreciate your earlier statement that you have no particular quarrel with the present method of control, if not the present type of control; but I am interested in trying to find out from you what definite tangible improvements that would obtain to the private radio stations should the type of control be changed?—A. Well, you see that puts us in this position. We are trying to be both fair and moderate and we are trying not to put ourselves in the position of complaining about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in the application of its regulations. Our answer to your question would have to be done almost on that basis because to indicate the method or specific change would be to build up an outline of the situations which we now feel would be incorrect or a little unfair in certain aspects.

Q. I certainly do not want to force you to state verbally the opposite of what you have stated in your brief which is obviously your opinion. I was wondering if there was something in your line of thought we could go on to follow your expressed words that the present type of control does hinder private radio in the fulfilment of its service to the community—A. We feel there are certain limitations which might be improved by the application of third party judgment.

By Mr. Jones:

Q. I have listened all afternoon and so far am not convinced there would be any change in turning over to a third party. Nothing you have said has convinced me and I would like to know what specific instance there is where benefit would accrue to the public?—A. We have, Mr. Jones, made specific application to the C.B.C.'s Board of Governors for alteration, amendment or modification of certain of their regulations. With one or two of these applica-

tions we have been over a period successful. It has been and always has been our feeling and is now that the application of third party judgment to such requests where they are made would lead to the better development of service by the privately-owned stations.

Q. Suppose you had the third party proposition adopted, would the personnel of the present Board of Governors be satisfactory?—A. Naturally, Mr. Jones, we have absolutely no—

Q. You have nothing against the personnel?—A. No. Absolutely not. We have nothing against the personnel of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. We have in this group a body of men and women who are honestly trying to do the best job they can under the limitations imposed upon them by the existing situation.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Your complaint would simply be the C.B.C. takes upon itself the role of an operating body. Is not that it largely?—A. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is, because of the chain of circumstances outlined in our opening statement, in our brief, forced to operate in the dual role of a corporation which provides services and at the same time regulates.

Q. Could I remind you that you have gone a long way from the original intention of the Act when the C.B.C. was supposed to be the only operating body, and I am asking you have not the private stations become powerful, pretty successful and more influential than they had been. I mean they have become progressively all these things under the present set-up.—A. The first part of your statement is almost in essence a statement we made earlier today. Had the recommendation of the Aird Commission been implemented it is our view the present broadcasting Act would be effective and cover the situation it was intended to cover. The recommendations of the Aird Commission were not implemented and the broadcasting Act did set up a framework of course which was intended to govern only the existence of the C.B.C. But the C.B.C. is now called upon to govern the operations of both itself and the independent stations.

Q. Would you agree with me, for example, that certain of the private stations have had their power, or kilowatts, or whatever you call it, boosted to something like 50000 kilowatts, to something which was never visualized at the time the Act was set up, or in fact was never visualized. I think, until the last two or three years? I think private stations are doing all right, and, as I said before, I think they are performing a useful service, but I think under the present C.B.C. set-up they have been doing remarkably well for themselves.—A. There are two privately owned stations operating at a power of 50000 watts. In one of these cases we are in the situation where the increase in power was not particularly the desire of the individual station concerned. Because of factors leading to a change of frequency the power was granted to the station in order to prevent the loss of that frequency under international agreement to another country. In connection with power, Mr. Knight, this factor should be kept in mind also. There has been a rapid increase in man-made interference as our population grows, and you need relatively more power to do the same job than you needed ten years ago.

Q. What I am wanting to know is if you want the C.B.C. to sort of become an old man of the sea who is off in a corner and does the brain work and looks after the cultural needs of the people, while the private stations collect the gravy? I do not see why the C.B.C. should not collect some of the gravy, too.

Mr. FLEMING: Twenty-six and a quarter million dollars this year isn't bad.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I am very suprised, but I cannot say I am disappointed because I am not, but I am very suprised to find that the C.A.B. evidently have changed

their attitude in regard to the C.B.C., and it is all for the good. One thing I would like to ask before I go to British Columbia, where I always go in my arguments and questioning, is there any argument, Mr. Allard, between the C.A.B. and the C.B.C. as to these new suggested regulations? Are you both agreed on them, or have you had the opportunity to confer about them?—A. The new proposals are a matter of continuing consultation between ourselves, the C.B.C. and, I am told, other interested parties.

Q. Are there any major differences between you on these suggested new regulations?—A. No final decisions have been arrived at.

Q. You are being very careful with your answers, I see. Now I want to go to British Columbia for a moment. We have been talking about controls for some time and that includes the control of frequencies used by independent stations. The Canadian Association of Broadcasters may not have any complaint about this, but the public of British Columbia certainly have. I have been asked by my colleague, Mr. Mott, the member of parliament for New Westminster, to bring this matter up, and I bring it up also for myself. In the last three weeks, we have had about 1,200 letters from British Columbia in regard to vacant localities as far as radio is concerned in British Columbia—Langley Prairie, White Rock, and some parts east of New Westminster. It seems out there they cannot receive certain radio stations, cannot get the programs from them. Has there been any representation from the C.A.B. to the C.B.C. regarding that situation in British Columbia?—A. Perhaps I might refer to the Chairman of my Board, Mr. Elphicke, for information on that. Mr. Elphicke, do you know if anybody in British Columbia has taken this question up?

Mr. F. H. ELPHICKE (*Chairman, Board of Directors, C.A.B.*): I would have to say no to that question because, after all is said and done, that is a matter for the individual stations rather than the C.A.B., which represents all stations in Canada.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Then I take it that the people in these parts, in writing to their members of parliament instead of writing to the C.A.B., are doing the right thing.—A. There would be no action that we could suitably take.

Q. Mr. Fulton earlier in the proceedings discussed this very satisfactorily, but I want to come back to it again—it is a matter of the old C.B.C. wave length on the dial in British Columbia. I think it was 1130, if I remember right. That wave length is now vacant and, as I understand, there have been applications for it by the C.B.C. Has the C.A.B. taken any official position in regard to a separate application in respect to an operator for that wave length? —A. Again, may I refer to the chairman of my Board?

Mr. ELPHICKE: As an applicant for that particular frequency, we were advised by the C.B.C. that they had the matter under advisement because they had some use for it in British Columbia.

Mr. GOODE: Let me refer to wave length 730. Does the same thing pertain there?

Mr. ELPHICKE: I am not an engineer, but 730 was one of these frequencies that was suddenly pulled out of the bag not by the C.B.C., but I believe by some firm of engineers in Montreal with the idea it might be a valuable frequency in British Columbia. That, again, is a matter that is under negotiation, in virtue of an international agreement, between Canada and Mexico.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Would not that be one of the things that would interest this independent regulatory body you are talking about, in regard to the allocation of the wave

lengths? Do you think you would get fairer treatment from an independent regulatory body than you are getting from the C.B.C.?—A. That would be one of the matters that they would have to concern themselves mith, this matter of allocation of wave lengths upon request for them.

Q. Is that one of the arguments you advance in support of this independent body?—A. It is, and I want to be careful not to leave an impression that we would not want to leave. We are not in any way suggesting that the C.B.C. in making these recommendations has been unfair or unreasonable. We do feel, however, that there would be more public support for a system in which the independent body decided whether a given wave length would be assigned to A, or B, or to no one at all, than when the recommendation is made by a body which obviously has an interest of its own in the matter.

Q. May I say, Mr. Allard, that the public of British Columbia do not entirely agree with you. You have your way of submitting a brief, and that is your business, but I would point out to you the indications from C.A.B. have certainly changed within the last twelve months, and I am not going to ask you why, and I certainly would not expect an answer or to give the reason why this has happened.—A. As a matter of fact, may I point out that I did not want to interrupt you at that point about us changing out attitude, but we have not done so—and you will forgive me if I cannot deal too specifically with British Columbia. Our association represents the entire country and we are more familiar with the problems on a national level.

Mr. KNIGHT: Have you changed your board members to any extent in the last twelve months?

The WITNESS: Four or five. Our Board of Directors is elected annually.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Mr. Allard, I would like to ask you some questions, the answers to which, I think, are inherent in your presentation, but because of certain discussions that we had last night I do think it is a matter to be clear on. the position of your association. You have in your brief and preliminary remarks to the committee today discussed mainly the question of an independent regulatory body, and then certain questions have arisen as to whether or not the existence of such a body would derogate from the position of the C.B.C., and in the discussions last night certain suggestions were made that if this idea was put into effect it would eventually mean the loss of Canadian control over Canadian broadcasting, in fact the expresssion was used that eventually Canadian broadcasting would be swallowed up by American influences. I want to ask you questions to bring out your ideas on this matter of regulation. When you advocate the setting up of an independent regulatory body, is it with a view to eliminating the public control or regulation of broadcasting in Canada? —A. Oh, no, sir, a separate regulatory body obviously is a body appointed by the public, responsible to the public, to maintain regulations in the public interest.

Q. You would then have your own organization which would have no fundamental objection to the idea of public control and regulation of Canadian broadcasting?—A. That is entirely correct, sir, as is pointed out in several places in both our preliminary statement and in our brief, insofar as regulation is concerned.

Q. Would you have any objection to the idea of regulations—I am not going to question you as to the subject matter with which those regulations might deal generally speaking—that is, with respect to the content of broadcasting, whether over publicly or privately owned stations, such regulations which would prescribe that there must be freedom of expression, and that there must be opportunity for answering any particular point of view which a private station may have allowed to be put over its station?—A. Speaking for myself,

and I am sure that my colleagues will agree with me, we would welcome a regulatory principle of that type, one guaranteeing freedom of expression.

Q. Would you have any objection to regulations prescribing or limiting the amount of advertising which could be put over the air, that is, the actual advertising content of a broadcasting program?—A. Provided always that the regulations are not so drafted or enforced as to put the operator in such a position that he can be or will be forced out of business, and provided it is a perfectly reasonable and normal application, no.

Q. Then in principle you would have no objection to regulations limiting the amount of advertising content of a broadcasting program?—A. No. In principle we have not objected to the application of any such requirement.

Q'. Would you envisage and be prepared to accept a regulation as to the amount of the Canadian content of the over-all broadcast, both by private and by public systems?—A. The phrase "Canadian content" is an extremely difficult one to define. We would certainly be prepared to co-operate with any honest attempt or regulation calculated to encourage the development of artistic genius and the presentation of it.

Q. So, in principle you are not seeking to throw out any regulation governing the question of Canadian content of a broadcast?—A. I think both in principle and in fact Canadian privately owned stations are making the best contribution they possibly can to the development of Canadian talent and Canadian creative genius.

Q. Would the same set of principles which you have just indicated apply to your position with respect to a regulation governing the proportion of live originations as against, shall I say, dead originations, in other words, live originations as against recorded originations?—A. Transcribed?

Q. Transcribed?—A. That again is a difficult question to answer. Of course this is a matter where circumstances will vary according to localities. This I think should be a matter for discussion between those who are sincerely interested in good broadcasting, to find out if there is any great difference beween the voice of Mr. X presented live and the voice of Mr. X presented by way of transcription.

Q. You are faced with that problem now in existing set-up and the existing regulations, are you not—A. Yes, we are.

Q. I wanted to be clear, because I have my own ideas of what sort of regulations that the C.B.C., or a regulatory body should make with respect to broadcasting in Canada. But I want to be clear whether your association is seeking to eliminate regulations along those lines or whether you accept them in principle provided that they are fairly, impartially, and practically administered?—A. The emphasis would be on the word "practically". If it can be demonstrated to us that a broadcast which is transcribed is for some reason or other not as good as a broadcast which is presented live, or a broadcast which is transcribed is deteriorating the quality of broadcasting generally, we would be prepared to accept that principle, certainly. But so far, we have not been convinced that there is any difference between broadcasting by transcription and, in many instances, broadcasting which is presented live.

Q. I am not qualified to argue the technical side of the question, but I am a little concerned at your caution, if I may put it that way. I am a little concerned as to whether or not you are in fact questioning the desirability of having a regulatory body which is generally separate from the C.B.C. with power to regulate as to the content of live or transcribed material in, and as to the proportions of, the broadcasts.—A. The word "content" opens up the whole field as to whether there should be prior approval of what should be said on the air. That is a matter which would concern us greatly. But in connection with transcribed programs, it becomes a matter of practicality. There are stations in some parts of the world which render their entire day's

operation by means of a continuous roll of tape which was transcribed beforehand. This provides an opportunity for a wider degree of accuracy, because if errors are made, they may be eliminated, and the broadcast may be done over again on a tape.

Q. The other day I had to record a broadcast in the Nation's Business Series. I suppose that would not be considered as anything other than a live broadcast although it was placed on tape and I listened to it before it was actually broadcast.

Hon. Mr. McCann: Did anybody listen to it?

Mr. Fulton: Judging from the comments I have had from the Liberal Federation, I take it there were many listeners.

Hon. Mr. McCann: You are just kidding yourself.

Mr. Fulton: I do not want to get into the political aspects of this matter or get into a discussion of the technique of live and recorded broadcasts.

Mr. Goode: That is a place where control should be put on.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Have you any objection in principle to a regulatory body being empowered to make regulations with respect to this subject?—A. I think that our preliminary statement and our brief make it quite clear that we accept the principle of such a regulatory body having the necessary authority to make regulations in the public interest, convenience and necessity.

Q. Now then, some questions were asked a moment or two ago with regard to network broadcasting. I must confess that I am not quite clear at the moment whether it is a matter of C.B.C. policy on its own which prohibits private stations from setting up networks, or whether it is a matter of the Broadcasting Act which they are simply implementing. Could you say a word on that?—A. I think that is probably a matter of opinion or interpretation. You have had training in the law, and so you are better qualified to answer that question than I am. But I believe that the Act provides that the C.B.C. "may" make regulations concerning the formation of networks, and that it "may" make regulations in connection with who shall form part of those networks, or who shall have permission to get on them. Whether or not the word "may" is to be interpreted as permissive or mandatory is outside my field, and whether the authority is permissive or mandatory is probably also a question of opinion.

Mr. Fleming: According to the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936, section 22, subsection (1) reads as follows:

> 22. (1) The Corporation may make regulations:—
>
> (*a*) to control the establishment and operation of chains or networks of stations in Canada;

And section 21 of the same Act reads as follows:

> 21. No private station shall operate in Canada as a part of a chain or network of stations except with the permission of, and in accordance with the regulations made by, the Corporation.

The Witness: Yes. Now, whether that provides for a network monopoly or not, a national network monopoly that is; is a matter of interpretation.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. The import of the provision today is that it is mandatory, and that it means that there shall be only one national network, and that is the government-owned and operated one.—A. That is right.

Q. But from the point of view of the CBC, your impression is—and I realize you cannot say what is in their mind—but your impression is that their attitude is that of merely applying a policy which is laid down in the Act?—A. Yes.

Q. Then I come to the third set of questions which I want to discuss with you. I must confess that this is trespassing in a rather controversial field, however I venture to do so. I am thinking of the suggestion which we frequently hear asserted in this committee that radio and television are in effect a form of natural monopoly owing to the limitation of the number of channels, both as to sound broadcasting and television. I believe it has been stated that that applies especially to television. I also want to admit that we have not had the advantage in this committee of hearing from the Department of Transport experts in the field, but I think Mr. Allard and his associates are reasonably well qualified from a technical point of view and I would like to ask them some questions along these lines. Firstly, are you qualified or can you tell us how many television channels are available in Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: That is in the brief.

The WITNESS: The official list of allocations as issued by the Department of Transport says that there are 230 television channels currently allocated to Canada.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. That is in the whole band of channels—I think it is called the spectrum? —R. In the entire spectrum? I do not want to leave the impression that that is necessarily the total number of television channels in the spectrum.

Q. But that is what is allocated to Canada in the whole spectrum?—A. The television portion of it yes.

Q. Am I right in my understanding that because of the limited range of television broadcast these channels can physically be repeated a vary large number of times in the 3,500 odd miles from coast to coast in Canada.

Mr. GOODE: Before Mr. Allard answers that question, did we not determine earlier in the sitting that we were going to leave television until we could ask general questions on it. I understood that, because none of us have raised the question of television at all.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether there was any such direction given out in connection with questions to Mr. Allard.

Mr. GOODE: There was an understanding to that effect, and I believe you were in the chair at the time.

Mr. FULTON: I think that was with reference to questioning Mr. Dunton, and the C.B.C.

Mr. GOODE: I do not think so, as none of us have been putting questions on television at all. Everyone of us has stayed away from it.

Mr. FULTON: Perhaps it opens up a new line of questioning, but I do not think that we are going to have an opportunity of getting the officials of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters before us again, and I understand they are interested in television as well as radio.

Mr. KNIGHT: I think it is a bad time to open up a new field at the moment, because we are past the time when we normally adjourn.

Mr. GOODE: I think there are many of us here who have questions to put on television.

Mr. FULTON: It seems to me an unnecessary complication, but if we have come to that understanding, then we cannot ask them about television.

The CHAIRMAN: I recall at the examination of Mr. Dunton we decided that questioning on sound broadcasting should be made first, and then we would proceed to television, but I was not in the chair unfortunately, when we commenced questioning this afternoon, and I do not know whether there was any such agreement reached in the committee.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): No question has been put on television this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN: It is quite true we have only a short time left to examine Mr. Allard, but I do not see any reason why we should keep away from one important part of his presentation.

Mr. GOODE: I would point out to you Mr. Chairman that the committee has understood that we should all stay away from television questions. I do not think any member of the committee has mentioned television because we thought that was the understanding at the commencement of the sitting today.

Mr. FLEMING: Perhaps we could resolve it in this way, that members who have questions on sound broadcasting could put them now, and when we are through with it, we could go onto television.

Mr. FULTON: May I suggest that television is such an important part of the field of broadcasting in Canada today that I would not want to see us being denied an opportunity of discussing it with Mr. Allard, and his associates, and if we cannot finish television or start on it with a hope of finishing it tonight, could they not come back on Friday or Monday of next week. If that could be arranged I certainly would not wish to pursue it tonight. If that is not possible, I think we should be doing ourselves a dis-service as well as the public if we cannot raise these very important questions about television.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): We could sit tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: Our difficulty tomorrow is that we have asked the Canadian Newspaper Association and station CFRB to be here which will probably take the whole day, two sittings possibly.

Mr. GOODE: May I assure you Mr. Chairman that we could not complete television within one hour.

Mr. FULTON: My suggestion would be—and I do not want to break any understanding come to by members of the committee—to ask Mr. Allard and his associates to come back another day.

Mr. KNIGHT: These gentlemen come from all over the country, and we must consider their convenience too.

Mr. FLEMING: Normally there are several committees meeting on Thursday morning, but it happens that tomorrow these committees are not meeting.

Mr. GEORGE: Agriculture is meeting.

Mr. FLEMING: The defence expenditure committee meeting was called off.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): May I ask whether another day Friday or Monday would be convenient. Would Friday or Monday be suitable to you Mr. Allard?

The WITNESS: We are completely within the hands of the committee, and we are prepared to do whatever you feel may be useful to you. Some of us can come back Friday or Monday, or whatever time is convenient to the committee.

Mr. JONES: Is tomorrow evening free?

Mr. FULTON: We have two sittings tomorrow.

Mr. HANSELL: What would be wrong with sitting tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN: Very well gentlemen; let us finish our questioning this evening on the question of the regulatory body which Mr. Allard mentioned

on sound broadcasting, and then I think it would be unfair to ask these gentlemen to come back next week. Could we sit tomorrow morning at let us say 11.30 and we could possibly complete television.

Agreed?

Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: Any questions on sound broadcasting?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): I have several questions.

By Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf):

Q. I would like to ask Mr. Allard to tell me if there are any private stations outside of the province of Quebec giving French language programs. —A. Yes sir, there are several.

Q. Name a few.—A. CFCL, Timmins, Ontario is a French language station; CHNO, Sudbury is partly a French language station; SKSB at St. Boniface, Manitoba; and a station at Saskatoon called CFNS; and, CFRG at Gravelbourg, Saskatchewan. They are wholly French language stations, except Sudbury which is partly a French language station.

Q. Are these programs given exclusively by the privately-owned stations or through the facilities provided by the C.B.C.?—A. I believe in most cases it is actually both. Mr. Ricard is here, and perhaps he could tell us whether he has network services or—

Mr. BAXTER RICARD: In the case of CHNO we have a French network and we have both local and network programs in both languages.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): What station?

Mr. RICARD: SHNO, Sudbury, Ontario.

The WITNESS: I forgot to mention a French language station in Edmonton, Alberta, and one in Edmundston, New Brunswick.

By Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf):

Q. And they give French language programs through the facilities of the C.B.C.?—A. I am sorry I cannot answer for all the stations in this connection.

Q. Would you write up the names of the stations and send them to me? —A. Yes sir. If you would like me to send them to you, I would be delighted to do so.

Mr. WILLIAM REA: The question asked by Dr. Gauthier was in connection with French language programs and not stations. We have a French language program on CKNW at New Westminster.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): Without the facilities of the C.B.C.

Mr. REA: Yes.

The WITNESS: These stations I mentioned Dr. Gauthier are stations, with the exception of Mr. Rea's in Sudbury which is essentially a bilingual station, which are exclusively French language in operation and provide nothing but French language services to their communities. There are also certain stations operating in the English language which do a certain amount of French language programs for the benefit of those listeners who prefer it that way.

By Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf):

Q. Given exclusively by the station itself with or without the facilities of the C.B.C.—A. In the latter case the stations themselves provide the service.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): Following up Dr. Gauthier's question, are there stations which are forbidden to have French on their broadcasts?

The WITNESS: Not to the best of my knowledge, sir.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): Are you sure there are not some of your stations that do not permit French on their stations?

The WITNESS: I am not aware of such cases.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): I want to recall the case of a personal experience I had last fall in Sudbury on CKSO. I was invited by the public library board of the city to speak at the official opening. They had requested the services of CKSO to record the speeches that were delivered at the official opening ceremony in the afternoon. This is quite a library; it is worth $400,000; it is a beautiful library and we are proud of our library.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it as good as the Sudbury area?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): Yes, and we are proud of that too. When we go we go first-class. I was asked—and this library board is composed of seven members, five of whom are English-speaking and two are French-speaking—to speak. That library serves the population, and you say in your brief that your stations do everything to promote community spirit and all that; and I was asked by this board in a written invitation which was sent to me along with the program—I was the only person with a public function who was to be on the program that afternoon—and I was requested to speak in French by the board. I was requested in writing. The tape recording went on. The first man on the program to speak was the mayor of the city, and he was recorded. There was nothing wrong with the tape there. The second speaker was the Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Gemmell, and the tape was equally good. The third man to come up—I admit I am not a very good speaker—but the third man to come up was I, and I was cut off completely when the recordings were produced that night of the tape recording which was made in the afternoon. My speech was not on there at all, because it was in French; and many English-speaking people in the city the next day resented that. I think that your association should know these things.

I want to refer to another matter while I am speaking on this, pertaining to Mr. Fleming who is here. When the Minister of Transport, the Hon. Mr. Chevrier, was speaking in the House of Commons on this resolution on March 17 he referred in his speech to the fact that the reason why C.B.C. was held by the present government in this country was to save certain rights of minorities in this country, which was given to them by the B.N.A. Act; and Mr. Fleming—what did he answer? "This is the most shocking kind of demagogic claptrap." That was your answer, Don.

Mr. FLEMING: I think you should read precisely what the minister said. Read the minister's remarks.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): It is on page 3013 of *Hansard* of March 17.

Mr. FLEMING: Read what the minister said.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): How far do you want me to go?

Mr. FLEMING: Read the last few lines of what the minister said when he introduced a note that was quite unworthy of him.

The CHAIRMAN: May I remind the members of the committee that we are trying to complete our questioning of Mr. Allard on the sound broadcasting and regulatory body aspects of his brief. I think Mr. Gauthier was asking a question as to whether there was any regulation, or otherwise, applying to broadcasters other than C.A.B. stations.

The WITNESS: Might I be permitted at this point, Mr. Chairman, to answer Mr. Gauthier's very excellent question. The circumstances you have described, Mr. Gauthier, are indeed unfortunate, but to err is human, and broadcasters being human, they do make a few mistakes.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): Well, then, they are human very often.

The WITNESS: I can assure you this by no manner of means is the general policy. I have worked on broadcasting stations which operated wholly in the English language and operated in communities that were substantially English, in which broadcasts in the French language were accepted when any request was made or when any useful purpose could be served. Here in Ottawa I have heard French language broadcasts, and on two occasions that I can recall offhand French language programs, from the English language stations right here in this city. This exclusion or error is not a general policy, and I should point out that we have amongst our own membership in this association no less than twenty-four French language broadcasting stations, and these people, believe me, help to shape our policy and our views on these matters and are prepared to give us any assistance and advice that we might need.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): Well, it was not a very pleasant experience. It would appear that nobody in this country seems to take care of these people who are not doing what they are supposed to be doing in accordance with the licence that they hold.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this subject, I would like to say that Mr. Gauthier has not accepted my invitation to put on the record what it was in the minister's remarks on which I made that well deserved comment.

The CHAIRMAN: As I indicated before, Mr. Fleming, we are here for questioning the Canadian Association of Broadcasters. The record in Hansard will speak for itself.

Mr. FLEMING: I was refering to the suggestion that the position of the French language would be jeopardized unless the C.B.C. was permitted to continue a policy of complete monopoly in television. That was the whole point.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): That is not here.

Mr. FLEMING: Put it on the record.

The CHAIRMAN: The record is in Hansard.

Are there any further questions on sound broadcasting?

Mr. DECORE: I have a motion, Mr. Chairman, to the effect that the brief and the appendices presented by the C.A.B. today be printed as an appendix to today's evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the wish of the committee on that?
Agreed.

Mr. FLEMING: There is one matter, Mr. Allard, on which you have not yet been invited to make comment: in relation to the proposal for an independent regulatory body the suggestion was put forward, and strongly, last night that this would mean more American programs and, indeed, American domination sooner or later. What is your comment on that contention?

The WITNESS: As we pointed out this afternoon, and as it is stated in our brief, this is definitely not the case. I will read that part of the brief which refers to this:

> Some critics of this proposed forward step have suggested that establishment of an independent regulatory body would permit infiltration of United States influence. Leaving aside for the moment the fact that the owners and operators of non-government stations have in practical fashion demonstrated their devotion to Canada and their desire to assist in the development of this country, it is obvious that the opinion of the separate regulatory body supported by the weight of public opinion would have as much or more power in preventing such a possibility as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation now has.

That is taken from page 12 of our brief.

And may I add to that, sir, that in the event—and in my view the unlikely event—that an independent broadcaster wished to apply to the separate regulatory body for affiliation with a United States network, we must bear in mind that he would have to obtain the permission of that body, that there would be public hearings at which all the facts would be brought out, and then the independent regulatory body itself would decide whether or not such permission would be granted.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. I would like to return to the subject Mr. Fulton was dealing with concerning the availability of channels. Now I understand, Mr. Allard, that the use of frequency modulation would assist in this problem. That is my first question. The second question is that the adapting to the use of FM in Canada seems to be slow. I wonder if that applies to private stations as well as to the C.B.C.?—A. As to the first part of your question, with respect to the FM channels, or the possibility of more usage of them, the fact is that very few of the FM channels have been taken up. I am sorry that I do not quite follow your second question.

Q. FM has proceeded very slowly in Canada and I wonder if there is any particular reason for its slow development?—A. The best reason we could give, or the best reason we have available is that the public does not seem to be particularly captured by the possibilities of FM. FM sets, when they were first brought out in this country, sold very slowly indeed, which tended to slow further or tended to stop the development of FM by either the C.B.C. or by ourselves.

Q. In regard to the number of channels available, do you find in your association any extensive demand for an increase in the number of FM broadcasting stations in Canada?—A. We made a rather extensive statement on this matter this afternoon, or on this set of factors. The fact is that the limiting factor in practice is economic, simply the economic factor. As we have pointed out—this is on page 9 of our preliminary statement of this afternoon—

> ...today there are 139 such stations, and there are channels available for many more. This does not take into account the many hundreds, perhaps thousands of channels available for FM stations, the 230 channels already available for television stations, and the others that will be available for allocation. This compares with less than 100 daily newspapers.

Q. But there is no real demand that is not being satisfied with the establishment of new stations?—A. No.

Q. That is a potential situation. Now, in connection with the problem of Canadian culture, it is significant, is it not that private stations tend to emphasize local community needs perhaps more than the CBC; and there is a tendency in broadcasting, as I see it, that broadcasting originates in metropolitan centers. Do you think that the private stations, with their local emphasis, could in any way compensate for this tendency, because it seems to me that Canadian culture springs from local sources and not necessarily from metropolitan influences?—A. I am completely in agreement with your latter statement. There are two aspects which tend to develop the full utilization of talent. I think it is best done through the networks because that spreads the cost efficiently, fully and effectively. And so far at least as privately owned stations are concerned, they are prevented access to national networks. In so far as the development of Canadian culture is concerned, you are getting into a highly academic question. I think that T.S. Eliot once said that the derby and the dog

races are as much a part of the culture of Great Britain as its literature and its music. That is just a view which I put forward. When all these things are taken into consideration I think you will find that there has been contribution to the development of Canadian culture by privately owned broadcasting stations to a very effective, useful, and worthwhile degree.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Does that not carry out the thing which Mr. Dinsdale has been talking about, namely, that a bright boy in a small town will head for the bigger centers such as Montreal and Toronto?—A. There is that inevitable tendency that the production centers and the opportunity for greater financial reward will lure them away, together with the tendency or desire to want to play in the big leagues, so to speak.

Q. I would hope that the establishment of a production center by the C.B.C. in Saskatchewan would result in our being able to keep some of our talent at home.—A. It is a very difficult problem and the C.B.C. has our sincere sympathy in attempting to do what it may try. We would be delighted if mechanics could be found for keeping more talent and more creative products in local communities. But as you have pointed out, there is that inevitable gravity towards places where there are more financial opportunities and more opportunities for prestige.

Q. If Mr. Dinsdale is correct in his assertion that culture is a grass roots thing, I quite agree with you, and I also agree with your statement that culture is spread by regattas and hockey games and I acknowledge the educative value of entertainment, but the point is this, that you are going to impose upon this country a Montreal or Toronto rather than the grass roots culture we are talking about, and that is largely an American culture which we have in these metropolitan areas at the moment. Am I right?—A. Yes, you are Mr. Knight, and I must say that myself and my colleagues are fully apprised of this situation, and all of us are doing all we possibly can to provide the necessary inducement to the development of what Mr. Dinsdale called grass roots culture to operate in centres which will tend to keep talent, if I may use that word, at home. It is pretty difficult, because in the big centres there is more money available and there is the lure of the big league and the bright lights.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. If a local station developed an outstanding program that was going over well in the local area, I understand that it would be possible to give that particular local program a national scope by arrangement with the C.B.C.? —A. Occasionally.

Q. But if the program is recognized as something outstanding there would be no particular difficulties in presenting it to a larger Canadian audience.

Mr. KNIGHT: If it were very good we could take it away from its point of origin. But the only way to get it would be to remove it from New York.

Mr. DINSDALE: Then it loses its local character.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that the end of questions gentlemen? If so, we will adjourn this evening and meet tomorrow at 11.30 when we will limit our questioning to the subject of television.

EVIDENCE

APRIL 30, 1953.

11:30 a.m.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum.

I have here a brief sent to Mr. Donald Fleming which is entitled Frontier Fifty-Three, The Canadian Radio and Television Broadcasting Controversy and a Proposed Plan for its Solution, by Donald M. Fergusson, Hudson Heights, Quebec. To comply with the request of Mr. Fergusson, Mr. Fleming would like to file this brief with the committee so that any member may be able to consult the brief. Is it agreed?

Agreed.

Now, yesterday we agreed that we would go on with the questioning of Mr. Allard on his opening statement on television and that we would try to stick to television and finish up with Mr. Allard at this sitting this morning if possible.

Mr. T. J. Allard, General Manager, The Canadian Association of Broadcasters, called:

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. May I ask Mr. Allard a question or two concerning the opening pages of that portion of his printed statement which relates to television beginning on page 14. You begin, Mr. Allard, with the commendation of the present television policy of the government as announced on March 30th, 1953. Now, in case there should be any misunderstanding as a result of that opening statement I should like to ask you if the conclusion embodied in the first sentence of your brief on television is related to this particular statement of Dr. McCann of March 30th, 1953, and if your conclusions as so expressed have changed as compared with your views in respect to earlier statements of the government's policy on television?—A. No. Our remark in the opening of that paragraph is in reference to the present television policy as announced by Dr. McCann and set forth later following our opening sentence.

Q. That is the statement of March 30th, 1953?—A. Yes. The statement of March 30th, 1953, by Dr. McCann is in essence the television policy that our association had several times before suggested.

Q. I take it that the policy announced in the statement of Dr. McCann was a very different policy from that announced in an earlier statement on behalf of the government by Dr. McCann in 1952 and the Throne Speech of November, 1952, and later in the House early in 1953, and that we are to interpret your statement as relating entirely and exclusively to the statement of March 30th, 1953?—A. That, sir, is correct.

Q. And it does not relate to the earlier statements?—A. No, sir.

Mr. RICHARD: Please. If Mr. Fleming has any statements of Dr. McCann will he put them on the record. I do not know what he is talking about.

Mr. FLEMING: I think it is high time Mr. Richard did.

Mr. RICHARD: What! Let us get down to the facts.

Mr. FLEMING: I have referred I think to statements that are known to us all, statements made by Dr. McCann.

Mr. RICHARD: Dr. McCann has made many statements. You had better mention them.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, I did mention them. I referred to the statements made by Dr. McCann; two in particular in 1952 and you will find them in the House debate on radio and television July 4th, 1952, and further statements of government policy in relation to television, in the Throne Speech and on January 27, and on March 30th, 1953. If there is any doubt left in the mind of Mr. Richard I will ask Mr. Allard if he is well acquainted with these statements to which I have referred.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: It is on page 14, Mr. Richard.

Mr. RICHARD: I know that. There must be some definite statements and I want to know if Mr. Allard knows what Mr. Fleming is referring to.

Mr. RILEY: Mr. Richard is right.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is that the one, the 30th of March, 1953?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes. I asked the witness in his first statement here where he says he commends the government on its present television policy if that statement is related exclusively to the statement of Dr. McCann in the House on March 30th, 1953, and is not related to the earlier statements. The witness obviously is acquainted with those earlier statements because he has answered my question which was based on and referred to those earlier statements.

Mr. RILEY: What was his answer to the question?

The WITNESS: The answer as I interpreted the question was "yes". On page 15, at the top of the page, we go on to say:

> Our opinion is that the policy as announced is likely, within a reasonable length of time, to assist in providing the great bulk of Canadian communities with competitive television service and to assist in the sound development of a great new industry as well as helping to speed the provision—by means of this new invention—of information, news and entertainment to Canadians.

Then, we go on to say in the immediately subsequent paragraph: "that this achievement has always been the desire of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters and its member stations".

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Any questions?

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Last night I started to ask questions on television and Mr. Allard told us there were 230 channels taken from the whole spectrum and allotted to Canada under international agreement. I then asked him whether I am right in my understanding that in view of the present limited range of television broadcasts, these 230 channels could be multiplied a considerable number of times, bearing in mind the fact there is approximately 3,500 miles from coast to coast in Canada.—A. I should make it clear in replying that our figure of 230 allows for that multiplication. There are in the VHF band, (very high frequency) channels 2 to 13 inclusive, and they are, of course, the ultra high frequencies or UHF bands additionally available. Channel 2, to take a specific instance, can be used in a great many cities. In that the figure of 230 we have allowed for the fact that each said channel could be used over and over again in different areas. The approximate effective range of television channels today seems to be somewhere between 75 and 100 miles, and therefore this duplication is possible. Even then however, the figure of 230 is not the ultimate maximum number of television channels that could be utilized in Canada from a technical viewpoint.

Q. But in using the figure 230 you said you were taking into account the geographical factor of a possibility of multiplying or using one individual channel on a number of occasions.—A. Yes, we arrived at that figure of 230 simply by taking the Department of Transport allocation list and counting up the allocations listed on it.

Q. Your figure is based on the Department of Transport allocation, not on your own views as to the potential number.—A. This is correct. The figure 230 is taken from the Department of Transport official release headed "Canadian Television Allocation plan" and if you refer to the first page of that you will find under the notation marked "B" it says: "This table includes channel assignments for only those areas within 250 miles of the Canada-United States border, and a few other areas where assignment must dovetail into the border areas. Where specific localities are not mentioned, or only VHF channels assigned, other assignments wil be worked out to meet requirements as they develop. So that the figures of 230, obviously, is not the maximum number of television channels that technically can be utilized in our country.

Q. I prefaced my question last night with reference to the discussion which took place previously in which it had been suggested that radio and television and particularly television is in the form of a natural monopoly owing to the restricted number of channels available. You tell us that the Department of Transport has worked out an allocation at the moment of 230 available channels from coast to coast in Canada, and you tell me that is only within a strip of 250 miles north of the border. Is that correct?—A. That is approximately what the Department of Transport release says. It says: "This table includes channels assignments for only those areas within 250 miles of the Canada-U.S. border and a few in areas where assignments must dove-tail into the border areas.

Q. That number then is capable of considerable increase in your opinion, is it?—A. It is obviously capable of considerable increase when new technical developments, now in the experimental stage and in one and two cases well past it, come to fruition.

Q. I did suggest that to Mr. Dunton, and he said he believed I was correct, but I would prefer confirmation to come from the Department of Transport, that in Canada the policy now being applied does not permit television stations on the same channel to be located closer than 220 miles from each other, whereas in the United States the corresponding figure is 170 miles. Are you aware of whether or not that is the fact?—A. This I think is something that would require confirmation by the Department of Transport, but speaking subject to any correction they may like to make, that is approximately our understanding of the situation.

Q. Do you see any technical difficulties, or do your technical men tell you there are technical difficulties which dictate a wider range in Canada as against that now being applied in the United States.—A. I would not think, sir, that is a technical question. It would seem to be a question probably of policy. There may be technical factors involved, but I am pretty certain it is more a matter of policy than of technical requirement. It is naturally possible if the necessity ever arises that the present separation limits might be reduced.

Q. And if that is a possibility, that would be a further multiplication or increase in the number of television stations which can be established in Canada. —A. That would definitely make it possible to allocate more channels for effective use. There are many ways in which such increasing development in the broadcasting industry, which is taking place extremely rapidly, can increase the number of channels actually available. To take a very simple instance, and I must refer for my instance back to radio—but it is for the purposes of illustration only—the present policy on the standard band is a 10 kilocycle separation, this reaching from 540 to 550 to 560 and so on. At the last inter-

national conference in Montreal about two years ago, it was proposed by some of the signatory countries under the North America Regional Broadcasting Agreement that the separation limit be 9 kilocycles instead of 10. Should the economic factors ever make it necessary and desirable to greatly increase the number of channels in the AM band, it appears feasible that the 9 kilocycle separation could be effected. Similar developments are taking place in the television field.

Q. So that I think it is inherent in what you said that there is actually no practical support for the proposition that television is a natural monopoly. —A. There is, sir, none whatever in either AM or TV. Technical requirements permit of more channels than economic requirements will allow us to use.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Mr. Allard, I am going to ask your permission to question two members of your committee for this reason, that the members of this committee have discussed the national policy but I am going to pinpoint it again to British Columbia, and if you will give me your permission, sir, I am going to ask some questions of Mr. Elphicke and then I want to ask some questions of Mr. Rea. —A. With their permission, Mr. Goode, I will be very delighted to have you do that, but certainly I do hope this does not mean British Columbia is taking a preliminary step to seriously considering secession.

Q. I would be up against that in any case. Mr. Elphicke, do you know what it costs to put television on the air by an independent operator?

Mr. ELPHICKE: Do I know what it costs?

Mr. GOODE: Yes, how much money would you have to have to put television on the air in British Columbia?

Mr. ELPHICKE: Mr. Goode, I have heard varying estimates of what it costs and it greatly depends on what type of operation you are going into. In a certain operation that I have been interested in myself, which is modest to the extent that it will include a mobile unit, a building with one studio and equipment, it is estimated to cost something in the neighbourhood of $400,000. If that organization is going to build its own building, that cost would have to be added to the original estimated cost; but if they are going to rent a building it would not require so much cash.

Mr. GOODE: Is it true you have a location purchased for an independent television station in British Columbia should a licence be granted?

Mr. ELPHICKE: Yes, sir, I have had since 1951.

Mr. GOODE: Where is it located?

Mr. ELPHICKE: Right in your constituency, Mr. Goode, in Burnaby.

Mr. GOODE: What would you intend to do if you were granted a licence—what do you intend to do in regard to television?

Mr. ELPHICKE: I would get into operation as quickly as I possibly could.

Mr. GOODE: There has been some discussion in this committee regarding technical advice on television. When Mr. Dunton was here, along with some of his experts, he did say that technical advice is quite easy to get but that it costs a lot of money. If you did receive a licence could you secure the necessary technical staff, or have you already arranged for a technical staff.

Mr. ELPHICKE: I have not yet arranged for that staff, but my own present AM staff would form a nucleus for my TV staff and I undoubtedly would have to go out and get expert help in addition.

Mr. GOODE: Do you think that Canadian programs could be arranged over your station to any reasonable percentage desired by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation under the regulations?

Mr. ELPHICKE: Provided it is reasonable, yes.

Mr. GOODE: You said you would have to provide a mobile unit. We have some information on mobile units here and my information is that they cost something like $100,000. Is that your view?

Mr. ELPHICKE: $88,000. If I may correct an impression, I did not say that I would have to provide a mobile unit, but it is advantageous to have one.

Mr. GOODE: Am I right in saying that if you were going to produce local programs that you would, of necessity, have to have a mobile unit?

Mr. ELPHICKE: Yes, that is right.

Mr. FLEMING: But that figure of $400,000 you gave included a mobile unit?

Mr. ELPHICKE: Yes, it included a mobile unit.

Mr. GOODE: As I said, if you were going to put on a large percentage of local programs you would have to have a mobile unit. Do you agree with that idea?

Mr. ELPHICKE: I think it is a tremendous help, yes.

Mr. GOODE: How long does it take to get equipment delivered?

Mr. ELPHICKE: I have not inquired as to specific deliveries, as I have not seen a licence in the offing, and I made no inquiries. I imagine it is going to get a little more difficult all the time as stations come into operation, though.

Mr. GOODE: Why would you say that?

Mr. ELPHICKE: Because I think the equipment companies are going to be bogged down with big orders.

Mr. GOODE: Have you any information which would put you in the position to say that the delivery of equipment at the moment is slow?

Mr. ELPHICKE: No, only from discussions that I have had with salesmen in the business.

Mr. GOODE: What have they talked about in connection with deliveries?

Mr. ELPHICKE: Mr. Goode, I have not talked to them about specific deliveries.

Mr. GOODE: Do you know how many television receivers there are in British Columbia?

Mr. ELPHICKE: In British Columbia or the lower mainland?

Mr. GOODE: The lower mainland.

Mr. ELPHICKE: The estimates I heard are approximately 5,500.

Mr. GOODE: Then my figures were right in the first instance.

Mr. ELPHICKE: I did not see your figures.

Mr. GOODE: Where are television programs coming from at the moment?

Mr. ELPHICKE: King, Seattle; I think there is sketchy coverage by KTNT, Tacoma, and I believe before long we will get some from KVOS, Bellingham, Washington.

Mr. GOODE: There has been some advertising in lower mainland papers regarding the station KVOS in Bellingham. I remember seeing an advertisement in both the Vancouver papers regarding salesmen to sell advertising for that station in British Columbia. Do you know of that?

Mr. ELPHICKE: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. GOODE: Have you any figures on how much advertising is expected to go to KVOS from British Columbia?

Mr. ELPHICKE: No, but I think Mr. Rogan Jones is going to try to get as much as he possibly can.

Mr. GOODE: Have you heard mentioned the figure of $122,000 a month?

Mr. ELPHICKE: A month? No, I have not heard that figure. In fact I have heard no figures used.

Mr. GOODE: You say you have acquired this location in Burnaby?

Mr. ELPHICKE. Yes.

Mr. GOODE: Where is it? Can you tell us where it is located?

Mr. ELPHICKE: Kingsway and Wilson Road, right in Central Park.

Mr. GOODE: I am not going to ask you what you paid for it because you may want to buy some more land there and it may affect the price.

Mr. ELPHICKE: Thank you.

Mr. GOODE: But do you definitely intend, if a licence is granted to you, to build a television station in that location?

Mr. ELPHICKE: As quickly as possible.

Mr. GOODE: May I now ask some questions of Mr. Rea, please.

Mr. FULTON: What is the name of your present radio station?

Mr. ELPHICKE: CKWX, Vancouver.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Rea, you are the operator of CKNW in New Westminster?

Mr. BILL REA (CKNW—British Columbia Association of Broadcasters): Yes.

Mr. GOODE: How long have you been in the radio business?

Mr. REA: Directly, since 1936, but indirectly since 1932.

Mr. GOODE: How many people do you employ?

Mr. REA: Fifty-two.

Mr. GOODE: What welfare work do you do on your station?

Mr. REA: Well, Mr. Goode, like any community station, I would say we do all we can for every worthy group.

Mr. GOODE: Could you tell me how much money has been raised by your station in the last, say, five years, for welfare work?

Mr. REA: Well, for one fund, our children's fund, we raised over $100,000.

Mr. RICHARD: Mr. Goode, you might ask him who won the John J. Gillan award.

Mr. GOODE: Would you mind answering that question, Mr. Rea?

MR. REA: The John J. Gillan award is given annually to the Canadian radio station which, in the opinion of a board of advisers, has done a good job of community services, and we are very proud that CKNW has won the award this year.

Mr. GOODE: I take it that is a very great honour in the radio business. Why I want to ask those questions is because I want the committee to know not only that you are a high official of your organization, but that you are a responsible local resident. Have you ever had the opportunity of applying for a television licence?

Mr. REA: Yes, and no; I have filed in all four complete applications for television, but each one of them has stopped in the Department of Transport because government policy did not clearly define what action should be taken in recommending it by the Board of Governors of the C.B.C.

Mr. HANSELL: Excuse me, Mr. Goode, but might I ask a question: Does that apply to your application or would that apply to all?

Mr. REA: I would think that many broadcasters in Canada have filed complete technical briefs with the Department of Transport, which were not forwarded to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for consideration because television is a new art and a clearly defined policy had never come out in full until, in my personal opinion, March 30, when Dr. McCann came forth with his clear statement that there should be both individual enterprise television and government television in any area in Canada.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: When was your last request made to the Department of Transport? What was the date of that request? Do you remember?

Mr. REA: Yes, I have the dates right here. We first applied for television in 1945. At that time we could not file in channel No. 5 because the channel assignments had not been made. Getting down to financial estimates, we applied for channel No. 8 on January 3, 1949 with a complete technical brief. And we applied for channel No. 10 on August 10, 1950; and we applied for channel No. 6 on September 20, 1950, in each case with complete technical briefs.

Our channel No. 6 brief is voided now because channel No. 6 has been removed from the lower mainland area and has been re-assigned for consideration in Victoria.

Mr. GOODE: When you applied for an application for a licence, did you also have to amend that application by a financial statement?

Mr. REA: That is true except that it is only in the case of the last few months where the C.B.C. Board of Governors is now following the Massey Report and so on and is now going to recommend licences for television. It is only in the last few months that specific requests have come to stations such as our own asking for full financial figures. Consequently, last year we did run off a statement of our cash deposits, and station CKNW filed with the C.B.C. a statement of its actual cash which it was ready to invest in television right now.

Mr. GOODE: I want to develop that point further but before doing so let me ask you this. If a television licence were granted to CKNW, from where would you project your programming?

Mr. REA: We approached the municipal officials in the Burnaby municipality and we were informed that land could be rented on top of Burnaby mountain. The area is not one which is fully developed with sewers, streets and so on and they will not sell the land, but they will rent the land. We found from our engineering people that Burnaby mountain would be an excellent site for giving good television.

Mr. GOODE: You would just use this location for your masts and transmit your programs from there, but they would not originate there, would they?

Mr. REA: We have given consideration to the economy of dual operations on top of Burnaby mountain and now there is a very good road. I just completed a television study south of the line and from it I recommend the value of having our entire operation in one area.

Mr. GOODE: At what cost?

Mr. REA: The cost of equipping such a station would be approximately $300,000, to install a station which would be adequate to serve an area such as the lower mainland of British Columbia. However, while a television station could be built much more cheaply, it would not provide the services which I feel are called for in that area.

Mr. GOODE: And you would be prepared to spend on the station alone $300,000 if you were granted a licence? Let us leave it there for a moment.

Mr. FULTON: Did Mr. Rea's answer get on the record?

Mr. REA: You mean the word "immediately"?

Mr. FULTON: I did not hear an answer. I merely saw you nod your head, Mr. Rea.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Rea, from the experience you have had, and if this application were granted, and if a studio were built and if you went into operation, what is your information regarding profit and loss over, let us say, the first one or two years of the station?

Mr. REA: Well, you cannot go entirely by information. The information I have from the American side of the line is that if you start to broadcast television within the year you might possibly break even. But that information is based upon experience on the American side, where many of the stations do most of their programming simply from the four networks. I envision that in Canada we will use local programs in order to fulfil the recommendations of the Massey Commission and I envision that television as a private enterprise in Canada is going to have a period of at least 3 years in which we will lose money.

My application is based on the fact that I have six other small businesses whose revenues could be diverted into television operation to pay the amount of money which I would lose in the next three years. I envision losing, in three years, at least the capital investment. And I feel that in the fourth year the station would be able to finance itself as a business enterprise.

Mr. GOODE: You are telling the committee that it will cost $600,000 to build it?

Mr. REA: That is my estimate. It can only be an estimate because we do not have private enterprise television functioning in Canada yet.

Mr. GOODE: Would you consider this to be the maximum cost of an independent television station in the operation which you envisage.

Mr. REA: I think it could be done with an investment of $300,000 and with a loss of $300,000 over the next three years.

Mr. GOODE: And would this $300,000 include the mobile unit?

Mr. REA: Yes, and if you had a real estate investor build the building for you and rent it to you at the rate of 10 per cent profit on the money which he had put into it.

Mr. GOODE: You think you would have to have a mobile unit for the operation of local programming?

Mr. REA: That is right.

Mr. GOODE: Did you have with your application for television on the dates of which you have informed the committee—proper financing arranged for that $600,000?

Mr. REA: Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: Are you speaking now of the 1949 application, the first one?

Mr. GOODE: May I put this question to you: Would this guarantee of $600,000 be included in every application which you have made?

Mr. REA: The ability to make that guarantee is included except that it is only since the C.B.C. has been able to consider individual applications for television—it is only since then that I have actually taken the cash deposits and had them sworn as affidavits and filed with the C.B.C. through the Department of Transport. It is only since last year.

Mr. RILEY: You mean in your last application?

Mr. GOODE: You are indicating that you have at the present time an application to the Department of Transport or to the C.B.C. guaranteeing an amount of $600,000.

Mr. REA: The application that I have includes a statement from a chartered accoutants firm that I have approximately $300,000 available in cash for constructing such a station, and it is accompanied also by a statement of income from the different businesses, which show that I could afford to guarantee the losses which would be incurred over the first 3 years in television.

Mr. GOODE: What about the programming? If you were to be granted this licence and if a station were constructed, what would you consider an ideal television daily log of programming?

Mr. REA: Well, Mr. Goode, my investigations show that you cannot operate a station successfully on less than 70 hours of service per week. If an independent station tries to operate with a smaller schedule than that you have to charge so much for your advertising that it is not worth it to a commercial firm. I think the starting point is this: That from my own findings you need 70 hours of programming a week in order that the station can justify itself as a public service or as a business enterprise.

The other point that has now come up to my knowledge from reading the findings is this: The most successful television station that I know of spends 50 per cent of its programming time on local live programs. That is, the most successful station I know of spends that much. In talking or thinking about television we hear remarks about a national system and so on. I think those things are very important; the creation and extension of Canadian culture and so on. The point has never been established but the inference is that local live programming is not in the province of the broadcasting corporation but the local community station operator, and I envisage a possibility of 50 per cent local live programming and I can show a station which had done just that and that would be my ambition.

Mr. HANSELL: I should have asked this question before. Suppose that you had your licence granted to you, how long would it take you, do you think, before you would be in operation?

Mr. REA: There are two answers to that. I know of one equipment company which has stated to me that they could deliver the equipment for a television station within six to ten weeks. I do not mind telling you the name of the company, it is Dumont. However, there are two schools of thought on how quickly a station should rush on the air. You can go on the air without having given your staff training in dry runs, but the best way to start a television station is to build it up by dry runs of programs instead of just rushing on the air. You cannot send all your staff away to learn television. It is better to train them right at home. If a licence were granted there are two ways it could be done. One would be to rush on the air in two or three months. The other would be to take a year assembling everything and get it right and when you come on the air be able to provide an adequate continuous service.

Mr. HANSELL: My next question would be this: Had the government decided a year ago or earlier on their policy of granting licences to independent operators would you say that Canada could have television at the present time?

Mr. REA: Yes, Mr. Hansell, but I do believe in fairness to the government there is one other point which should be brought out which has not been brought out. A year ago we were undecided about the future of colour television and that I believe is one reason our Canadian government has held back in the licensing of stations. Now, the general knowledge is that colour television will be compatible with black and white and a year ago it was felt you might buy a television set and when the stations began broadcasting in colour five years from now you might have to throw out that $400 machine. But now, what is involved in television is if you buy a black and white set, five years from now when they are broadcasting colour you would still be able to pick up the same program on the black and white set.

Mr. HANSELL: I understand that the commission in the United States has not permitted colour yet.

Mr. REA: They have not licensed the transmission of colour. They have experimental programs on the air.

Mr. HANSELL: My understanding is they are holding back on that account.

Mr. REA: They are holding it back to get compatability so that your set would not be outmoded.

Mr. GOODE: What about technical staff? What does it take in technicians to run an independent television station?

Mr. REA: As a matter of fact, on an average station the technical staff would run from 15 to 50 depending on the size of the operation.

Mr. GOODE: What about your operation. If you were granted a licence how many technical people would you need?

Mr. REA: Well, again it is hard to give a specific answer. On some stations you may have one man who can move from the dolly to running a camera and back to producing and so on. If you boil it down to how many we would need technical, I would say about 23.

Mr. GOODE: What about this station KVOS, Bellingham. Mr. Rea, as you know they have been putting on quite a drive for business in British Columbia with 5,500 sets we now have on the lower mainland. Do you know anything about their activities in Canada with regard to taking Canadian advertising money out of the country?

Mr. REA: The only thing I know is they have opened representation in Toronto to sell national advertising to reach the Canadian market and have opened representation in Vancouver to sell local advertising.

Mr. GOODE: What kind of organization have they opened in Vancouver?

Mr. REA: They have engaged a representative. I do not think they have opened their own office. I think they are engaged in television and radio work.

Mr. GOODE: To take Canadian advertising money into Bellingham? What is their idea?

Mr. REA: Yes.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Allard agreed with me there were 5,500 sets on the lower mainland and southern slope of British Columbia. When television comes in on the lower mainland what do you think would be the minimum number of television sets in that area?

Mr. REA: How many sets there would be in a year or three years from now?

Mr. GOODE: Let us leave it at a year. The C.B.C. have told me they are going to have television in British Columbia in the fall. How many sets do you think there will be sold on the lower mainland in a year?

Mr. REA: It is very hard to give an answer to that. With television developing all across Canada there may be quite a problem with the production of cabinets and so on and the manufacturers of television sets may not be able to keep up with the demand when London, Hamilton, Vancouver and the other centres get television. I should think that if there is a good supply of sets within a year you could estimate 40 or 50 thousand sets being in the lower mainland.

Mr. GOODE: My figure is 20,000. Let us leave it at that for a moment. Am I right in saying the marketable value of those 20,000 sets would be approximately $8 million?

Mr. REA: Yes, around $400 each.

Mr. GOODE: That $8 million market—and I think we are both agreed that amount is a deliberate minimum—would I be correct in saying that this $8 million market would create an employment body of at least 500 people?

Mr. REA: Yes, I believe so.

Mr. GOODE: In fact I would be correct in saying more, wouldn't I, in the retail and wholesale outlets?

Mr. REA: Yes.

Mr. FULTON: Mr. Rea, did you or Mr. Elphicke have any surveys made, or have you any information on which to base an opinion as to the number of television stations which the lower mainland area and market is capable of supporting?

Mr. REA: Would you like to address that question to Mr. Elphicke?

Mr. ELPHICKE: No. You go ahead, Mr. Rea.

Mr. REA: There will be three channels on the regular band and I am personally sure that our area can easily support a C.B.C. station and the two commercial stations and then as television grows I am sure that there will be more later.

Mr. FULTON: There is a potential initial market you would say for three outlets and perhaps for more. Would you care to estimate how many more—two more stations?

Mr. REA: None of us know how much television would grow.

Mr. HANSELL: What is the smallest size community in which you could operate television economically.

Mr. REA: There again our general manager answered that by saying that it would depend on the restrictions under which you worked. When I talk about the mainland of British Columbia with 700,000 people, that is the potential range of a television station, and when I talk of a station with 50 per cent of its programming on a local level, I mean places like San Diego and Miami that are about the same size, and I am comparing that with the operations of a smaller station in a community like Brandon, Manitoba. Properly to bring television to the people of the Brandon area, your station might consist of bringing films through the national system, and from syndicated features, and the development of such a station might be mainly concerned with film shorts and slides and so on. In other words, television for Brandon might be a mechanical operation, rather than a program production centre, such as you would get in urban areas with a large population.

Mr. HANSELL: I think perhaps the operator might like it on this basis, and would not care whether they put on live talent or not. I am not so certain they would be just as interested in what you would call dry operations.

Mr. REA: I agree with you that what comes on the screen is all that counts. They do not care whether it was transcribed last week, or whether it comes direct on the network.

Mr. HANSELL: What I was concerned about was that you were talking about the large populated areas. In the prairies we do not have this. In Alberta we have Calgary and Edmonton, but we have other cities like Lethbridge and Medicine Hat that would run to a population of perhaps 15,000 or 20,000, but the surrounding area there may be 40,000 or 50,000 people, and I am wondering how a community of that kind would fare in television.

Mr. REA: The best answer I can give to that—

Mr. HANSELL: I think your Brandon illustration would perhaps be good enough.

Mr. REA: In Tucson, Arizona, there is only about 40,000 people all the year round, not counting winter visitors, and they have one station built and two licensed so that there will be three television stations going up.

Mr. RILEY: But have they not large areas around there?

Mr. REA: They have the desert.

Mr. JONES: Would a station be feasible in the Okanagan Valley?

Mr. REA: To answer that I think would be very difficult. I think you would need 50,000 people on an estimate in order to justify a station at the present construction cost which at the present time for building a complete station might run to $70,000, $80,000 or $90,000, and where costs are excessive that is our limiting factor, but I think costs will go down.

Mr. KNIGHT: I am interested in your statement that costs will go down. On what do you base that?

Mr. REA: I think electronic developments are such that I can picture television transmitters using transitors instead of transmitting tubes. For instance a 1,000 watt radio transmitter, which once might take up a space from here to the corner, can now be put in a package half the size of that cabinet.

Mr. KNIGHT: It would be through technological development mostly.

Mr. REA: I really think costs will go down, all the way down, receivers, transmitters and all the rest of it.

Mr. FULTON: Actually then a smaller population would be able to support a TV station?

Mr. REA: I think so, and there is another factor that will come with time, and that is the special programs similar to that in the movie industry. Some people believe that the movie industry will just make spectaculars such as 3D, and perhaps the basic film library will be made available for entertainment in these towns, and so programming costs will be cut down. At the present time no film is allowed to be televised unless it is seven years old. It has to be seven years out-of-date before it is shown on television.

Mr. BOISVERT: You refer to the building of television stations in the United States. Do you know the cost?

Mr. REA: I know the cost by comparison. For example, Gene Autry built a station—

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: The singing cowboy?

Mr. REA: Yes. He built a station and it cost $284,000 including the building and transmitter and he has quite a powerful transmitter of 316,000 watts effective radiated power, and that cost includes furniture, fixtures and the whole thing. Mind you, costs are higher in Canada because of the duty on all these things.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Do I understand we have finished?

Mr. GOODE: I have two minor questions. Mr. Rea, will the sets that are being sold today carry both colour and black and white pictures.

Mr. REA: No, you will need a special set to pick up colour, but the long deliberations and negotiations in the United States did protect the public in their final decision, and that is, the set you buy which now picks up black and white will still pick up programs in black and white five years from now, when television on the air is all on colour.

Mr. GOODE: What about the Canadian situation. Do regulations call for that protection too?

Mr. REA: My personal feeling Mr. Goode is that one reason the Canadian government held back on the development of television to the full is that these things such as colour television and so on had not been resolved.

Mr. GOODE: One other question, then I am finished. You spoke about local programs, and you mentioned having to put on 50 per cent. What would local programs consist of in your particular area?

Mr. REA: Just to illustrate the type of thing that can be done in local television programming, you will watch a television and see a panel from New York, a sort of quiz program which is on an entertainment level, and on

an educational level. That same type of program in the life of a smaller community is of greater interest still because the fellow you see on the screen is the chap you go to church with on a Sunday, and you get a kick out of that. When I say local programming, our station for example has sports nearly every week regardless of whether they are sponsored or not, and we carry all the sports. There may be some sports where it is of great interest, and television may cut down the gate receipt, so they may not want a major sport, so television puts on minor hockey and baseball game. I would say that sport on television is one of the finest local live programs you could have. I am not suggesting any local live program is best where you have some fellow playing a piano, but I think one of the finest local programs I have ever seen is in Los Angeles. I think the name is "City at Night", and they take you right into the telephone company and show what happens when you pick up the receiver and place a call to your mother in Quebec. They go right through the telephone company with cameras, and such a program is of great local interest. You can go into the local industry, as we do in radio, and show how it works. That is the type of local program of tremendous interest and appeal, and that is the kind of thing that a network with a national viewpont cannot possibly encompass.

Mr. JONES: Going back to the statement of 70-hours service a week, would that all be commercial?

Mr. REA: Well I believe Mr. Hansell had a good answer to that the other day. In radio or in television people enjoy the program just as much if it has a sponsor who gets the credit. This program I mentioned, "City at Night" in Los Angeles, is sponsored by the Southern Pacific Railway, and that is as fine an educational program with that sponsor's trains in the picture as it is without, I would say. The ideal in a television station would be to have programs that the people want to see and want to listen to, and programs so good that somebody would want to sponsor them.

Mr. DINSDALE: I was interested in the problem of compatibility, colour TV. Would that mean that sets purchased before this problem is resolved will be obsolete and have to be replaced?

Mr. REA: No, what the Federal Communications Commission fought for in the United States was compatibility. You have perhaps read a report of how it works. One outfit developed a system of colour with large spinning discs. You have to strike on the side to get your colour. What happened down there was, they did work out this problem of compatibility. What comes now in colour TV will come right on the job, but the point is you won't need to scrap present sets in which the public have a big investment, and the public will be protected.

Mr. DINSDALE: I don't know too much about the technical side of it, but I understood the problem had been resolved earlier than this year, for example.

Mr. REA: No, I cannot give you the exact dates. The Department of Transport could, but it is only about a year and a half ago that the C.B.C. colour system was approved, or almost approved. They were still arguing about it a year and a half ago. Perhaps our general manager would know the dates.

The WITNESS: I do not think we have the exact dates before us. We did not come prepared to talk on this subject of compatibility, and so we have no information on it here.

Mr. CARTER: I was just going to ask you would it require very much additional capital expenditure to change over from the transmission of black and white to the transmission of colour.

Mr. REA: No, I do not think so. When the stations begin broadcasting colour, I think the equipment you have can readily be adapted.

Mr. HANSELL: Would that be for live programs as well as the other type?

Mr. REA: Yes, a camera is a camera whether you are photographing in black and white or in colour.

Mr. FULTON: Do you anticipate that the date is very near when a set will be capable of receiving both VHF and UHF without the necessity of having to install extra machines to modify it?

Mr. REA: TV is so different from radio that we may never, in Canada, have full need for that ultra high frequency and that has been set aside. After all, we are only one-tenth of the population of the United States and we have more expanse of territory than the United States, and so even through the years we may only need one-tenth as many stations as the Americans do. In TV the American stations will not be interfering with Canadian stations the way they do in radio, and I think that is why on the American side most receivers they make and sell from now on will probably have the ultra H.F. band built into the sets, whereas the sets sold in Canada may just have the regular band.

Mr. FULTON: How do you equip existing sets to receive UHF? There is some sort of a machine you buy now that can transform it from one to the dual?

Mr. REA: A machine, yes, but also your serviceman can alter the standard set that is sold, he can build right in the added strips for tuning the ultra high frequency.

Mr. FULTON: Will that appreciably increase the cost of a set to a manufacturer initially, a set with the dual range?

Mr. REA: At the manufacturer's level, probably yes; I am not a qualified technician, but my guess would be it would increase the cost of a set, say, $50 at the manufacturer's level, to have that built into a regular set.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are we through, gentlemen?

Mr. DINSDALE: One more question on programming, if I may, Mr. Chairman. Anybody can answer this, I suppose. It seems to me that at the present level of development of the private stations it will be almost impossible to produce live programs in the smaller centres which, at the present time, are mostly served by private stations, and the exorbitant cost will mean that live programs will be almost impossible to produce.

Mr. REA: I think you are very right. You have that illustration in your local theatre. If you can successfully produce a good show that the public would want to go and see, you would have a stock company in the theatre in Brandon putting on a play each week, just in the same way when a first-rate picture comes into your local picture house. I think that same thing would be true in television and broadcasting, that you can have a better program when the cost is spread over many outlets.

Mr. DINSDALE: Brandon has been mentioned as a typical example of a smaller station. We have Mr. Craig here from Brandon, who can corroborate many of the references to that city, and I suppose much that has been said is true of our local station.

Mr. J. B. CRAIG (Managing Director, CKX, Brandon): Mr. Dinsdale, quite frankly I cannot quite take a back seat even to New Westminster in the local activities that might be of value in the city of Brandon. We have a good reputation in the field of sport that Mr. Rea emphasizes so much, and while it is quite true that perhaps in our initial stages of operation we will not be using too much live programming, I see no reason why a city as large and important as Brandon should not have a program with a good many features such as he mentioned. We have in our city the provincial exhibition, which,

by the way, is not held in Winnipeg but in Brandon; the Manitoba Winter Fair is also held in Brandon. Those are events of some importance in our city, and I visualize that we can make extensive use of that type of thing in TV, as we do in radio.

Mr. DINSDALE: Your station in Brandon, CKX, is interested in TV?

Mr. CRAIG: My company is in the process of filing a television application with the Department of Transport. As a matter of fact, part of the brief is already in their hands. I expect that very shortly it will be complete.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions or are we through with this questioning on TV?

Mr. FLEMING: If we have finished with the questioning, Mr. Chairman, I would like the opportunity to say a word on a question of privilege. Last night Mr. Gauthier of Sudbury, in the course of discussion on a point, brought in my name and a statement I made in the House which he read into the record without reading the context, although invited to do so. I did not have a copy of *Hansard* of March 17, 1953 available at the time, but I have it now, and I would like to complete the record on this matter so that a distorted picture is not left on the record as to what happened. Mr. Gauthier was referring to an incident in the city of Sudbury where, as he put it, a speech which he had made in the French language had not been broadcast by the Sudbury station. He said that the reason the speech was not broadcast was that it was in French. If that is the reason, I think all members of this committee would regret it and resent it very much, but what concerns me is that directly after making that observation Mr. Gauthier went on to say, or apparently to give the impression, in the same context these words:

> I want to refer to another matter while I am speaking on this, pertaining to Mr. Fleming who is here. When the Minister of Transport, the Hon. Mr. Chevrier, was speaking in the House of Commons on this resolution on March 17 he referred in his speech to the fact that the reason why C.B.C. was held by the present government in this country was to save certain rights of minorities in this country, which was given to them by the B.N.A. Act; and Mr. Fleming—what did he answer? "This is the most shocking kind of demagogic claptrap." That was your answer, Don.

And then the report of our proceedings goes on to indicate that I asked Mr. Gauthier to read the minister's remarks on which I had made that comment, but he did not do so. Therefore I would like to do that now, Mr. Chairman, to make the facts clear. These are the words of the minister and I shall now read from page 3013 of *Hansard* for March 17, 1953, immediately preceding the comment of mine that was quoted last night by Mr. Gauthier of Sudbury:

> If the policy of the Conservative Party is such as was laid down by the Leader of the Opposition at page 410 of *Hansard,* which I have just read, then there is to be no regard for regional or minority rights. I go a step further and say that there is to be no French language station. That is evident and I will tell my hon. friends why.

On that remark I made what I consider to have been a very proper rejoinder as follows:

Mr. FLEMING: That is the most shocking kind of demagogic claptrap.

That makes it quite clear as to what I was referring to here when I made that remark.

I made that remark following the statement by the Minister of Transport that the policy that we were advocating, of not allowing a monopoly in

television, was that there was to be no French language television station. I did so because it is well known that *La Presse* in Montreal has had an application pending before the Department of Transport for a long time for a privately owned television station, and there are others coming in now from Quebec and elsewhere and there will be many more of them under the policy we have advocated of allowing privately owned television stations.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: The incident came after the question I put to Mr. Allard, for stations outside of any in Quebec.

Mr. FLEMING: Quite. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is true, but I say that the issue I take with the introduction of this reference by Mr. Gauthier last night is that it was introduced as though it had some relationship to the incident which he complained of, that the private station cut off his speech in Sudbury because it was in the French language—I want to make it perfectly clear that if that was the attempt or the effect to be given to it by introducing those two things together, then it is a downright distortion of the truth.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I am sure that Mr. Gauthier would not want to give to the committee or to other parties the suggestion that you were connected with it.

Mr. FLEMING: I hope not, but you will notice he introduced it at a spot where he was referring to the matter of his speech in French being ruled off the air.

> I want to refer to another matter while I am speaking on this, pertaining to Mr. Fleming who is here.

I think you will agree, Mr. Chairman, that there is no English-speaking member of this House who has shown more respect for the French language and its legal and constitutional position in this country than I have. And if the attempt last night in introducing this reference in this way was to give the impression that it had any relationship whatever to the mentality that apparently led to the exclusion of that speech of Mr. Gauthier's in French from that particular station, then I say it was a downright distortion of the truth, and it is quite surprising coming from Mr. Gauthier of Sudbury.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I do not think he was trying to connect you with that incident.

Mr. FLEMING: Or with the mentality.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I do not think so.

Mr. BAXTER RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Fleming mentioned "the" Sudbury station. I would like to have that changed to read: "a Sudbury station" so that I will not be involved in this matter.

Mr. FLEMING: I would be glad to see that done because it was mentioned last night that there were two Sudbury stations and I believe Mr. Gauthier's complaint was at to the other one. I do not know anything about the incident that Mr. Gauthier complained about last night. I think we would all be very sorry if the reason for the exclusion of his speech from the air was the reason given last night, namely, that it was in the French language. If that was the reason, I think we would all regret it very much. But it certainly had nothing to do with my rejoinder to the minister in the House upon his assertion in regard to the effect of the policy which I was advocating, because the policy I was advocating would have the very opposite effect to the effect that was ascribed to it by the minister. We believe that if there were more private stations, there would be more French language stations. And the government policy we complain against has had the effect of preventing privately owned French-language stations from being on the air long before this.

Mr. GOODE: If the words "demagogic and claptrap" are parliamentary, which I would doubt, I wish Mr. Fleming would take me aside and explain them to me because I do not know what they mean.

Mr. FLEMING: I would be delighted to do so at any time.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I forgot to tell you that the clock has been set right and that we have a new member of the committee, Mr. Weaver. I wish to thank Mr. Allard and through him his colleagues of the C.A.B. for the very interesting presentation which they have given to us and for the calm and dignity they exhibited in answering all our questions.

Mr. ALLARD: Thank you, sir.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: At 3.30 this afternoon we shall hear from the Canadian Weekly Newspaper Association and from Mr. Sedgwick.

Mr. ALLARD: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, both for myself and on behalf of my colleagues and associates for your courtesy and the interest and attention you have displayed throughout our presentation.

Appendix I

AN OUTLINE OF PRINCIPLE IN CONNECTION WITH BROADCASTING IN CANADA, BY THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, TO THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON BROADCASTING 1953

1. Broadcasting Requires Regulation in the Public Interest

Broadcasting is a new art, science and technology. It is the newest form of publication. Like all forms of publication, it requires to be regulated in the public interest.

These factors together necessitate a continuing examination of the whole role and structure of broadcasting within our society. Especially do these facts indicate necessity for review of the framework within which broadcasting operates. We suggest this should be adjusted to meet changed conditions so that broadcasting may arrive as quickly as possible at a position of utmost usefulness, in our democratic society.

2. Development and Growth of Broadcasting Tremendous Since Existing Legislation Drafted

Every worthwhile new idea and invention has required a period of adjustment to find its proper and most useful place within the framework of society. During its earliest years every such idea and invention has undergone a series of adjustments, especially concerning its regulation by society, because the original form of the idea and invention expands and changes.

The attitude of society, especially insofar as regulation is concerned, has in each case, been periodically and successively modified as the new idea or invention developed and progressed, permitting utmost availability, utility and freedom of use. Such progressive emancipation conforming to the realities of development may reasonably continue to be the expected pattern in future in relation to broacdasting.

Regulatory change and development to conform to the reality of a developing idea or device is clearly evident in such cases as the printing press, the steam engine, the internal combustion engine and in many similar instances.

For instance, there was a time when it was considered proper to license publication by printing and to require prior approval of the contents by established authority. Similarly at one time it was considered an essential precaution that trains and automobiles should be preceded by a man on foot carrying a warning flag.

The development of these inventions and their more widespread use made it necessary to modify such restrictive regulations and controls so that the new device could be fully utilized by society and achieve its maximum usefulness.

3. Existing Legislation and Application Pertaining to Broadcasting Outdated

Broadcasting is a very young art and science, younger than the lifetime of most adults. But in the last quarter century, it has had incredibly swift development, and continues to develop at a rate that could never have been predicted.

This rapid development has so changed broadcasting's structure and position that it calls for re-examination of the original still existing, regulatory concepts. These were devised in broadcasting's infancy, when the rate of its development and its true importance in the life of society were not foreseen and could not have been foreseen.

Existing regulations and controls were designed to cover broadcasting's place in the community only in its earliest stages. As is usually the case, they have not kept pace with the progress and development of the art; with its vastly increased opportunities for usefulness; nor with its changed position in relation to society.

Two major enactments govern broadcasting in Canada. First of these, the *Radiotelegraph Act* was originally passed in 1913 and was designed to regulate the use of this new medium by ships at sea. As pointed out by the Right Honourable C. D. Howe, in the House of Commons on 8 July 1947, "If my Honourable Friend will go back into the records of the Department of Marine, one of the predecessors of the Department of Transport, he will find the *Radio Act* very much as it is today".

Those who drafted the second of the Acts, the present *Broadcasting Act* had the recommendations of the Aird Report in mind. This report recommended the complete nationalization of broadcasting in Canada.

If that recommendation had been accepted by the public, the present *Broadcasting Act* would be effective, would govern the situation it was intended to govern. However, the rapid development of broadcasting and its growing acceptance as an increasingly important form of publication led to that prime recommendation of the Aird Report being rejected.

So, the present Act, is anomalous. It fails to meet the needs of the existing situation. It governs a situation it was not designed for. However valid the recommendations of the Aird Report may have seemed at the time, the whole pattern of broadcasting has changed.

Perhaps a new Government realized that new technical developments made possible a tremendously increased number of channels and the provision of wider service. When the Aird Report was written in 1929 at the start of the depression, there were 65 non-Government stations in Canada. Today, nearly a quarter century later, there are 139 such stations and channels available for many more as compared to less than 100 daily newspapers. There are also available under existing international agreement, at least 230 television channels; a greater number by far than are likely to be of practicable use for the immediately foreseeable future, with others available for allocation.

Many conditions and circumstances of our economy and society have greatly changed since the Aird Report was written in 1929. Certainly the nature and extent of broadcasting has changed tremendously, and we suggest that it is therefore necessary to modify existing legislation. Only thus can the law recognize changed circumstances . . . and the fact, unrealized when the Broadcasting Act was written, that broadcasting is publishing and a form of enterprise comparable to daily newspapers; a most important means of mass communication.

4. Method and Extent of Regulation Should Encourage Development

It is always difficult to achieve a proper degree of balance between procedure which on the one hand permits full growth and development, yet on the other, retains a proper degree of regulation in the public interest. That is one of the continuing problems of a democracy.

Perhaps the best degree of balance between license and liberty was defined recently in Montreal by the Prime Minister when he said,

> I think the kind of economy we want in Canada is the kind where as many men and women as possible are free to make as many decisions as possible for themselves.

The regulation of broadcasting we suggest involves two major factors.

1. It should clearly recognize broadcasting's position as publication.*
2. It should recognize the particular and immensely important place of broadcasting in the publications field, and of the individual characteristics of its structure.

The Canadian Association of Broadcasters believes that democracy rests squarely on the rule of law and on equal justice under the law. We think that all citizens including publishers, whether using newspaper, pamphlet, platform, pulpit or radio to publish, should be governed equally by the established law of the land, especially existing laws concerning libel, slander, false advertising, and misbranding, and that no one type of those publishers should be singled out for specific discretionary controls.

5. Broadcasting is Publication and is Part of the Press

Broadcasting's position as publication, was best illustrated by an explanation given to the Massey Commission by Mr. A. D. Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. His phrasing of this truth was:

> One (of the questions in the last day or two) was the question as to what broadcasting is, a question which has been discussed at some length in the last few days. It seems to me that broadcasting is first of all a very important means of communication amongst the minds of people. It can communicate all sorts of things. Sound broadcasting communicates all the things that can be communicated by sound—speech and all that goes with speech; music and the many other things that go with it. It has become in a very short space of time one of the most important means of communicating among peoples' minds. I think probably indeed the only thing comparable to it is the printing press and the way its use has developed over the centuries. Broadcasting in about a quarter of a century has reached a position in some ways and in some countries of becoming about as important a means of communication as the printing press.

Publication may be by voice or in print. He who uses the pulpit, the platform or the microphone to convey an idea, to comment, to inform, is as much a publisher as he who uses the pen, duplicator or the printing press.

The law, which has had to be precise in relation to printed matter, has made a sharp distinction between printing on the one hand, which is purely an act of manufacture; and publication upon the other; which consists of distribution. It is distribution which is publication. Publication means to disseminate ideas, to scatter them broadcast, to publish to all who will read or listen.

For centuries the publishers of books, magazines and newspapers were practically alone in the field. Their sole competitors were speakers on street corners or in public halls who could reach only those within range of their voices. It was a competition so small that those who used the printing press to publish began to be thought of as the only "publishers". It is an understandable shift of emphasis but it was not and is not true.

Hundreds of years after Copernicus and Galileo proved otherwise, we still speak of the sun "rising" or "setting". Because printing was long the chief mechanical means of producing publication, we still confuse the two terms.

It is not the form that counts but the act itself . . . that of mass communication. Thus, broadcasting is publishing, an integral part of THE PRESS.

* The phrase "publication by broadcasting" now exists in the Defamation Acts of Alberta, Manitoba and Prince Edward Island.

6. Self Government Depends on Freedom of Information

All personal frredom is based on freedom of information.

Professor Hocking says in "The Freedom of the Press": *

> In truth, freedom of speech and press is close to the central meaning of all liberty. Where men cannot freely convey their thoughts to one another, no other liberty is secure; the way is barred for making common cause against encroachments. Where freedom of expression is present, the germ of free society exists and a necessary means is at hand for every extension of liberty. Free expression is thus unique among liberties as protector and promoter of the others. And when a regime moves toward autocracy it is by instinct that freedom of speech and of the press become the first objects of assault. The meaning of our free press is thus inseparable from the general meaning of freedom in the modern state.

It is impossible to conceive of Parliamentary Government with its connotation of democracy except in terms of the liberty to learn facts, to form ideas and to communicate those ideas to others. Freedom from governmental control over the publication of facts, over public discussion, and over the formation of opinion through such discussion, is not a mere ornament of a free society, it is the means by which it lives.

7. Regulation is Democratic. Control is Dictatorial.

It is basic that freedoms are inter-dependent and there is no absolute freedom. It was early recognized that,

(a) the public interest required the greatest freedom from control over material published, but,

(b) publication also required a proper degree of legal regulation in the public interest.

Because of this, the results of experience were enacted into appropriate laws, enforced in the Courts. These laws make publishers responsible for what they publish; they give individuals a right to compensation for personal damage inflicted and they prescribe prosecution for publication considered damaging to the public interest.

Regulations concerning libel, obscenity, treason, misbranding, and related matters are part of the law of free countries.

All these regulations are, however, law; enacted by elected bodies and enforced in the courts of the land before independent judges with full right of appeal to assure impartiality and correction of any judicial error. These existing laws already apply to the broadcast form of publication.

8. Proper Regulation Will Stimulate Growth of Both C.B.C. and Non-Government Stations.

In working out the position that broadcasting is to occupy so that it can provide a full degree of useful service to our society, and ensure its continued development, it would be a major forward step to create in Canada, a Separate Regulatory Body. Such a body would:

(a) establish the proper degree of regulation in the public interest;

(b) encourage the continued development of service by both the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and Non-Government stations;

(c) bring the regulatory situation into line with all parallel and similar situations in Canada and the rest of the free world.

---

* University of Chicago Press, 1947,
W. J. Gage & Co. Ltd. Toronto 2B, Canada.

Once again, we should like it to be made crystal clear, there is no truth in charges made that we have any desire whatever to adversely affect the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation or its existence, or the service provided by it. We do not quarrel with its existence as an operating or programming body. On the contrary, it seems obvious that if it be left free to concentrate on broadcasting and the provision of programming service, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation could do an even better job of providing the service it was and is intended to give.

The situation we suggest visualizes the continued existence of both the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the non-Government stations in an atmosphere which would encourage both to continue and improve their respective services to the community.

The creation now of an independent Regulatory Body would recognize the changes that have taken place in our community and in the structure and development of broadcasting since the original legislation was created.

There is a tendency to confuse this issue of freedom of broadcasting and television with the question of public vs private ownership. This is an entirely different question. The believer in freedom need not necessarily be an opponent of public ownership of radio and television. To declare that the broadcasting or televising of news must be free is no more an attack on the the C.B.C. than to declare that the filming of news must be free is an attack on the National Film Board, or than to declare that printed publications must be free is an attack on the Queen's Printer.

Bearing in mind the anticipated state monolopy when the existing legislation was drafted about a quarter century ago, it seems that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's Board of Governors was then created to regulate and supervise only the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. No alternative nor competing service was visualized.

We believe that nobody should act at the same time as both controller and competitor, nor as both judge and litigant, nor as both judge and prosecutor.

Moreover, it has long been recognized that a democracy cannot permit a single body to combine the executive, legislative and judicial functions.

The principle of separation of powers is extremely important in the philosophy of democracy. In Canada and Great Britain this principle is recognized in theory and practice, sanctioned by tradition and common sense. In the United States it has been made a fixed principle of the Constitution.

In provincial affairs the same principle applies. In many provinces a Government corporation or commission produces electric power but these, like private power companies, are subject to one common regulating body which generally is a provincial public utilities board.

A striking example of the adherence of the Government of Canada to this basic principle was given when it adopted in 1952, the recommendations of the MacQuarrie Commission. The Commission has said this:

> When an investigation is completed, the Commissioner is required by the Act to assume an entirely different and incongruous role. He must make an appraisal, intended to be public in nearly all cases, of the situation which has been brought to light by the investigation carried out at his instance and under his direction. He is given the compromising appearance of being "at one and the same time prosecutor and judge". No matter how fully his assessment of a situation may be justified by results, its value is lessened by the inconstancy of his position.
>
> Many of the criticisms we receive about the present procedures and the report turned on this point. It is important that the Act receive the widest possible public support. There seems to be no valid criticism of

> the fairness or the vigour of the administration of the Act but as long as a single official is placed in the position of being required to perform incompatible functions there is room for a good deal of public misunderstanding. Furthermore, a separation of the two functions of investigation and appraisal would effect a logical, efficient and economical division of work.

These recommendations were adopted with the approval of all parties in June, 1952.

Thus, the principle is clearly established in every parallel situation that a democracy cannot permit a single body to combine the executive, legislative and judicial functions.

Yet, these are precisely the conflicting roles now forced upon the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation by existing legislation.

This negation of all accepted concepts of democratic regulation is not the situation visualized by the Broadcasting Act when it was written.

The establishment of an independent regulatory body would provide for better distribution of labour, and would relieve the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation of the heavy regulatory responsibilities it is forced to assume under existing legislation.

At present the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is called upon to administer a very large complex and far-flung organization. These duties will grow more arduous as television develops. Left free to concentrate on the provision of a programming service—the job it was originally set up to perform—C.B.C. could do an even better job of providing that specific service. An independent regulatory body would assist the full and free development of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, just as much as that of broadcasting generally.

The independent regulatory body we suggest exists in several similar or parallel situations where a state corporation competes with privately owned businesses.

The Board of Transport Commissioners exercises the regulatory function in the case of both the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway; the Air Transport Board in the case of both Government and non-Government air lines. In Australia a five-man Australian Broadcasting Control Board regulates both the Government owned stations and networks and the non-Government stations and networks.

We believe that creation of a similar independent regulatory body in Canadian broadcasting would permit and encourage the improvement and expansion of all forms of broadcasting service to the community.

Some critics of this proposed forward step have suggested that establishment of an independent regulatory body would permit infiltration of United States influence. Leaving aside for the moment the fact that the owners and operators of non-Government stations have in practical fashion demonstrated their devotion to Canada and their desire to assist in the development of this country, it is obvious that the opinion of the separate regulatory body supported by the weight of public opinion would have as much or more power in preventing such a possibility as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation now has.

This suggested forward step does not offer the hard-and-fast alternative of control by the C.B.C. or no regulation at all. On the contrary, it provides proper regulation by a public authority in the manner best designed to serve the interests of the public. It would encourage the maximum of service and development from both the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the non-Government stations.

9. Television

With respect, we should like to congratulate and commend the Government on its present television policy. Announced on Monday, 30 March, 1953, by the Honourable J. J. McCann, M.P., that Policy sets forth these principles:

> The principle of one station to an area is to apply only until an adequate national television system is developed. At the rate that applications for stations are now being received it may not be long before there is a sufficient degree of national coverage to justify the government and the C.B.C. giving consideration to permitting two and perhaps in some cases more than two stations in certain areas. It is anticipated that, in due course, private stations will be permitted in areas covered by C.B.C. stations, and the C.B.C. may establish stations in some areas originally covered by private stations.

This announcement brings government policy into line with the recommendations of the Massey Commission and at the same time reaffirms the general Canadian distaste for monopoly.

Our opinion is that the policy as announced is likely, within a reasonable length of time, to assist in providing the great bulk of Canadian communities with competitive television service and to assist in the sound development of a great new industry as well as helping to speed the provision—by means of this new invention—of information, news and entertainment to Canadians.

This achievement has always been the desire of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters and its member stations. These stations have for many years indicated their willingness to provide television service to the people of Canada. It is a striking indication of their faith in the future of this country and of this great new medium of communication that applications for licences in permissible areas were filed immediately upon announcement that such applications would be heard. Seven (7) of these applications were granted and television service will shortly be a reality in the affected area as the result of the combined efforts of ten (10) existing AM licensees.

As further indication of the sincere intention of independent broadcasters to bring Canadian Television service to Canadians as quickly as they are permitted to do so, we find that an additional seventeen (17) existing AM licensees have already applied for television licences or intend to apply this year in the areas where such applications are permitted. An additional group of eight (8) have their plans near completion and intend application late this year or in 1954. A third group of eleven (11) have plans well underway and will submit applications as soon as technical and other data can be properly assembled. When present government policy is fully implemented and applications are permitted for centres now reserved for the C.B.C., a fourth group of fourteen (14) existing AM licensees will submit television applications. Some of these had previously made application.

With respect, we suggest that present government policy as quoted above be expedited as quickly as economic factors will allow, and that the telecasting form of broadcasting also be subject to the operations of the independent regulatory board which we have proposed. We would like to urge also the earliest possible announcement of the regulations under which Canadian television stations are to operate.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE ACTIVITIES OF SOME STATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS:

CFJR BROCKVILLE.....Every worthwhile community activity is given the full support of CFJR. CFJR features local young people's choir "The Choralines"; Collegiate choir and orchestra; radio plays produced by the Brockville Theatre Guild and Junior Theatre guild and presents regularly the local Salvation Army Group; Pastor Downing's Children's choir and church services from four local churches. CFJR donates trophies annually to the Brockville Collegiate and the local Sailing Club as well as a Scholarship for the Lion's Club Music Festival.

CKDA VICTORIA.....CKDA in 1952 through a five-minute daily feature raised a sum of $5,200.00 for the Crippled Children in various hospitals in the Victoria area. Contributed free time during the period September 1950 to Dec. 1952 to various organizations to an amount of $33,000.00. CKDA's roving reporter daily interviews the "Man on the Street" getting his opinion on topics of current interest. During the sessions, CKDA keeps the people at home informed on what is taking place in the House of Commons by means of broadcasts direct from the Press Gallery daily. One half hour weekly is devoted to "College Conference", discussions on science, family topics, domestic and foreign affairs, etc., with Moderator, Prof. R. T. Wallace of Victoria College.

CKX BRANDON.....CKX features regularly news reviews, round table forums, educational talks; as well as teen age programs; Department of National Health and Welfare and Department of Labour programs, for which free time is given by the station. Religious broadcasts also receive free time. CKX airs over 8 hours per week programs originated by the CBC, plus many other programs of its own, featuring classical music. CKX contributes free time to schools during which school orchestras and church choirs are featured as are many other programs of a public service nature.

CKNB CAMPBELLTON.....CKNB provides broadcasting facilities to local music teachers for periodic recitals; to choral and dramatic groups, etc. Studios are made available on request for rehearsals and meetings of home and school associations, etc. CKNB features Report from Parliament Hill, Department of National Health and Department of Labour programs as well as many classical music presentations and religious programs.

CKTB St. Catharines.....CKTB, to keep its audience up to date on local activities and to encourage local groups, broadcasts all speeches of political leaders who address the St. Catharines Collegiate assembly in citizenship series; features the St. Catharine Civic orchestra; "Summer Theatre of the Air" which is made up entirely of local talent. CKTB airs weekly half hour programs featuring local artists who were winners and runners-up in the Lincoln County music Festival; a series of quarter hour programs presenting students of the members of the Welland-Port Colborne Music Teachers' Association. CKTB broadcasts a 26-week series of discussion forums with the cooperation of the Junior Chamber of Commerce on such subjects as education, municipal, national and international affairs, etc.

CFCN Calgary.....CFCN besides bringing its audience regular newscasts and reviews, "Reports from Parliament Hill etc. contributes toward development of local organizations by giving free time to such groups as "The Arts and Letters Club", civic theatres, Calgary Symphony orchestra, the Junior League and makes cash contributions to all worthy causes, e.g. $1,000 to the Banff School of Fine Arts; prizes for achievement to winners in the Boys and Girls' 4H Club, substantial donations have been made by CFCN to the Y.M.C.A. Building Fund, Salvation Army Building Fund, Mount Royal Building Fund, Community Chest, etc. To develop interest in the better type musical field, CFCN airs evening classical music programs plus one full hour "Afternoon Concert" five days per week; light concert music by the "Jean Cotton Trio" in addition to many C.B.C. originations. Teen Age Book Parade is another regular feature of this station plus commentaries by Mr. James Grey on relations between farm and city and Sunday programs by talent from all the province of Alberta.

CKPR Fort William.....Discussions on town affairs under the heading "Timely Topics" is a regular presentation by CKPR. Free time is given to local organizations and complete cooperation and free time is given to all schools upon request. During Education week, special programs are aired, featuring local school children, and at Christmas, a series of programs by public and separate school choirs are aired. CKPR carries on a constant search for local radio talent and every encouragement is given to anyone showing interest in becoming associated with radio. CKPR features a large number of classical music programs as well as discussions and commentaries on articles of local, national and international

CKPR Fort William—*Conc.*

interest. Occasionally, students from local high schools are given an opportunity to program a full half hour in the manner they consider most fitting. CKPR presents all winners and runners-up in the annual Musical Festival. Broadcasts by the Fort William Music and Arts Club are frequently scheduled on CKPR.

CJOR Vancouver.....CJOR records City Council and committee meetings for later broadcasts. CJOR is the Home Station for the program "Town Meeting in Canada", and has supported its growth down through the years. CJOR presents "Around Home", a discussion of community affairs; "Your Community", a weekly program shared by the PTA, the Community Arts Club and pro-rec. movement; "Man in the House", daily discussion of current events national and local problems with listener participation. "B.C. Music Festival", Promotion and time donated for broadcast of finals of this festival. CJOR each week donates 15 minutes to the Council of Women speakers. On Saturday mornings, CJOR features "Community Arts Council", a program devoted to cultural activities scheduled for the following weekend. Weekly on CJOR is scheduled the program "B.C. Church of the Air", a program donated by CJOR and directed by the Ministerial Association for the benefit of churches of all denominations.

CKWS Kingston.....The program "On Stage" presented by CKWS is designed to promote interest in Canadian Theatre and consists of interviewing members of the "International Players", a professional theatre company which is active in Kingston ten months of the year. The CANADIAN RADIO AWARD in 1952 was presented to CKWS for its production "Kingston Penitentiary on the Air", a thirteen week series of variety programs written and presented by inmates of Kingston Penitentiary. "Music in the Air" is a nine-week series of half hour programs featuring light classical selections sung by the Angrove Singers, a well known local ladies choir. "Your Neighbour Nylon", a series of six quarter hour programs of a documentary nature describing the work of the various departments at the Kingston Nylon plant.

CKOV Kelowna.....CKOV by way of promoting interest in local school activities, donates time plus engineering and production aids for a program by the high school radio and drama Club in Kelowna with various Okanagan Valley schools taking over at least one program per year. Parent-Teacher Associations are given free time weekly. Regular presentations of CKOV are the Department of

CKOV KELOWNA—*Conc.*

National Health and Welfare and the Department of Labour programs as well as programs made up entirely of classical music. CKOV reviews on the air all presentations by amateur theatrical and musical groups and through the summer, this station presents "Community Cavalcade", a program made up of interviews and presentations by musical groups of Okanagan Valley. Twice weekly, the children's librarian of the Regional Library reads over the air one of the better stories from the library. Teen Age Book review is a weekly feature on CKOV. Local speakers are encouraged to do series of talks and free time is given to all community organizations. CKOV for the past ten years has annually given a scholarship to an outstanding student in the Valley. Recently CKOV donated a tape recorder to the Kelowna Senior High School for use in language classes and has built and presented a public address and playback system for the Glenmore Community Club. A Silver Cup is presented by CKOV for the Okanagan Music Festival.

CHRC QUEBEC..... CHRC has done much for the development of interest in all local activities and particularly to develop interest in local school activities. Noteworthy among its contributions is the program "Soirée Étudiante" which is a twenty-five minute program aired on Sunday night and featuring boys and girls from 7 local schools under the direction of CHRC staff members. During the centennial celebration at Laval University in September 1952, CHRC aired all important functions and gave free promotion to this event by special broadcasts during several months preceding the celebration.

CJDC DAWSON CREEK..... CJDC presents classical music to its listeners every day, six days per week from 2.05 to 3.00 p.m., plus a total of 3 hours per week evening classical music presentations. CJDC contributes toward all local school and community activities. Once per week, CJDC features "Canadian Review" which is a local live talent program of music by Canadian composers. For a period of two months prior to the local Drama and Music Festival, a weekly feature on CJDC is a program which introduces to the listeners contestants who will appear in the Festival On Sundays, CJDC airs a program entitled "University of British Columbia Digest", a review of student activities at the University. Local open forums are presented from time to time. Spot announcements are given free of charge to the "Clef Society" which is a local serious music organiza-

CJDC Dawson Creek—*Conc.*

tion. Occasionally, one half hour on CJDC is given over to the local Little Theatre Group known as "Workshop 59". During Education Week, local live broadcasts by teachers and other education groups are carried. A regular feature on CJDC is "Citizenship Ceremonies", broadcasts from the Court House at Pouce Coupe. Programs by local and visiting choral groups are regularly scheduled on CJDC.

CKNW New Westminster...CKNW donates annually a TV scholarship to the University of British Columbia, a scholarship to Ryerson—Ontario and has donated in 1952 an amount of $1,000 to the Solarium for Crippled Children at Victoria as well as radios for children's ward at the new Burnaby General Hospital. CKNW has installed sick room radios at the Crippled Children's Hospital in Vancouver, Loyal Protestant Home etc. CKNW's Orphan Fund takes all kiddies on annual picnic and serves them at Christmas with gifts and treats. CKNW pays all operating expenses of the fund and members of the staff donate their time. CKNW provides meeting places for Vancouver Board of Trade courses, etc., and donates air time daily to the Ministerial Association for use of all churches in the area. All local service groups are provided with air time free on CKNW. Daily Traffic Safety broadcasts are aired by CKNW from the Vancouver Police Traffic office on condition of roads, traffic rules etc. and the Safety Club broadcasts are aired through the summer months from city parks in co-operation with the Parks Board, Playground Division.

CKSF Cornwall.....CKSF contributes toward the betterment of the community with a number of broadcasts, many of which are aired free of charge. Some of the CKSF presentations are: "Farm News Box", 15 minutes made available weekly to the local representative of the Storemont Agricultural Committee."Here's Health"—15 minutes given to the airing of a program provided by the Department of National Health and Welfare. "Operation Safety", The Ontario School Broadcasts, 5 half-hour programs per week. CKSF News Review—15 minutes each Sunday night reviewing the news of the week. "I see by the papers"— 15-minute weekly discussion on editorials that have appeared in various papers throughout Canada. "Women's Institute News" —15 minutes made available to local Women's Institute." "Vistas of Israel"—15 minutes informing Jewish listeners of what is taking place in Israel. "Canadian Institute for the Blind" Weekly time given to this organization.

CKSF CORNWALL—*Conc.*

"Canada at Work" Department of Labour Program. "Canadian Legion Show" a Friday night feature. "Five Minutes for Freedom" Weekly program supplied by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. "Alcoholism—15-minute program on AA. CKSF features regular religious programs. CKSF extends outstanding support to all local cultural activities and all local and national fund raising campaigns. From time to time CKSF opens the station to groups of school children. CKSF airs a large number of classical music programs and many presentations by local talent.

CJCA EDMONTON..... CJCA is proud of its well balanced broadcast schedule a large portion of which contributes toward the development of interest in finer music, local community and school activities etc. CJCA is an outlet for some CBC originations such as "Toronto 'Pops' Concert" and "The Voice of Firestone" both classical music programs. CJCA also presents "Five Minutes for Freedom", "Young People's Book Club", "This is your problem", "Farm Round up Hour", "Alberta Farm Roundup", "Farm Show", "Weekly Newspaper Roundup", "Report from Parliament Hill", "Legislative Report", "Courtesy vs Death" (Safety in Traffic program) "The Edmonton Story" (historical), "Safety Patrol" (traffic safety for children) and many others. CJCA features drama in "Teller of Tales", "International Theatre", "Beaver Playhouse" all by the CJCA Players. Religion comes to CJCA listeners in such programs as "Protestant Churches" (rotating schedule), "Christian Faith" (non-denominational) etc. CJCA received Honourable Mention in the Public Affairs Class, 1952 Canadian Radio Awards for its production "Courtesy vs Death" and Distinguished Achievement Award for CJCA's News Bureau from the National Association of Radio News Directors. CJCA donates an Annual Speech Arts Scholarship, Annual instrumental Scholarship, Annual Western Board of Music Scholarship and Trophies to the Alberta Futurity Show and for the Best Project, Agricultural Committee in Canada, Junior Chamber of Commerce; Best Calf Showmanship, Annual Darwell Country Fair. Cash donations have been made by CJCA to the Edmonton Museum of Arts, Alberta Music Festival, Edmonton Symphony Society etc. Free time on CJCA is given to all worthy causes as well as cash donations to the Red Cross, Community Chest, YWCA Building Fund and others.

CJOY GUELPH..... CJOY contributes liberally toward the development of appreciation of better music among its listeners by devoting much of its broadcast time to programs of concert, symphony and light classical music with a total of 15 such programs weekly. CJOY presents a weekly book review entitled "Books of all Years" and many community service programs such as "Town Meeting in Canada", Operation Safety", "Here's Health", "Children's Aid" etc. All national appeals are strongly supported and promoted by CJOY both through the donation of broadcast time and the efforts of the staff. CJOY donates trophies annually to the Kinsman Music Festival, The Canadian Legion (sports) and the Guelph Curling Club.

CKY WINNIPEG..... CKY offers among its programs of a cultural nature "Browsing Through Richardson's Art Gallery" a 15-minute program featuring commentaries, opinions and discussions concerning art and artists of the old and contemporary schools. Full support is given by CKY to the Manitoba Music Festival with a series of announcements prior to the festival urging early entry of contestants and regular programs are aired featuring live talent and finally, during the week preceding the festival, a series of 7 programs and 92 spot announcements were featured last year in an attempt to stimulate public interest. Under the supervision of CKY's Special Feature Department, a series of 26 30-minute programs are organized and broadcast over CKY by the students of the University of Manitoba. CKY's complete facilities are made available to the University one evening per week in which to rehearse, write material and produce the show. A similar series of 34 weeks duration is aired, using representations from every major high school in Winnipeg and suburbs. A 13-week series of 15-minute programs is presented by Normal School students. CKY features a special program on Alcohol studies presenting well-informed authorities e.g. The Director of Mental Health Services for the Province of Manitoba.

CFAC CALGARY..... CFAC has its own Drama Department that produces among others the program "Wednesday Night Playhouse" with casts built from off-the-staff dramatic personnel. CFAC won First Place in the Annual Canadian Radio. Awards 1952 for its submission in the Drama Non-Network Class. Another production of CFAC'S Drama Department is "State Your Case" which consists of a panel of three regular members of CFAC staff Drama Director and a moderator plus one guest each week, all of whom

CFAC CALGARY—*Conc.*

discuss current problems of interest. In connection with this program, CFAC donates $25. per week to some charitable organization. CFAC as a public service carries weekly a feature entitled "Let's Talk it Over". This program is produced by CFAC in cooperation with the Calgary School Board and Calgary Home and School Association. This program is designed to bring to parents and students problems which are being faced in the educational system. CFAC features a number of programs intended to keep its listeners up to date on current happenings, among these are "British Industries", "Report from Parliament Hill" etc. Local events are covered by CFAC's 15-minute nightly feature "Talk of the Town". "Winter Caravan", a CFAC presentation is designed to bring to the public information on the operation of industries in Southern Alberta. CFAC's serious musical contributions are numerous, "Chapel by the Side of the Road" (religious musical program), "The Decca hour of good music", "Chapel Chimes" and many others. CFAC presents weekly "Your Sunday Guest" promoting local talent. This station supports a long list of charitable organizations and has donated broadcast time for a series of 13 quarter hour programs promoting safe driving and has given liberal support to recruiting for all branches of the services. An annual scholarship is presented by CFAC through the Western Board of Music and all award winners from Calgary and surrounding area are featured on the air and then presented with a recording of their performance. In 1952 CFAC awarded a Scholarship to the Banff School of Fine Arts for the best original Radio Play, this Scholarship will be awarded annually.

CFCH NORTH BAY.....CFCH during the six-month period ending October, 1952, donated broadcast time to churches, clubs, cultural and artistic groups, etc., to the value of $11,551.20. Annual cash awards are presented by this station to winners in the Northern Ontario Interscholastic Oratorical Contest. CFCH broadcasts programs with classical music content daily as well as special programs on Sunday. Schools are given extensive support by CFCH through the airing of plays, discussions etc., put on by North Bay Collegiate Institute and Vocational School. Programs by all North Bay Schools are aired regularly and during Education Week, programs are taped at the various schools and later aired. Local artists and other groups are encouraged to use CFCH studios for rehearsals etc.

CKRD Red Deer.....CKRD's daily schedule incorporates a number of programs of an educational nature, e.g. "Excursions in Science", "RCA Kiddies Show", "High School Program" etc. CKRD's special contribution toward the development of local talent is a 60-minute Saturday Show "Open House" featuring local school children. CKRD brings to its listeners regular religious broadcasts and its daily schedule incorporates a large number of "better type" musical programs—"RCA Victor Album", "Web of Dreams", etc. CKRD makes regular cash contributions to Little Theatre Groups, Schools, Artists and cultural groups as well donations of broacdast time to all worth while causes.

CHGB Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere.....CHGB carries a number of CBC presentations of classical music through each week and on Sunday, CHGB airs 5 full hours of programs with classical music content. CHGB presents regular religious broadcasts plus a complete coverage of local, national and international affairs.

CKLD Thetford Mines.....CKLD presents a special children's program on Saturday devoted to the development of local talent and many other educational and community service programs in addition to newscasts and news reviews. Religious programs are regularly scheduled on CKLD.

CJBQ Belleville.....CJBQ presents to its listeners eash Sunday, one full hour of symphonic music and many weekly programs made up entirely of serious music, among these "Theatre Guild" which is a local presentation; "Know your Music" also a local production in the form of a quiz on classical music. "Summer Symphony Hour", "Concert in Miniature" etc. Hi-Time is a program conducted by the Radio Club of the Belleville collegiate featuring talent drawn from the Collegiate. "Belleville Band" featuring local municipal band. By way of keeping its listeners well informed, CJBQ presents such programs as "United Nations Album", "Report from Parliament Hill" etc. "Here's Health", a program of the Dept. of National Health and Welfare and "Operation Safety" are among the comunity service programs.

CKBB Barrie.....Local and national issues of interest are thoroughly covered by CKBB's weekly presentation "J.C. Guest Forum". A special program "Women's Institute", a feature presentation of CKBB is devoted to discussions of vital questions by members of the County Women's Institutes. CKBB also

CKBB Barrie—*Conc.*

presents a weekly 25-minute program under the direction of members of various Home and School Asso's. featuring news, views and panel discussions. Children's programs such as "Once Upon a Time", "The Story Lady" (quarter-hour of Children's Classics), "Alice in Wonderland" and others are regular CKBB presentations, Newscasts, religious broadcasts and many other community service programs are regularly scheduled on CKBB. CKBB airs a quarter hour program weekly entitled "Guide to Good Reading", this is a book review with emphasis on Canadian literature; "Book Nook" a weekly broadcast of 25 minutes informal interview with local librarians. In cooperation with the County Council, CKBB sponsors a county-wide competition, "Best Essay on History of the County" and the winner is presented with an award by CKBB annually.

CFRB Toronto.....CFRB devotes much time to keeping its listeners informed with such programs as "Report from Overseas", "Report from Parliament Hill", "Canadian Army Reports", "Howard K. Smith" etc. Many viewpoints are brought to CFRB listeners through broadcasts of a commentary nature, forums, etc. Much free time is given to little theatres, symphony orchestras and other organizations and each year, a cash donation is made by CFRB to the Ontario Agricultural College; this prize being presented to an individual student designated by the teaching staff.

CKSM Shawinigan Falls.....Presents a special children's program weekly. This is a half hour show designed to encourage local talent. The program is recorded in one of the local schools and aired under the title "Le Club de la Mauricie". CKSM awards a $15 prize to a student each week on this show. Local talent is also featured on the program entitled "Les Artistes de CKSM", a Sunday evening broadcast. "La Causerie de Mardi Soir" features a local member of some professional group discussing matters pertaining to his particular profession. "Que Pensez-vous" is another local program featuring forum discussions on subjects submitted by the listeners of CKSM. "Causerie du Club Richelieu" features a speech by a guest of the Richelieu Club in Shawinigan. This program is a weekly feature. "Ombres et Lumières", a weekly broadcast of an informal chat by the local Catholic Bishop on subjects of a religious nature. "Ligue Ouvrière Catho-

CKSM SHAWINIGAN FALLS—*Conc.*

lique", "Radio Sacré-Cœur", "L'Heure Colombienne" are regular broadcasts of a religious nature. Junior Chamber of Commerce is given one ¼ hour weekly on CKSM for a report on its activities . Special times are reserved by CKSM for local schools and School and Home Associations. Serious music is brought to the listeners of CKSM through such programs as "L'Heure Exquise", "Les Chanteurs que vous aimez", "Chefs d'Œuvres des grands maîtres", "Moment Musical", "L'Album Victor", "Concert London", "Récital London" and others.

CKSO SUDBURY.....To illustrate the efforts of CKSO in the public interest, we have chosen the station's report of the Month of March, 1953. During this one month, CKSO contributed time to the value of $4,226.65 to various schools, department of Health, Canadian National European Flood Relief, YMCA Building Fund campaign, War amputations of Canada, Sudbury Sanitorium, Sudbury Safety League and others. CKSO features a large number of religious and cultural broadcasts as well as complete and up-to-date news coverage.

VOCM NEWFOUNDLAND.....VOCM extends complete co-operation to all local talent groups, donates free time to these groups and makes its studios recording facilities and equipment available to all local choral and orchestral groups for rehearsals and recording sessions. VOCM features a summer series of band concerts presenting some of the best known community concert artists. One of VOCM's outstanding public service programs, the weekly Rotary Broadcast on Thursday features talented artists, leading educationalists, authors, industrialists and other prominent people.

CKLB OSHAWA.....CKLB presents nightly one full hour of the world's greatest music (classics). Local church groups and artists are featured during two hours each Sunday. Another two-hour period on Sunday is devoted to church service broadcasts and "Morning Devotions" is a religious program heard daily over CKLB. CKLB covers all events of local interest and features daily broadcasts of news and events of world-wide interest. "Oshawa Collegiate and Vocational Institute" is among CKLB's programs of an educational nature. 'Operation Safety", 'The Way I See It" and many other community service programs are regular features on CKLB. CKLB offers support to local Little Theatre groups and sponsors two baseball teams and one bowling team. Incalculable support is given to all charities, local and national.

CKLW, WINDSOR..... CKLW features a large number of cultural and educational as well as public service programs among which are: "Quiet Sanctuary", "Dusty Lane", "German Radio Service", "Search that never ends", "Ford Theatre", "Windsor Labour Speaks", "Operation Safety", "Jewish Horizon", "The Human Side of the News" and many others. CKLW has been the sole supporter of the Windsor Symphony Orchestra since its inception. So far this season, CKLW has sponsored four concerts of the Windsor Symphony—guest artists are all Canadian talent.

CKMO VANCOUVER..... CKMO features "Open House" daily, a program of classical music; "Music of the Ballet", "RCA Victor Album" etc. Educational shows such as "The Garden Man", "City Hall Report", "Report from Parliament Hill", "Here's Health" and others are regular presentations on this station.

CFNB FREDERICTON..... CFNB features weekly, "My Concert Album", "Saturday Afternoon Concert" plus broadcasts of the "Fredericton Music Festival" and other programs of better music; the total cost of which is borne by the station. Recordings of festival performances by schools in the area are all presented free of charge by CFNB. All professional performers whose contracts allow broadcasting are featured by CFNB, all others are interviewed when possible. The University of New Brunswick has presented a number of performances with full time assistance from station CFNB. Talks and interviews are presented annually in support of the Fredericton Guild, the Fredericton Art Club and others. This includes reviews of performances all of which are on a sustaining basis. The Fredericton High School has presented plays, the public schools have been provided an hour per week for talented youngsters wanting to learn about radio work. This feature allows students to announce, operate, produce, write, act, etc. No force for good, culture or education goes without the support of CFNB.

CKBW BRIDGEWATER..... CKBW takes active interest in promoting all events of interest or benefit to the community. This ranges from covering a Music Festival to describing how a dog show is operated; from presenting musical programs from local churches at Easter to describing ship launchings. The Kinsman's Club of Bridgewater through its annual radio auctions over CKBW during the past five years have been able to raise over $20,000 for their good works. CKBW assists the local farmers through daily programs entitled "Farm Fare" and "Farm News". Local talent is never refused a chance to be heard by

CKBW BRIDGEWATER—*Conc.*

CKBW. Activities of local interest such as "Town Council" meetings, exhibitions, local and national appeals are inclued in CKBW's schedule. Educational broadcasts are numerous and are given choice times on CKBW.

CHAT TRAIL.....CHAT features educational, commuity service and religious programs regularly and in addition extends a standing invitation to all local musical societies and organizations to use the station facilities for rehearsals, etc., and are given free publicity on CHAT. Among CHAT's better type musical programs "Pleasure's Prelude" is deserving of special mention. All Alberta school programs plus local teachers' association programs receive free time on CHAT. CHAT extends special service to farmers in the area through two-per-day farm service broadcasts. Broadcast time and equipment is donated to the Associated Canadian Travellers for the "Search for Talent Shows" in aid of crippled children. CHAT stands ready to co-operate in all conditions of emergency, floods, storms, etc.

CHFA EDMONTON.....Serious music is featured 6 days per week on CHFA in 'Au caprice des Gouts" and 'Adagio". On Sunday, 4½ hours of classical music is presented. Community service programs are numerous among CHFA's presentations and regular programs of local student talent are prominently featured on this station. Interviews, forums and discussions are also included in CHFA's daily schedule. CHFA's policy is to broadcast classical, semi-classical and light modern music only, eliminating jazz and boogie-woogie completely. CHFA annually donates a scholarship to the Western Board of Music for deserving candidates.

CKOX WOODSTOCK.....CKOX keeps its listeners up to date on community activities through such programs as "Community Reports", "City Council", "Credit Union Report", etc. As a further community service, CKOX features church service broadcasts regularly as well as "Here's Health" (a program of the Department of National Health and Welfare), etc. Better type music is brought to CKOX listeners through "The Concert Hour" (daily 60 minutes), "Concert Album", "Sunday Evening Concert", "Organ Recital" and others. On "Playtime" CKOX presents all time favorites by such authors as "Victor Hugo", "Mark Twain", "Charles Dickens", etc.

CFQC SASKATOON.....CFQC carries a number of CBC originations and several local productions in the serious musical program category. CFQC also airs a number of educational programs among which are "University of Saskatchewan programs, Junior

CFQC SASKATOON—*Conc.*

Chamber of Commerce presentations, VON talks, mental health talks, safety programs, Teen Age book parade, Sunday School of the Air, etc". CFQC donates a silver trophy annually to the school of agriculture at the University of Saskatchewan and gives extensive support to all community activities both through cash donations and free time.

CKWX VANCOUVER..... CKWX features the "Hour of Music", a Sunday presentation of serious music, "Chicago Theatre of the Air", "The Enchanted Hour", etc. In the educational field, CKWX airs "Why do they do it?" (a half hour safety program), "This happened today", a five per week feature news service where recordings of actual happenings are aired. Local coverage is made through portable tape recordings while telephone calls placed around the world to get the voices of people who make the news. "Science and Your Eyes", "Labour Forum", "How's Business", "Report from Parliament Hill", "Sam Ross Reports" an editorial comment on British Columbia and Canadian affairs by Sam Ross. Each year CKWX runs a course on broadcasting for the University of British Columbia Radio Society and the leading members of the course are hired as summer replacement at CKWX thereby having an opportunity to put their knowledge to practical use.

CJIB VERNON..... CJIB devotes one full hour each afternoon to performances of classical music with scripts especially prepared for this broadcast. "Gems of Melody", a weekly presentation of serious compositions of British contemporary composers. "Serenade" a weekly presentation of great singers. CJIB features a special weekly children's program in which children are introduced to special recorded musical selections, designed to acquaint children with good music. CJIB has been commended many times for its promotion of programs on a local level in the informative and educational categories. Among these presentations are "Your Garden and Mine", "Junior Chamber of Commerce Forum", "Road Reports", "Report from Parliament Hill", "Market Reports and Farm News", etc., etc. CJIB cooperates completely with all church groups in the district, supports all charitable organizations in both local and national appeals and offers free time to such groups as the "Vernon Little Theatre", "Okanagan Valley Music Festival", "The High School Opera Society" and The National Film Board in promoting Canadian Motion picture productions.

CKRS JONQUIÈRE.....CKRS provides its listeners with broadcasts of all current happenings throughout the world through its BUP service and with local happenings by means of its own staff reporters. Sports events are thoroughly covered by CKRS in addition to its home and farm presentations, etc. CKRS cooperates fully with the local schools and school organizations to which free time is donated regularly. The most recent contribution of CKRS toward development of local talent is a program "Place au Talent"—a contest where local artists are invited to perform before a group of judges, the five best artists are then invited to appear a second time and the best performer is chosen and presented with a scholarship of $250.00 and a series of 13 broadcasts over Station CKRS. CKRS provides a five-piece orchestra to accompany the artists and the expenses incurred in putting on this contest are entirely born by the station with the scholarship money being presented by a local merchant. Another contribution of CKRS toward development of local talent is the program "Chœurs et Chorales", ten or more choirs have been heard over CKRS in 30-minute performances, local talent is also featured over CKRS in a number of programs. Over two hundred candidates from all over the region have been auditioned by CKRS and the successful candidates are now being presented over CKRS in radio plays. Weekly CKRS presents a program featuring a dinner guest speaker at the Richelieu Club in Chicoutimi. CKRS offers liberal support to local and national appeals and presents classical recorded programs and religious broadcasts regularly.

CKRC WINNIPEG.....CKRC offers a large number of community service broadcasts, e.g. "Ferguson Farm News", "Your Garden", "Market quotations", "Provincial Affairs", "Report from Parliament Hill", "U.N. Association Program", Home and School broadcasts besides many educational programs of C.B.C. origination. In the better music field, CKRC offers "Junior Musical Club", "Experiments in Drama", "C.I.L. Singing Stars of Tomorrow", "University Diploma Society Broadcasts" etc. CKRC also airs a number of religious broadcasts regularly and carries on a constant search for local talent. All promising candidates are given assistance by the station. At present CKRC is paying teaching expenses for a promising young Winnipeg singer to the extent of approximately $300 per year. Assistance is given to cultural and educational groups through promotion and publicity and in an

CKRC WINNIPEG—*Conc.*

advisory capacity. Some of the groups receiving CKRC assistance are the "Royal Winnipeg Ballet", "Winnipeg Little Theatre", "Winnipeg Drama League", "Manitoba Drama League", "Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra", "Kelvin Grads Glee Club Operattas", "University of Manitoba Drama League", "University of Manitoba Glee Club and many others. To list a few of the awards presented through the courtesy of CKRC: "Rose Bowl" for public speaking, Junior Chamber of Commerce;" Silver Vase" to the Province of Manitoba Department of Agriculture annual competition in agriculture for their yearly fair. "Drama Trophy" given to the University of Manitoba for the best drama production in annual competition. "Best Actor and Best Actress" trophies for University of Manitoba inter-faculty contest. CKRC donates time for spots and programs, flashes, talks and interviews in campaigns for funds, e.g., Sanitorium Board of Manitoba, Community Chest, Red Cross Drive, CARE parcels, Easter Seal Campaign, Canadian Save the Children Fund, Victoria Hospital and many others. CKRC studios are made available for meetings, rehearsals, recitals, etc., to such groups as the Winnipeg Sales and Advertising Club, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg Canoe Club, Manitoba Drama League, Game and Fish Assoc., Canadian Musical Review, Winnipeg Rugby Club, Community Clubs of Gr. Winnipeg, etc., etc.

CHLP MONTREAL.....CHLP carries a number of religious programs such as "Nos Missions sur les Ondes", "Radio Sacré-Cœur", "Radio Notre-Dame", "Le Rosaire" etc. "Les Amis de l'Art", "Ligue du Bien-Etre Visuel", "Vivre et laissez vivre" are among CHLP's cultural and educational programs. Serious music is offered by CHLP on a Monday through Friday basis with several week-end presentations. CHLP covers all special events and keeps its listeners up to date on happenings in all parts of the world.

CKFI FORT FRANCES.....CKFI donates each year two trophies to the Rainy River District Music Festival and one to the Junior Golfers of the Fort Frances Golf and Country Club. Cash contributions as well as free time is donated to such groups as the Canadian Legion, Children's Aid Society, Red Cross, Women's Institute and many others.

CKOK PENTICTON.....CKOK carries one full hour of symphonic music on a public service basis daily and special Sunday programs. CKOK maintains a full time Farm Editor service to provide the local

CKOK PENTICTON—*Conc.*

farmers with complete farm news coverage as well as soil conservation and horticultural advice by mail and telephone. CKOK provides free time to all groups interested in the arts and sciences or the educational field as well as to all churches for the broadcast of religious services on a rotating basis. Free time to the Ministerial Association alone in 1952 amounted to $2,600.

CFCF MONTREAL..... Among Station CFCF's contributions to wrothy causes is the sponsoring of an annual dinner of the Canadian Universities' Press Editors which is attended by University editors from all across Canada; the Home and School Association's Art Contest and McGill Radio Course which last year was attended by McGill students during 17 weeks. CFCF organized two blood donor marathons for the Canadian Red Cross, one of which was held in the main studio of CFCF while the last clinic was held at an Armory, this marathon lasted 37 hours and was covered throughout by CFCF personnel entertainment and air-wise and resulted in over 2,000 pints of blood being donated. CFCF's monthly average of free time donated to various organizations amounts to approximately $5,000. CFCF's originated and carried out the "Tiny Tim" campaign in aid of the Children's Memorial Hospital. The first year an amount of $3,600 was raised through this campagin and in 1952, this campaign resulted in donations of $80,000. All speeches of important guests appearing at the Canadian Club, Kiwanis, Ad and Sales Club, Rotary, etc. are taped and excerpts from these speeches are carried weekly on the "Week Review" program.

CJCS STRATFORD..... CJCS donates an annual scholarship to the Stratford Music Festival as well as financial aid to the Stratford Little Theatre and the Stratford Shakespearean Festival Foundation. CJCS donates free time to the Stratford Home and School Club regularly as well as special times during Educational Week. A weekly program by Collegiate students covering their various activities is broadcast over this station. Community service programs, e.g. "Here's Health" and others are regular features on CJCS as well as complete coverage of special local and world events. Generous allowance of free time is made to all charitable organizations by CJCS and special programs of news and views on farming are regularly aired.

Appendix "B"

The proprietors, managers and employees of broadcasting stations across Canada have demonstrated their loyalty and faith in Canada by their outstanding achievements during World Wars I and II. An indication of this record is given in the attached list.

Reference to this list will show that on a total of 53 stations recorded here, there are 359 war veterans to whom over 130 decorations were awarded. Among these decorations are to be found the O.B.E., D.F.C. and the D.F.M.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CJIB Vernon, B.C.		
A. G. Seabrook	General Manager	Canadian Army, Edmonton Regiment, World War II.
Harry Gorman	Accountant	Four years armoured corps (administrative).
Don Warner	Sports Editor	Canadian Army Engineers on Active Service. Britain, Italy throughout World War II.
Larry Scott	Sales	Royal Canadian Artillery, World War II for five years. Rank: Sergeant.
Ross Nerby	Announcer	R.C.N.V.R. (Active Force) from April. 1945 to January, 1949.
CKOK Penticton, B.C.		
Maurice P. Finnerty	Managing Director	World War II, Infantry (Seaforth Highlanders of Canada). Served in Canada, Northwest Europe, Italy. Served 5 years, 10 months. Enlisted as private; discharged Captain—wounded in action twice.
Roy G. Chapman	Station Manager	World War II R.C.N.V.R.: Served in Canada as an instructor. Served 2 years.
Jeff Ajello	Continuity Editor	World War II. R.C.A.F. Served in Canada. Corporal. Served 20 months.
Al Barker	Traffic Manager	World War II: Army C.M.S.C., in Canada and Europe. Served 6 years, enlisted as private—discharged as sergeant.
Margaret Chapman	Secretary-Receptionist	World War II in the W.R.C.N.S. Served in Canada and Newfoundland, 16 months. Wren.
Vincent Duggan	News Editor	World War II, in R.C.A.F. Canada and the Northwest Territories, for 3 years, LAC.
Dick France	Studio Engineer	World War II, Army Reserve, Pacific Coast Militia Rangers.
Louis Hohenadel	Continuity Writer	World War II, in the Army—Tank corps, served in Canada, England and the Continent. Served 5 years and two months, enlisted as private and discharged as a corporal.
Russ Richardson	Announcer	World War II in the Army—Infantry, Queen's Own Highlanders of Canada. Served 7½ years in Canada and Europe. Enlisted as a private, discharged as a Staff Sergeant.
Dave Roegele	Sports Editor	R.C.N.V.R., served in Canada for 3 years as an A/B

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CKDA Victoria, B.C.		
N. E. Bergquist	Chief Engineer	3rd Divisional Signals (World War II)—5 years, 4 months. Saw service in England, France, Holland, Belgium and Germany. Lance Sergeant. Commendation from Field Marshall Montgomery for good service. Served 2½ years. R.C.E.M.E. Reserve, Vancouver—postwar.
E. Pearce	Librarian	2½ years R.C.N.V.R. (World War II)—Able Seaman—Served in convoys—Battle of Atlantic.
S. S. Lancaster	Promotion and News Editor	Lieutenant, Royal Edmonton Regiment (World War II) CA(R)—3 years. Unit Signals Officer—on loan from Radio Stn. CFRN to MD #13 H.Q. for Public Relations and recruiting via radio.
C. E. Farey	Program Director	Flt. Lt. R.C.A.F. (World War II)—5 years. Saw service in Canada, England, Ireland, India and Burma. Reconnaisance Patrol, Anti Submarine—Transport and Troop supply—attached to R.A.F., India Command. Awarded Burma Star. Also on loan to U.S. Navy for 3 months at Corpus Christi, Texas instructing U.S. Flying Personnel on British Radar equipment.
N. R. Pringle	Announcer	Corporal, R.C.A.F. (World War II)—4½ years—Canada. Flight Dispatcher.
R. Jacques	News Announcer	Sergeant—(World War II)—#4 Commandos, British Army. Instructor in Commando Tactics and Intelligence. Saw service in Norway, St. Mazaine, Cap d'albrecht, Boulogne, Dieppe. Captured. 2½ years prisoner of war. Wounded twice. Belsen 6 weeks. Awarded D.C.M.
C. M. Wilson	Account Executive	Sergeant—29th A.A. Regiment (World War II) 4 years. Free lance organizer for army shows; Alaska, Canada—also #1 Unit Canadian Army Shows. Supervised and distributed shows to Canadian Military Hospitals.
CJDC Dawson Creek, B.C.		
L. R. Roskin	Manager	Army—Canadian Infantry Joined as private, retired as Lt. C.V.S.M. Victory Medal.
Leroy Tansem	Announcer	R.C.A.F.—Air Gunner C.V.S.M. Victory Medal.
CKOV Kelowna, B.C.		
Iddins, A. J.	Caretaker	Imperial Army — Royal Engineers.
Leckie, Robert	Continuity Editor	R.C.A.F.—June, 1944 to November, 1944. Army—January 1945 to June, 1946 (Canadian)
Reid, Dennis	Assistant Manager	Canadian Army—Sept. 4, 1940 to March 17, 1947 (All service in Canada—low medical category) Personnel Selection Branch. Warrant Officer. Hold C.V.S.M. and Victory Medals.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CKOV Kelowna, B.C.—*Conc.*		
Thompson, J. C.	Announcer	Joined Canadian Army as private in 1940, R.C.A.S.C. Overseas service April, 1942 to January 1946. Discharged with rank of captain. (Platoon Commander). Hold C.V.S.M. and Clasp; Victory Medal; Defence Medal.
CKWX, Vancouver, B.C.		
Frank N. Elphicke	V/P and Gen. Mgr.	Royal West Surrey Regt. World War 1 June, 1918-Dec. 1919. Discharged as corporal.
Sam G. Ross	Ass't Manager	War Correspondent, Jan.-June, 1945 with first Canadian Army. RCAF 1940-45. Army Reserve 20th H.A.A. 1946-48 Edmonton: Current—102nd Coast Rgt. RCA—1952, Vancouver.
Clare Copeland	Retail Sales Manager	2 years, 10 months, Wireless Electrical mechanic in RCAF, Toronto, Montreal, Pat Bay, Pennfield Ridge, Ottawa. Rank—LAC.
Robert T. Hughes	Account Executive	World War II—R.C.A.F. Wireless Operator—LAC—3½ years.
Laurie Irving	Production Manager	N.P.A.M.—1929-1935.
John E. W. Ansell	Program Manager	Canadian Army Active Force, 3 years. Discharged with rank of Sergeant World War II.
Norman W. Griffin	Farm Service Director	6 years with 2nd. Can. Div. Sigs.—England, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany—4 years and eight months overseas. Was C.O. of Air Cadets at Berwyn, Alta., for one year after the war. World War II.
Robert J. Hutton	Senior Announcer	2nd Batn R.M.R. (res.). 1939-42 Sigs.
John Sharpe	Announcer	2 years service in Canadian Army Active Force in Royal Canadian Signals (World War II). At present in Army Reserve Force (7 A.A.O.R.) as Sergeant Wireless Instructor.
Fred Bass	Librarian	3½ years with 47 Battalion C.E.F. (New Westminster) 1916-1919. Provincial Civil Defence Instructor World War II (6 years)
A. G. Cannings	Dir. News and Special Events	1926—5th C.M.R.—Bugler 1927—13 Can. Machine Gun Batt. R.S.M. (WO 1) 1932; Calgary Regt., (Tank) R.S.M. (WO 1) 1936-37; Instructor Wing schools Sarcee and Work Point 1932-35 inc., (Drill, Vickers, Lewis, Gas); 13 Div. Sigs. R.C.C.S. 1938-39 C.Q.M.S.; 1939 R.C.A.F. as AC2 G.D., discip. 1940-41; Commission Public Relations 1941-45. Inactive reserve since.
Joe Midmore	News Editor announcer	R.C.A.F. 1943-46 (15 months overseas). Sgt.
Earle MacLeod	News editor	Reserve Army Signals 2 years. Air Force 1947.
John Boates	Sales Service Rep.	Royal Canadian Army Service Corps. 1943-1946 C.V.S.M. and Clasp Service—Canada, Newfoundland and Overseas. B.C.D's Armoured Regt., (Reserve 1942-43).

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CKWX Vancouver, B.C.—*Conc.*		
Chas. R. Smith	Chief Engineer	F/Lt. R.C.A.F. World War II. Present —Class E. Reserve.
James Walmsley	Chief Transmitter Operator	6 years R.C.A.F. World War II, Fl/sgt. No. 2 Tech Signals Unil.
Raymond W. Atkinson	Transmitter Operator	3½ years in R.C.A.F. World War II. Rank: LAC, signals.
Elizabeth Robertson	Receptionist	3½ years civilian employee with R.C.A.F. 13 months with Women's Royal Canadian Naval Service. Discharged as Leading Wren.
CHUB—Nanaimo, B.C.		
Chuck Rudd	Manager	World War II—Army. Sgt. in active army then transferred to Canadian Forces Radio Service in London, England and Holland.
Al Erskine	Continuity Editor	World War II—Army—Royal Canadian Signal Corps—Instructor—wireless and teletype operator.
Lew Fox	Account Executive	Is at present Armament Instructor with Air Cadets in Nanaimo—title of F/O.
Gerry Black	Account Executive	World War II—Airforce. Leading Aircraftsman—Air Frame Mechanic R.C.A.F. Presently Sub-Lieut. Sea Cadets—Training Officer.
CKNW, New Westminster, B.C.		
Phil Baldwin	Assistant Manager	Served in the Canadian Intelligence Corp. World War II, all NCO ranks up to and including Warrant Officer; awarded B.E.M., served overseas with C. Int. C. until V-J Day and then joined Canadian Forces Radio Ser., London for latter part of 1945.
Hal Davis	Production Manager	Served with R.C.A.F. as Wireless Operator World War II.
Hugh Wallace	New Westminster Sales Mgr	Served in Canadian Army in World War II, in Personnel Selection.
Vern Wileman	Acting Chief Engineer	Senior Flight Radio Officer in the R.A.F. Transport Command World War II.
Joe Chesney	Musician Director	Served in R.C.A.F. as Flying Officer in World War II.
Hal McInnes	Assistant Chief Engineer	Was LAC in the R.C.A.F. during World War II.
Clare Purvis	Transmitter Engineer	Chief Petty Officer R.C.N., World War II.
Bob McDonald	Technician	LAC in the R.C.A.F. during World War II.
Doug Court	Transmitter Technician Operator	Chief Petty Officer R.C.N., during World War II.
Jack Cullen	Feature disc jockey	Served with the R.C.N. World War II.
Elsie Hall	Receptionist	Served with R.C.A.F., W.D., as general duty clerk.
Rolly Ford	National Sales Mgr	Public Relations R.C.A.F., and photography during World War II.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CFCW, Calgary, Alta.		
James A. Love	Program Mgr.	Army (R.C.A.) 1942-45 Lieutenant Can. U.K., France, Belgium, Holland, Germany—C.V.S.M. and Clasp. 1939-45 Star, France-Germany Star, Victory Medal, Defence Medal.
K. W. Mackinnon	Continuity Dept.	Army R.C.A. 1939-45. Can., U.K.—Northwest Europe. Lieut. 1939-45 Star, France-Germany Star, Defence Medal, C.V.S.M. (clasp), Victory Medal. Wounded 3 times. 1948-51 Canadian Army (A.F.), Staff Officer and Camp Comd. HQ. N.B. Area. Regt. Officer, 2nd Regt. R.C.H.A. 25 Brigade, Medically retired June 1951.
G. L. Carter	Commercial Dept.	Army 1940 R.C.A.F. 1941-45 Flying Officer—Flying Instructor, Canada. Presently F/O R.C.A.F., Class "A" Reserve, Flying.
Henry Viney	Sports Director	12 years pre-war Reserve Force Army (R.C.A.) 39-45 Capt. District Sports Officer M.D. 12, Regina.
Dora Dibney	Woman's Director	World War I—(1916) Civilian on sub—HQ. staff, Camp Hughes. World War II—Civilian—spoke across Canada recruiting for all 3 womens' services. War Finance work.
Bob Lamb	Chief Engineer	Civilian staff radio maintenance of aircraft and ground equipment. No. 2 Air Observers School, R.C.A.F. Edmonton.
Leo Trainor	Commercial Dept.	Army (RCA) 1942-1946 Can. U.K. Italy, Holland, Germany. C.V.S.M. 1939-45 Star—Italy Star—France-Germany star. Victory medal.
Frank Irwin	Studio Engineer	43-46 R.C.A.C. Can. N.W. Europe. C.V.S.M. and Clasp—39-45 Star. Victory Medal.
Wm. N. Love	News Dept.	Army (R.C.A.) (C.I.C.) 42-46—Lieutenant Can. Italy, N.W. Europe. C.V.S.M. and Clasp. 39-45 Star. Italy, France-Germany Star. Def. Victory Active Reserve Army R.C.A. Capt.
R. A. Kerr	Announcer	R.C.N.V.R.—44-46 Writer Canada.
Walter Arens	Announcer	R.C.N.V.R.—44-45 At sea off West Coast. Now active—Sub. Lt. R.C.N.R. H.M.C.S. Tecumseh.
Ross Henry	News Dept.	Army R.C.C.S. 42-46—Can. U.K. N.W. Europe.
CHAT—Medicine Hat, Alta.		
Mrs. Jean Cozzetto	Receptionist	World War II—R.C.A.F. Women's Division—L.A.W.
Mervyn Stone	Announcer	World War II—Calgary Highlanders—Private.
Stanley Weiler	News Editor	World War II—R.C.N.—Signalman.
Orville Kope	Sales Manager	World War II—R.C.N.—Able Seaman.
Sidney Gaffney	Transmitter Technician	World War II—R.C.A.F.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CFGP—Grande Prairie, Alta.		
A. J. Balfour	Manager	World War II in R.C.A.F. Squadron Leader.
John A. Wilson	Production Manager	World War II in R.C.A.F. Sergeant.
Phil Floyd	Announcer	World War II in Merchant Navy Engineer.
Jack Soars	Sales Manager	World War II in R.C.A.F. Pilot Officer.
Gene Ross	Announcer	World War II in R.C.A.F. L.A.C.
John Barron	Writer	World War II in R.C.A.F. L.A.C.
Francis Tanner	Engineer	World War II in Canadian Army Pte.
Cecil Morton	Librarian	British Commonwealth Air Training Plan (World War II) Signals Officer.
Bob Butchart	Announcer	World War II in R.C.A.F. W./O. (1st class).
P. D. Scanlan	Salesman	World War II. F./O. Airforce, D.F.C., 3 years.
G. F. Grady	Commercial Manager	World War II, Sgt. Army.
CJCA Edmonton, Alta.		
Dalt Elton	Production Manager	R.C.A.F.—one year—air crew.
Keith Rich	Announcer	Reserve Army 20HAA—current.
Johnny Mackin	Announcer	R.C.N.V.R.—four years.
Jack Wilson	Announcer	R.C.N.V.R.—four years.
Bob Keith	Transmitter Operator	R.C.A.F.—three years.
Wally Everitt	Studio Operator	R.C.N.V.R.—three years.
Larry Hartman	Transmitter Operator	R.C.N.V.R.—eight years—P.O. Wireless.
Ed Arrol	Continuity Writer	R.C.A.F.—four years—Air Gunner.
Bill McAfee	Continuity Editor	R.C.A.F.—five years—radar.
Don Clayton	Farm Director	Army—six years—artillery.
Tony Cashman	News Reporter	R.C.A.F.—three years—navigator.
Joe Carbury	Sports Editor	R.C.N.V.R.—two years—convoy signalman.
Bob Simmermon	Salesman	R.C.A.F.—four years—pilot—F/O.
Ken Lee	Salesman	R.C.A.F.—three years—aero engines.
CJNB North Battleford, Sask.		
Thomas O. Nelson	Production Manager	Royal Canadian Artillery (Lance Corporal) C.V.S.M. and Clasp, 1939-45 Star, Defence of Britain, France-Germany Star, Victory Medal.
A. Clint Nichol	Chief Engineer	Royal Canadian Air Force (L.A.C.) C.V.S.M. and Clasp 1939-45 Star, France-Germany Star, Victory Medal.
Eldon M. Elliott	Announcer	Royal Canadian Air Force (Corporal) Canadian Volunteer Service Medal.
Alfred C. McCalder	Announcer	First Field R.C.H.A. (Sergeant) C.V.S.M. and Clasp, 1939-45 Star, Defence of Britain, Italian Star, France-Germany Star, Victory Medal (Amputee—right leg).
Geoffrey G. B. Ayres	Continuity Writer	Royal Canadian Artillery C.V.S.M. and Clasp, 1939-45 Star; Defence of Britain France-Germany Star, Victory Medal.
Robert A. Barr	Regional Sales	Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve (C.P.O.) Atlantic Star; Pacific Star.
(Mrs.) Dorothy Nichol	Continuity Writer	Canadian Women's Army Corps (Corporal) C.V.S.M. and Clasp Victory Medal.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CFQC Saskatoon, Sask.		
Harry Dekker	Production Manager	Can. Airforce—World War II, L.A.C. in Radio Signals. Awards: C.V.S.M. and clasp G.S.M.
Bill Friest	Assistant Sales Mgr.	Can. Airforce—World War II—Sergeant in Flying Control.
Lyn Hoskins	Chief Engineer	Flight Lieutenant Royal Can. Airforce World War II—Radar Branch. 2½ years England, 2 years India where he was attached to Royal Airforce Commanding radar units in the field. Awards: Can. Service Medal, Victory Medal, India Medal.
Glen Macdonald	Announcer	U.S.A. Airforce as P.F.C.
Roy Currie	Chief Announcer	Army—World War II—Sergeant Royal Can. Dental Corps. Awards: Battle of Britain, Defence Medal, France-Germany Star, C.V.S.M. Medal with Clasp, Gen. Service Medal. Served in Canada, U.K. and Northwest Europe.
Blair Nelson	Commercial Manager	World War II—Major U.S. Marine. 1941 to 1946 3 years in the South Pacific Presidential Unit. Citation with 2 stars. Victory Medal South Pacific Ribbon with 3 stars. American Service Medal.
CJGX Yorkton, Sask		
Wm. Western	Announcer	R.C.A.F.
A. Pawluck	Continuity Editor	R.C.E.
J. M. Shortreed	Manager	R.C.A.F. Sergeant.
H. McRae	Chief Engineer	R.C.A.F. Corporal.
CKRM Regina, Sask.		
Winnifred Dufty	Office Manager	Royal Canadian Air Force, Women's Division 1942-1945.
John Esaw	Sports Commentator	Canadian Navy, 1944-1945.
Gerry Gordon	Sales Dept	Merchant Marine, 1944-1945.
Bob Hill	Program Manager	Royal Canadian Air Force, 1941-1945—Overseas 1½ years. Flying Officer.
Art Kennard	News Dept	Royal Canadian Air Force, 1940-1945.
Arnold Kyle	Engineering Department	Army Ordnance Corps, 1942-1943.
Joe MacDonald	Sales Dept	Royal Canadian Navy Volunteer Reserve 1940-1945.
D. J. Oaks	Station Manager	Captain of Calgary Highlanders, 1940-1948.
John Sandison	Announcer	Royal Canadian Navy, 1943-1945.
Reg. Shawcross	News Dept	Merchant Marine, 1942. Royal Canadian Air Force 1943-1948.
A. J. Smith	Executive Assiatant and Accountant.	Royal Canadian Air Force, Flight Lieutenant. 1940-1946. Overseas 2 years.
CKY LTD., Winnipeg, Man.		
"Porky" Charbonneau	Feature Announcer and Broadcast Supervisor.	Royla Canadian Army, World War II Three years in the Service.
Clay Hawkins	Local Sales-Manager	Royal Canadian Air Force. World War II, 5½ years of service.
Jim Henderson	News Announcer	R.C.A.—World War II. In 7 years of service jumped from private to major in the Queen's Own Cameron Highlanders. Saw action all over North-West Europe. Was wounded.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CKY LTD., Winnipeg, Man.—*Conc.*		
George Keith	Traffic Librarian	Royal Canadian Navy—World War II. Leading-Hand. Saw action on the Atlantic. Was stationed in England. France and Germany. 5 years of service.
Bill Liska	Features co-ordinator	R.C.A.F.—World War II. 5½ years of service as a Leading Aircraftsman.
Al Loewwan	Sales Representative	R.C.A.F.—World War II. One year of service as an Air craftsman, Second Class.
Alistair MacKenzie	General Manager	R.C.A.—World War II, 7 years of service as Sergeant with the Edmonton Fusiliers, and Lieutenant with the Calgary Highlanders. Organized and handled a complete recruiting drive.
Reg. Stepley	Sales Representative	R.C.N.—World War II, 5 years as a Communication Officer. Saw action in Atlantic, Pacific and Caribbean areas. Still on Active Reserve at H.M.C.S. Chippawa, Winnipeg, as Communication Officer.
Mary Arbez	Night Receptionist	R.C.A.F.—World War II. Women's Division, 3 years of service.
Bill Martin	Studio technician	R.C.A.—World War II. 4 years of service as a corporal.
Andy Malowanchuk	Chief Technician	R.C.A.—World War II. 13 months of service as a Sergeant.
John McManus	News Editor	R.C.A.—World War II. 4 years in the service as a Driver in England.
CKX Brandon, Man.		
E. D. Holland	Commercial Manager	Served 5 years with Royal Canadian Artillery—(Bombardier)—European Theatre, British Isles, and Mediterranean Theatre.
A. W. Olson	Promotion Manager	Served 4 years with Canadian Dental Corps—Corporal—in Canada.
D. A. Lee	Assistant Production Manager.	Served 2½ years with R.C.N.V.R. (Petty Officer) in British Isles.
K. L. Milton	Sports Director	Served two years with R.C.N. Interim Force—AB—in Canadian Waters.
CKRC Winnpepg Man.		
Joseph J. Gray	Technical Staff Transmitter.	Joined Army R.C.C.S. Sept., 1939 as Signalman. Transferred to Kingston, Ontario, 1940. Left for overseas, 1941. Corporal I.M. and E.S. Class 1A in England. Instructor on Radio in England. Hospitalized in England due to air raid in 1943. Returned to Canada, June, 1945. Decorations C.V.S.M. and clasp. 1939-45 Star and Victory Medal. Discharged September 1945.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CKRC Winnipeg, Man.—*Con.*		
John M. Hill	Production Manager	1940-1945 R.C.A.F. as a service flying instructor until 1942; then a tour of operations in Europe in Bomber Command with the rank of Flight Lieutenant. Shot down in 1944. Spent remainder of the war (European) in the protection of the Belgian underground. 1945 acted as radio liaison officer with R.C.A.F. public relations department in Ottawa until returned to flying service late in the year. Enlisted for service in Japan, but war ended before embarkation. Discharged September 1945. Decorations: 1939-42 Medal, Canada Overseas Medal, European Star, France and Germany Medal. 1939-45 Service Medal.
James Noakes	Transmitter Operator	Service September 2, 1939 to September 20, 1946 Royal Canadian Artillery, Staff Sergeant. Decorations: Canadian Efficiency Medal with clasp, C.V.S.M. War Medal 1939-45. Currently; Reserve Army 6th Anti-Aircraft Operation Control—Radar.
E. F. Dutton	News Editor	R.C.A.F. — Enlisted October 1941; shipped overseas December 1941 in flying control branch; flying control liaison officer Group 10 (Inverness) 1942; fighter control officer R.A.F. Peterhead and Castletown; Flying control officer Coastal command R.A.F. Tain 1943; Group operations officer R.C.A.F. bomber group 1943, 1944. Base operations officer R.C.A.F. linton 1944; Prisoner of War rehabilitation branch, Epinal France and R.C.A.F. liaison officer with U.S. Third Army Regensberg 1945. Discharged September 1945. Discharge rank Flight Lieutenant, temporary Squadron Leader, 1944, relinquished to meet establishment in P.O.W. branch. Decorations: 41-45 Star, France-Germany medal and standard Overseas service decorations.
David T. Couser	Studio Technician	R.C.A.F. from July 8/43 to May 29, 1946 as Wireless Mechanic. 10 months overseas from June 1/45 to April 15, 1946. Rank on discharge was LAC and trade group was Group A. Decorations: CVSM and clasp.
John Wilson Couper	Local Sales Manager	R.C.A.F. 1943 to 1945 AC 1 Decorations; France-Germany Star, Defence Medal, CVSM and clasp War Service Medal. 1950-1953—Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps Reserves—2nd Lt.
Bill Walker	Announcer	R.C.A.F. —4 years service — Flight Lieut. Pilot—35 trips over Germany as Bomber Pilot. Decorations: Distinguished Flying Cross. Currently Reserve Lieut. Pilot in Canadian Navy Air Arm.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CKRC Winnipeg, Man.—*Conc.*		
Bruce Sewart	Operator	R.C.N.V.R. 1943-1945 B/B S.T. Usual service ribbons H.M.C.S. *Chippewa* H.M.C.S. *Cornwallis* H.M.C.S. *Stadacona* H.M.C.S. *Border Cities* H.M.C.M.L. *064* H.M.C.S. *Protector*.
Bert Hooper	Engineer	Merchant Marine 1916-1922. Wireless Operator on five deepwater ships and nine coastal ships—west coast.
Marta Ellen Kettle	Receptionist	W.R.N.S.—January, 1945 to June, 1946. Rank: Wren Branch: Signals. Released in Class A.
A. T. Blondal	Announcer	R.C.A.F.—1943-1945. Aircrew with pilot training. LAC
John G. McRory	Salesman	R.C.A.F. April 1942–September 1945. Instruments Branch—Corporal.
Lorne V. McLeod	Salesman	R.C.A.F. 1942-1945. Flying Officer. Decorations: D.F.M., 1939-45 Star, France-Germany Star, Defence Medal, War Medal C.V.S.M.
Ron Alderson	Newsman	R.C.N.V.R. 1940-1942—Able Seaman.
Gordon Walker	Sales Representative	Reserve Royal Winnipeg Rifles Lieutenant—2 years.
George D. Knight	Announcer	Reserve Royal Winnipeg Rifles—Lieutenant 2 years— Member of Mess Committee Assistnt Public Relations Officer—Training Officer for Cadet Services.
W. G. Woodfield	Accountant	Reserve Canadian Reserve Signal Corps 1939 to 1943.
James Armstrong	Continuity Writer	Reserve R.C.A.F.—AC1--240.2 Squadron 1951-1952.
CFAR Flin Flon, Man		
C. H. Witney	Manager	LAC in R.C.A.F. with Radar as trade. No medals—No mention in dispatches —very dull life. 4 years overseas.
J. Thiele	Sales Director	Flight Sergeant in R.C.A.F.—Radar Trade—regular medals. 5 years overseas.
E. Smallwood	Program Director	
	Engineer	Canadiaa Army in Engineering 2 years.
G. Woodward	Engineer	Leading Seaman in R.C.N. For 4 years signalman in highspeed code work.
J. Wardle	Sportscaster	Lieutenant in Canadian Army—regular medals. 5 years overseas.
CJOB Winnipeg, Man.		
Blick, John Oliver	President	World War II. R.C.A.F. 4 years as Pilot Instructor. Retired with rank of F/O.
Crowe, James	Salesman	World War II. Royal Canadian Army. 5½ years service as R.C.A. Surveyor and Met. Observer. Discharged with rank of Bombadier.
Darby, David A	Accountant	World War II. Canadian Army. Served 5 years with P.P.C.L.I. on Instruction Driver Maintenance. Discharged with rank of Sergeant.
Davies, George	Production Manager	World War II R.C.A.F. Served 4 years as Instructor of Aircraft instruction. Discharged with rank of F/Sgt.
Durie, Reg. V	Chief Engineer	World War II. R.C.A.F. 2 years. Signals Branch. Rank of Corporal.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CJOB Winnipeg, Man.—*Cont.*		
Gibson, James	Announcer	World War II. R.C.N.V.R. Served as Telegrapher for 2 years. Discharged rank Tel. T/O.
Letrak, Herbert	Control Operator	World War II R.C.A.F. Instrument Technician. AC1.
McCloy, George	Announcer	World War II R.C.A.F. Wireless Operator. 4½ years. Rank of Sergeant.
Messner, A. J.	Commercial Manager	World War I. R.C.O.C. 4 years.
Messner, Murray	Salesman	World War II. R.C.A.F. Aero Engine Mechanic. 3 years Rank of LAC.
Sidwell, Fergus	Control Operator	World War II. R.C.N.V.R. Signal Corps. Signalman. 2 years.
Sprague, Frances M.	Office Manager and Sec. to Pres.	World War II. R.C.A.F. Administration Branch. In charge of Recruiting Women in Winnipeg and Montreal for 2½ years. Transferred to Air Staff Branch at Trenton, Ont. as Training Administrative officer for 2 years. Rank of Flight Lieutenant on retirement.
Stein, Irvine	Announcer	R.C.A.F. 2½ years. LAC
Williams, Norman	Continuity Editor	R.C.A.F. for 4½ years. Sgt.
CKPC Brantford, Ont.		
J. Anthony	Announcer	World War II 1942-43—AC2, R.C.A.F.
J. A. Coughlin	Announcer	World War II 1942-45—P/O R.C.A.F. P.O.W. 1946-48—Permanent Force LAC, R.C.A.F. 1950-51—U.N. Special Force Intelligence Corps—Private.
M. S. Davis	Announcer	1941-46—Army Trooper to Lieut.
T. H. Bremner	Manager	1941-45—F/O Transport Command R.A.F.—Radio Navigator. World War II.
C. H. Packham	Salesman	World War II — 1941-45 — Sergeant R.C.A.F.
T. A. Potter	Salesman	World War II—LAC, R.C.A.F. 1940-41.
R. A. Bremner	Ass't Engineer	World War II 1940-47—Leading Seaman R.C.N.
M. Warren	Announcer	World War II—1944—Staff Sergeant.
CFOS, Owen Sound, Ont.		
Wm. N. Hawkins	Manager	World War II, R.C.A. Private, 6 months.
Denys Ferry	Assistant Manager and Sales Manager	World War II R.C.A.F., Flt./Lt. 4 years P.O.W. 2½ years in Germany.
Everett Smith	Program Director	World War II, R.C.A., Sgt. 2½ years. Toured England, Belgium, France and Germany with Canadian Army Show, later transferred to Public Relations Branch of Army, Stationed in Hamburg, Germany with British Forces Network.
G. W. R. Tomlinson	Assistant Sales Manager	World War II, R.C.A.M.C., Sgt. 4½ years. Three years overseas, England, France, Belgium and Holland.
R. H. Turnpenny	Engineer	World War II, R.A.S.C., Staff Sgt., 3½ years; Served in England, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany.
Eric Sutherland	Chief Control Room Operator	World War II, R.C.A.F., LAC one year Canadian Army, Private.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CKLB Oshawa, Ont.		
Bill Smith	Sports Director (Assistant)	World War II—R.C.A.F., Flight-Sergeant, Good Conduct ribbon and 1939-45 Star. Served as wireless air gunner officer and physical training instructor.
Fred Russell	Commercial Department	World War II—1942-46 R.C.A.F. bandsman touring British Isles; Public appearances for benevolent purposes.
Grant Forsythe	Program Dir.	R.C.A.F. 1951, Air Crew. World War II.
Harry Miller	Part-time Janitor	World War I.
Sidney Reider	Commercial Department	World War II—Canadian Army, C.M.S.C.
CJIC, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.		
Lionel H. McAuley	News Editor	World War II. Royal Canadian Engineers #2 Tunnelling Co., Gibraltar. Jan. 1940-Sept. 1942. Rank: Sergeant. Recommended Commission returned OTC Commissioned Lieutenant, Canadian Infantry Corp., May 1943. Training Officer Camp Borden until February 1944. Returned overseas as Canadian Loan Officer C.N.D. 92. France June 1944 Platoon Commander 6th Bn. Royal Welch Fusiliers 53rd Div. Wounded early August 1944 hospitalized in Wales until Nov. 1944. While on 6 months convalescent leave accepted position as travelling service speaker for Public Relations British Ministry of Supply. In charge of groups of service veterans visiting factories throughout U.K. speaking to workers. Posted to 5th Battalion East Yorkshire Regiment, 50th Division February 1945, Company Administration Officer. Re-posted Canadian Army June 1946 returned Canada. Discharged with Pensionable disability.
Dave N. Irwin	Chief Engineer	World War II. April 1942-August, 1942. Canadian Army Active Service. August 1942-February 1946—Canadian Army Overseas, Royal Canadian Corps. of Signals.
Eb. Vance	Sales Manager	World War II, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps.—Canada. England—No. 2 Cacru. North West Europe—25th C.A.D.R. Elgin Regiment. Rank Captain E. Squadron, 1939-45 Star, France-Germany Star, Defence Medal, C.V.S.M. and Clasp, Victory Medal. Presently serving in Reserve Army of Canada. Rank Lt. Col., Officer Commanding 49th (S.S.M.) H.A.A. Regt., R.C.A. Officer in Charge Sault Ste. Marie Armoury.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CJIC, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.—*Conc.*		
Bill O'Malley	Announcer-Operator	World War II 1942-46. Manning Department #1, Toronto. #9 B&G School—Mt. Jolie, Que., #9 P.A.C. Detachment—Montreal, Que. Quebec City—Que. Uplands #2 S.F.T.S.—Ottawa— #6 Repair Depot—Trenton, Ont.
Sam Pitt	Announcer-Operator	Served 3 years and 10 months with R.C.N.V.R. (Eng. Room Div.) during military service was attached to Royal Navy and served aboard H.M.S. Valint. While with the Royal Navy for period of nine months, saw service in Burma Theatre of War, operating with the eastern fleet out of Trincomallee, Ceylon. During tour of duty with R.C.N.V.R. was aboard H.M.C.S. Cape Breton and served on convoy duty in Atlantic. Received Honourable Discharge on Nov. 5, 1945.
CJCS Stratford, Ont.		
F. M. Squires	General Manager	World War I. Royal Flying Corps. Lieutenant. World War II. Captain, Judge Advocate General Division.
John E. Phillips	Salesman	8th Army Tank Corps, Trooper
John Grigg	Chief Engineer	R.C.A.F.—Corporal (Radar).
CKLW, Windsor, Ont.		
S. C. Ritchie	Program Director	2nd Bn. Essex Scottish Reg't. July 1940-Sept. 1942—Lieut. Joined Active Army Sept. 1942—Lieut. Service in U.K. Infantry June 1943-June 1944—Lieut. C.M.H.Q. London—P.R. Div., (Radio) June 1944-Feb. 1946—Major (C.O. Canadian Forces Radio Service, U.K.).
Robert Johnston	Canadian Sales Mgr.	R.C.N.V.R. in World War II. Communications Branch—Sig. T.O. Overseas Service—Atlantic Escort.
Gene Saunders	Director Public Service Broadcasting	1941-1945—Bandsman—2nd Bn. Essex Scottish—(Reserve).
Don Sharon	Producer—Eddie Chase Show.	Enlisted October 1942—Royal Canadian Armoured Corps (CA) Overseas May 1943. Canadian Armed Forces Radio Service 1945. Member of the Garrison Officers' Mess—Windsor Armouries. C.V.S.M.—France and Germany Star—Defense of Britain—1939-45 Star—Victory Medal.
Art Boulden	Announcer	R.C.A.F. June, 1942 to December 1945. Canadian Volunteer Service Medal and Clasp 1939-45 Star, France and Germany Star, Defence Medal, War Medal 1945-45.
Giles McMahon	Announcer	Armoured Corps — Trooper — 30th R.E.C.C.E.
Terence O'Dell	Newscaster	R.C.A.F.—Served in Radio Branch, Department of Public Relations, pending aircrew training, which not completed—1944-45; handled broadcasts of R.C.A.F. Central Band on U.S. Tour.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CKLW, Windsor, Ont.—*Conc.*		
Walter Rudak	Studio Technician	R.C.A.F.—Corporal.
W. J. Carter	Station Manager	Rejected on first enlistment late 1917: Accepted R.F.C. 1918 but Armistice signed before any service. Past age limit for enlistment Active Service, World War II—acted as examiner in civilian capacity for R.C.A.F. in connection with Radio and Radar applicants for commission throughout war.
CKOX—Woodstock, Ont.		
Clinton V. Godwin	Announcer	R.C.A.F. World War II from 1942 to 1946, with rank of Flying Officer.
Al. D'Eon	Salesman	R.C.A.F. World War II, from 1941 to 1945, with rank of Flight Lieutenant. Winner of D.F.C.
Paul Freeman	Announcer	Canadian Army Signal Corps, from 1940 to 1945—World War II.
CKGB—Timmins, Ont.		
Wm. Rasmussen	Announcer	R.C.A.F.—Navigator.
W. Rewegan	Commercial Manager	Army—Sergeant.
G. Hall	Salesman	R.C.A.F.—Corporal—Wireless Division.
CKPR—Fort William, Ont.		
H. F. Dougall	President and General Manager.	World War I—Canadian Army—Royal Flying Corps—Decorated World War II—Joint Air Training Plan.
G. D. Jeffrey	Commercial Manager	World War II—R.C.A.F. Flight Lieutenant, A.F.C. 1939-45 Star; Defence of Britain; C.V.S.M. and Clasp and Victory Medal.
J. P. Friesen	Program Director	World War II—Canadian Army—R.C.A.F. Corporal—L.A.C. 1939-45 Star; C.V.S.M.; Victory Medal.
W. G. Thompson	Announcer Reporter	World War II—R.C.A.F.—Sergeant. Atlantic Star; C.V.S.M. and Clasp; Victory Medal.
T. Courtney	Announcer	World War II—Canadian Army; private. European Star; Defence of Britain; C.V.S.M. and Clasp; Victory Medal. P.O. War—10 months Germany.
CKFI—Fort Frances, Ont.		
Chuck Renaud	Announcer	Served in R.C.A.F.—Flying Officer. Served in Royal Canadian Navy—Petty Officer. Served in Royal Canadian Army—Lance Corporal. World War II.
CFCH—North Bay, Ont.		
Phil Clayton	Program Director	World War I—Canadian Infantry. Rank: Lieutenant. Decorations: Victory and General Service Medals. Served in Canada, England and France.
Jack Barnaby	Chief Engineer	World War I—Royal Navy. Rank: Able Seaman. Decorations: Victory and General Service Medals.
Len Brennan	Librarian	World War II—R.C.A.F. Rank: Sergeant gunner. Served in Canada, South East Asia Command and in the United Kingdom.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CFOR—Orillia, Ont.		
George S. Slinn	Chief Engineer	R.C.A.F.—Sergeant—Radar Mechanic G 1941-1945 (C.V.S.M. and Clasp), Canadian War Medal.
John Lawson	Announcer	R.C.A.F. L.A.C. Medical Section, 1943-45. C.V.S.M., Canadian War War Medal.
Russ Waters	Production Manager	Army—Sergeant, Instructor 1942-1945 C.V.S.M. Canadian War Medal.
CFRB—Toronto, Ont.		
Wally Crouter	Announcer	World War II—Corporal R.C.A.S.C.—Six years in Italian and European Theatres.
Ray Harrison	Technician	World War II—Corporal—Army—Service Medal and Clasp.
Cliff Simpkins	Technician	World War II—Army—Corporal—Service Medal and Clasp; Defence of Britain; European Star; Amputation R.A.K.—France 1944.
Loy Owens	Announcer	Private — Enlisted September, 1944 Canadian Active Army (Infantry). Given L4 PULHEMS medical classification while in Basic Training. Transferred to Army Public Relations. Discharged May 1946.
W. T .Valentine	Sales Department	Sergeant — Canadian Army — Public Relations—18 months. Then attached to British Army in Europe on Mobile Radio Units for 18 months. (British Forces network). Headquarters after end of War at Hamburg, Germany. World War II.
Jack Dawson	Announcer	L.A.C.—R.C.A.F. R-217429. Enlisted June, 1943; Discharged February 1945. Washed out trainee pilot.
Eddie Luther	Announcer	R.C.A.F.—World War II—Flying Officer. Three years as flying instructor at Dunnville for Air Force. At Kingston teaching Fleet Air Arm students to fly. Total Service—4 years.
Wishart Campbell	Director of Music	R.C.A.F.—1942-1945—Flight Lieutenant—Administrative Officer in the Entertainment Branch at A.F.H.Q., Ottawa. Assigned to the "Blackouts" Show as Officer Commanding. With this show made a tour of Canada and the Aleutians. Transferred to #3T.C., Montreal, as Director of Entertainment. Made a Member of the Order of the British Empire on the Late King George's VI's Birthday Honour List, 1945.
J. E. Rogers	Vice-President	World War I—Ambulance Driver; World War II—R.C.A.F.
Frederick Bridger	Maintenance	World War I—Sergeant—1st Batallion The Bedfordshire Regiment. Regiment #8739—Imperial Forces; One of the Old Contemptibles. Mons Star; General Service; Victory Medals; Silver Badge.
Ken Marsden	Promotion Manager	World War II—R.C.A.F. Aircrew—1942-1945.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CKSF, Cornwall, Ont.		
F. H. Pemberton	Manager	R.A.F.—1941-45 Communications Instructor.
Roland Forget	French Announcer and Transcription Librarian	World War II Army—Infantry Branch, 1941-46. Rank: C.Q.M.S.
Jack Reid	Chief Announcer	World War II—1939-45 in R.C.N.
Carl Fisher	Production Director	World War II—Army, R.C.O.C. Rank: Corporal.
CJGQ, Belleville, Ont.		
A. M. Haig	President and Managing Director	World War II—R.C.A.F. (Administration) Group Captain—O.B.E. (1940-1945)
W. H. Stovin	Manager	World War II—R.C.A.F. (Radar) Flight Lieutenant (1942-45).
F. C. Murray	Assistant Manager	World War II—R.A.F. (Air crew) Flight Lieutenant (1940-45)
J. H. MacDonald	Commercial Manager	World War II—R.C.A.F. (Aero Engine Mech) Flight Sergeant (1936-45).
C. Hannah	Program Director	World War II—R.C.A.F. (Postal) Sergeant (1941-45).
P. Flagler	Trenton Manager	World War II—R.C.N. (Radio Operator) Leading Seaman.
J. Devine	Sales Representative and Sports Director	World War II—R.C.A.F. (Arament) Sgt. (1941-45).
T. G. Hookings	Announcer	World War II—R.C.A.F. (Air Crew) F/O (1942-45).
CKWS, Kingston, Ont.		
Bill Luxton	Program Director	British Army—3 years. Royal Signals. British Forces Network Hamburg, Germany Forces Broadcasting Service—Egypt and North Africa. Rank: Sergeant.
Bert Cullen	Announcer	R.C.A.F.—one year AC/2.
Ted Snider	Announcer	R.C.A.F.—3 years. Bomb-Aimer Air crew. Served in Canada and United Kingdom.
Jim Chorley	Announcer	R.C.A.F.—4 years. Engine Technician. Served in Canada and United Kingdom.
Bert Cobb	Chief Engineer	R.C.A.F.—4 years. Radio Operator—Air.
Gord Backus	Transmitter Operator	R.C.A.F.—4 years. Radio Operator.
CKNX, Wingham, Ont.		
Carbert Robt	Farm Director	Army—Sgt.—Served in Canada (Can. Med. Corps).
Clark, Robt	Continuity Writer	R.C.A.F.—Corporal—World War II. Served in Canada and Newfoundland. World War II.
Cruickshank, John	Station Manager	Army—Corporal—Served in Canada (Provost Corp) World War II.
Cruickshank, G. W.	Assistant General Mgr.	Army—Trooper—Served in Canada (R.C.A.S.C.) World War II.
Eidt, Frank	Chief Continuity	R.C.N.V.R.—A.B./Canada and the Atlantic. World War II.
Grummet, D. W.	Musician	R.C.A.F.—A.C.—Canada World War II.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CKNX, Wingham, Ont.—*Conc.*		
Harris, William	Operator	Army—Cpl.—Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Belgium (R.C.C.S.) World War II.
Fry, Douglas	Announcer	R.C.A.F.—F.O. Serving in Canada World War II.
Heywood, Earl	Musician	Army—Pte. (Was discharged for medical reasons before being posted) World War II.
Langridge, John	Operator—Announcer	Army—English Artillery—Gnr—Great Britain, North Africa—Italy, Germany, Belgium. (prisoner of war for 3 years).
Reid, Scott	Chief Engineer	R.C.A.F.—Fl/Lieut. Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Denmark. World War II.
Schieffele, Glen	Transmitter Engineer	Merchant Marine—2nd Lieut. Wireless Operator. Atlantic and Indian Oceans. World War II.
Strong, John	News Editor	R.C.N.V.R. P.O./Tel. — Canada, World War II.
Terry, Iona (Miss)	Librarian	W.R.C.N.S.—Wren—Canada. World War II.
CJAD—Montreal, P.Q.		
H. T. McCurdy	Program Manager	R.C.A.F. 1942-45. Discharged with rank of F/Lt. (Pilot Instructor). 2 years overseas in Great Britain. Trained at Toronto, Windsor, Centralia.
C. W. McGibbon	Director of Station Relations	Armoured Corps, 1942-45. Discharged rank of Trooper. Instructed and Instructor at St. John's and Borden.
M. Rousseau	Chief Engineer	R.A.F. Loaned as civilian specialist, 1940-42.
Mrs. E. St. Martin	Secretary to General Manager	R.C.A.F. (W.D.) 1941-46. Discharged F/Officer (Admin.). Trained at Toronto.
R. Laurion	Traffic Manager	British Intelligence Service at B.C.C. in London, 1942-43. O.W. 1 at Algiers. R.C.N. 1943-46, discharged Able Seaman. Trained at Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal.
Lee Fortune	Music Producer and Announcer	R.C.A.F. 1941-45. 4 years overseas in England, France, Belgium, Germany, Holland. Discharged L.A.C. Now in R.C.A.F. reserve, rank of Flight Officer in No. 1 R. and C.
J. Tapp	President of the Radio Times Sales	R.C.N. 1940-46. Overseas in North Atlantic, English Channel and Bay of Biscay. Discharged Warrant Officer. V.C.M. and Clasp; Atlantic Star; 1939-43 Star; Victory Medal.
Murray Morrison	Vice President of Radio Times Sales	Canadian Army, 1942-46. 4½ years overseas in Britain, France, Holland, Germany. Discharged Private Signalman.
Frank Williams	Announcer—newscaster	R.C.A.F. 1941-42. Discharged after injuries received in a training crash. Now P.R.O. Flight Officer, R.C.A.F. No. 1 R. and C. Unit Reserve.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CJAD, Montreal, P.Q.—*Conc.*		
Lloyd Sharkey	Operator	Black Watch—73rd Batt. 1943-45 discharged rank of Cpl.
A. Leonard	Announcer-newscaster	R.C.A.F. 1940-41. Discharged rank of L.A.C. 1942-1944, attached to British Admiralty, Algerine Minesweepers.
A. Cauley	Announcer-newscaster	R.A.F. Transport Command, 1943-1945. Discharged Wireless Operator.
John Forrest, Jr.	Operator-Technician	Canadian Merchant Marines. 1943-46. Overseas on freighters to England, Egypt, India, Arabia, Ceylon, Jamaica, S. America, France, Germany, Belgium. Discharged: Radio Operator 1st Class. 1939-45 Star; Atlantic Star; War Medal.
CFCF—Montreal, P.Q.		
J. Hemming	Studio Supervisor	World War II—Army, 4 years. Anti-aircraft to R.C.M.E. to 21st Alberta Reconnaissance to 25 Pounder R.C.A. to R.C.M.E. to No. 1 Cdn. Tank Troops. Rank: Craftsman.
J. A. Hammond	Station Manager	R.C.A.F., Rank — W.O.2 — 1941-45. Served overseas 1941-1944.
Barry Ogden	Engineer	R.C.A.F.—Flying Officer, 3 years service. Decorations: C.V.S.M. and Clasp, Defence of Britain Star, 1939-45 Star.
L. Rasberry	Salesman	R.C.A.F., Corporal—5 years— Canada, Alaska, N.W. Europe. Wounded—left leg amputated below knee.
N. Hamilton	Salesman	Flight Sergeant, R.C.A.F., 5 years Europe, N. Africa, Canada.
J. Howlett	Production Supervisor	First Canadian Parachute Battalion, 3 years. Sergeant—Europe.
P. O. Steven	Newscaster	R.C.A.F.—L.A.C.—3½ years. Decorations: C.V.S.M. and Clasp, Defence of Britain Star, France and Germany Star, 1939-1945 Star.
B. Deegan	Chief Announcer	R.C.A.F.—L.A.C.—2 years.
T. J. Quigley	Commercial Manager	R.C.A.F.—F./O.—4 years. Decorations: Pilot's Badge.
W. V. George	Broadcasting Manager	Army—3 years, Lt. Colonel. Decorations: Defence of Britain Star, N.W. Europe, Volunteer Medal and Clasp.
Reo Thompson	Program Manager	Joined R.C.A.F. in 1944 (February), taking W.A.G.'s course. Course washed out in January of 1945. Given discharge. Joined R.C.A. in March 1945, taking Artillery course to its conclusion—transferring to Medical course to its conclusion. Discharged October 1945 to assist Radio Station CHWX in Victory Loan Campaign.
CHLP—Montreal, P.Q.		
Flavius M. Daniel	Manager, CHLP	Infantry—Major, World War II.
CHRC—Quebec, P.Q.		
Magella Alain	Program Director	Army—Régiment de la Chaudière, Caporal.
T. A. Gareau	Chief of Continuity Service	Army—General Service—Lieutenant C.V.S.M.—W.M.

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CHRC, Quebec, P.Q.—*Conc.*		
J. Ouellet	Salesman	Army—Régiment de Montmagny.
Gernando St-Georges	Librarian	Army—Royal 22ième Regiment Band Sergeant.
Romain Cormier	Continuity Writer	R.C.A.F.—Flight-Cadet.
Marcel Lecours	Continuity Clerk	R.C.A.F.—A.C. 2—Radar Training.
Paul A. Légaré	Studio Operator	Royal Rifles of Canada—Army.
J. Désiré Bouchard	Salesman	R.C.A.F.—L.A.C.—C.V.S.M. W.M.
CKLD—Thetford Mines, P.Q.		
Will. Dugré	Assistant Manager	Régiment de Joliette for 3½ years.
CKRS—Jonquière, P.Q.		
Tom Burham	Manager	World War II—R.C.A.F., Air-crew L.A.C. June 1942—September 1943. Canadian Army September 1943—September 1945—W.O.2.
Robert H. Singfield	Salesman	World War II—Canadian Army Auxiliary Services, Branch Knights of Columbus. Rank: Senior Supervisor, June 1941-December 1945. Medals: 1939-1945 Star, France and Germany Star, 1939-1945 Defence Medal, Canadian Voluntary Service Medal, Victory Medal.
Jean Renauld	News-writer	French maquis, 1944-1945.
CKCV—Quebec City, P.Q.		
Roger Bruneau	News Editor	Régiment de la Chaudière (Rés). World War II. (Asbestos) Q.M. Cpl.
Guy Samson	Announcer and Salesman	Army cadets, Académie de Québec, LFT.
Pierre Hudon	Clerk	Army cadets, Académie de Québec; Air Force cadets, Collège des Jésuites (Québec).
Normand Maltais	Announcer and Script-writer	C.O.T.C., Université de Montréal World War II.
St-Georges Côté	Announcer and Salesman	Worked in co-operation with Recruiting Office, Quebec, World War II.
Christo Christy	Motion Picture commentator	U.S. Army, Infantry, World War II.
Albert Duberger	Chief Engineer	R.C.N.V.R.—Telegraph, World War II.
Lucien Lapierre	Operator	C.O.T.C., Université Laval—Les Voltigeurs (Rés) World War II.
André Duchesneau	Operator	R.C.A.F.—Training School No. 8, Ancienne-Lorette. World War II.
Jacques Duval	Announcer	Army cadets, Lévis, World War II.
Ben Nadeau	Salesman	R.C.A.F.—World War II.
CHGB, Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, P.Q.		
Adrien Dube	Supervisor	
Antoine Freve	Salesman	
P. E. Hudon	Manager	
Clément Landry	Speaker	
L. G. Chamard	Speaker	Served for four years in World War II—R.C.O.C. (Active). Victory Medal, C.V.S.M.
Roger Plante	Speaker	
André Gaudreault	Speaker	
Roland Chevrier	Speaker	

STATION PERSONNEL MILITARY SERVICE RECORD—*Conc.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Served in either World War I or World War II with:
CKVM, Ville Marie, P.Q.		
Gaston Tasset	Engineer	Ordonnance service, World War II.
Guy Burelle	Scripter-announcer	C.O.E.C. Reserve.
Louis Bilodeau	Manager	Reserve caporal.
CKBW, Bridgewater, N.S.		
John F. Hirtle	General Manager	Sergeant, Canadian Army Active Force (Instructional Cadre—Infantry) 1942-46.
James A. MacLeod	Station Manager	Flying Officer, Royal Canadian Air Force (Fighter Squadron) 1941-45.
Douglas Hirtle	Chief Engineer	Corporal, Royal Canadian Air Force (Radio Communications) 1942-46.
Max Ramey	Program Director	Corporal, R.C.A.F. (Armament Technician) 1941-45.
Lloyd Griswold	Chief Transmitter Operator	Private, Canadian Army Service Corps (Dispatch Rider) 1942-45.
Raymond Snyder	Transmitter Operator	Private, Canadian Army Active Force (West Nova Scotia Regt. Infantry) 1939-46.
CJCH, Halifax, N.S.		
Syd Pilkington	Continuity Manager	Petty Officer Telegrapher — Royal Navy.
Cy Lynch	Chief Librarian	Lance-Corporal, Royal Canadian Army
Bill Fulton	Exec. Assistant	R.C.A.F.—LAC.
Lloyd Chester	Announcer	Leading-Seaman, R.C.N. (Reserve).
Allan Campbell	Chief Operator	R.C.A.F.—LAC.
Finlay MacDonald	Station Manager	Captain—Royal Canadian Army.
Russ Bailey	Salesman	R.C.A.F.—Flight-Sergeant.
Vern Glazebrook	Asst. Engineer	R.C.A.F.—Corporal.
Reg. MacWilliams	Engineer (Chief)	R.A.F. Transport Command—Radio Officer.
Vincent Currie	Operator	Leading-Telegraphist—R.C.N.
Harry Mosher	Librarian	R.C.A.F.—LAC.
Len Chapple	Announcer	R.C.A.F.—Corporal
Fred Hearn	Announcer	R.A.F.—Sergeant.
CFNB, Fredericton, N.B.		
Jack T. H. Fenety	Program Director	World War II—C.I.C. (Army) Lieut. Five decorations—C.V.S.M., etc.
H. L. McFee	Sales and Promotion Mgr.	World War II—West N.S. Regt. (Army)—Lieut. Four decorations—C.V.S.M., etc. Amputated leg.
Don Weeks	Studio Engineer	World War II—R.C.A.F.—Sergeant. Four decorations. Mentioned in Despatches.
Bert Sinclair	Transmitter Operator	World War II—R.C.A.F.—Sergeant. Three decorations, C.V.S.M., etc.
Ed. Everett	Transmitter Operator	World War II—Navy—ABS. Five decorations—C.V.S.M., etc.
Glenn Love	Chief Engineer	World War II—Flying Officer, local Air Cadet Squadron, R.C.A.F.
CKMR, Newcastle, N.B.		
R. J. Wallace	Acting Manager	Cpl. R.C.A.F. — C.V.S.M. — Wireless Mechanic.
P. A. Hansen	Operator Announcer	Cpl. R.C.A.F. — C.V.S.M. — Wireless Operator.
VOCM, St. John's, Newfoundland		
John W. Holmes	Announcer	Staff Sergeant, Royal Engineers. In England and Europe, 1940-1945.
Sylvia Wigh	Announcer and Women's Editor	Attached to UNNRA in England and Europe. Volunteer Worker in Displaced Persons Section, 1942 to 1945.

Appendix "C"

The proprietors, managers and employees of broadcasting stations also demonstrate their loyalty to this country and their faith in Canada present and future by an unusual and outstanding record of contribution to and participation in religious, benevolent, charitable welfare and other types of community activities.

It is probably not immodest to say that no other group in Canada has a better record in this respect.

A partial list for indicative purposes follows.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CJIB—Vernon, B.C.		
A. G. Seabrook	General Manager	1953 Chairman of publicity for Vernon Board of Trade; member Rotary Club of Vernon; past president Regina Executive Club; past publicity and public relations chairman of Regina Kiwanis Club; former executive member Regina Welfare Council; member Vernon Parent Teachers Association; armed forces. (See attached).
Harry Gorman	Accountant	Charter member of Vernon Kiwanis; People's Warden of All Saints Anglican Church and other church work; army service. (see attached); member of Boy Scout Group Committee.
Larry Scott	Salesman	Executive member of Vernon Junior Chamber of Commerce; active in local sport circles, including Vernon Softball Association.
Loren Merriman	Chief Engineer	Member of civil defence communications organization; member Radio Amateurs Emergency organization; active in aiding local events with sound problems.
Don McGibbon	Program Director	Active in Vernon Little Theatre Association; works closely with many local singers, musicians, choral groups, etc.; staff writer The Vancouver Sun and contributor of feature stories newspapers and magazines.
Nyra Groves	Continuity Editor	United Church Choir; Teen Town newspaper editor; Girl Guides, Red Cross Teacher-Organizer.
Mary Chadwick	Children's Programs	Red Cross youth instructor (swimming, etc.); member of U.B.C. Alumnae Association; Kappa Alpha Theta Women's Fraternity, U.B.C.
Alice Moffat	Secretary	St. John's Ambulance Association (Medallion).
Lynn Adcock	Copywriter	Extremely active in church and Welfare work; convener of Baptist Young People's Union; president Okanagan Baptist Young People's Society; vice-president Okanagan Baptist Camp Committee; canvasser for many charitable causes, including Red Cross and European Flood Relief; member of First Baptist Church Choir

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CJIB, Vernon, B.C.— *Conc.*		
Walter Rudeloff	Assistant Engineer	Treasurer St. John's Lutheran Church Young People Society.
Marian Mitchell	Sales	Member Vernon Little Theatre Association.
David Lilwall	Announcer	Active in youth work.
CKOK—Penticton, B.C.		
Maurice P. Finnerty	Managing Director	Past president Canadian Legion, Penticton Branch; past chairman Industrial Committee, Penticton Board of Trade; member Fund Raising Committee, Canadian Red Cross; member Penticton Rotary Club; member of Advisory Committee, Penticton Squadron, B.C. Dragoons.
Roy G. Chapman	Station Manager	Chairman Membership Committee, Penticton Board of Trade; director Penticton Tourist Association.
Jeff Ajello	Continuity Editor	Member Canadian Legion, Penticton Branch.
Al Barker	Traffic Manager	Member Canadian Legion, Penticton Branch.
Bjorn Bjornson	Announcer	Member Penticton Players Club; member and instrumental in forming South Okanagan Scandinavian Club; public relations officer B.C. Dragoons.
Margaret Chapman	Secretary-Receptionist	Member Junior Hospital Auxiliary.
Vincent Duggan	News Editor	Member and past executive member Canadian Legion, Penticton Branch; member Penticton Board of Trade.
Mrs. Dan McNulty	Accountant	Choirleader St. Ann's Catholic Church; member Young People; member Summerland Singers and Players Club; member Junior Hospital Auxiliary.
Louis Hohenadel	Continuity Writer	Member Penticton Art Club.
Norris McLean	Announcer	Member Penticton Players Club.
Dan McNulty	Sales Representative	St. Ann's Catholic Church member Young People.
Dave Roegele	Sports Editor	Member Canadian Legion, Penticton Branch; member Oddfellows.
CKDA—Victoria, B.C.		
D. M. Armstrong	President	Victoria Gyro Club; member Victoria Chamber of Commerce.
G. M. Reid	Assistant Manager	Director Victoria Community Chest; member Adm. Council Red Shield Campaign; member Camosun Gyro Club.
D. G. Hill	Production Manager	Member Publicity Committee, Victoria and District, Canadian Red Cross; member B.C. Parent-Teachers Federation.
C. E. Farey	Program Director	Representative Queen Alexandra Solarium Campaign.
Mrs. C. Roberts	Continuity Editor	Members S.P.C.A.
B. Binney	Continuity Writer	Campaign Secretary Victoria Community Chest; producer and writer of many plays for local charitable organizations.
Miss K. Knights	Continuity Writer	Member Beta Sigma Phi; member Canadian Womens Press Club; member (Hon.) Workshop Fourteen (Little Theatre); member Western Ontario Drama League.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKDA, Victoria, B.C.—*Conc.*		
Mrs. Ruby Masters	Accountant	2nd Vice-President Victoria Business and Professional Women's Club; Corresponding Secretary Beta Sigma Phi City Council.
Ann Armstrong	Traffic Department	Member Solarium Junior League.
Iola Gordon	Receptionist	Member I.O.D.E.; Beta Sigma Phi.
Adrienne Taylor	Assistant Accountant	Member Canadian Red Cross Corps; member St. Ann's French Creek W.A.
Suzanne Egg	Secretary	Member Solarium Junior League.
CJDC—Dawson Creek, B.C.		
Bob Trimbee	Announcer.	
LeRoy Tansem	Announcer.	
Roy Darling	Announcer.	
Bill Gordon	Chief Engineer	Member of the Jaycees.
Deloris Pawliw	Secretary.	
Marjorie Jamieson	Continuity Writer	Member Eastern Star.
Marilyn Williams	Bookkeeper.	
Maureen Byng	Continuity Writer.	
L. R. Roskin	Manager	Vice-President Junior Chamber of Commerce; member Arena Commission; member Canadian Legion; Lt. Loyal Edmonton Reg. Reserve; Director Lakeview Credit Union; Charter President Kinsmen's Club.
Mike Michaud	Announcer	Member of the Jaycees.
CKOV—Kelowna, B.C.		
C. F. Patrick	Salesman	Director Anglican Dramatic Club; member St. Michael and All Angels' Church; ex officio rep. Community Chest; Director Kelowna Little Theatre; Kelowna Lions Club International; Kelowna Aquatic Club; Kelowna Scout Hall Chairman Bd. of Trustees.
Hugh Caley	Salesman	B.P.O.E.; Holy Name Society; Square Dance Group; Cubmaster Okanagan Mission Cub Pack.
Brian Herron	Studio Engineer	Junior Chamber of Commerce; Knights of Columbus; many hours service donated to community groups such as Kelowna Figure Skating Club, Little Theatre, Regatta Comm. School choirs —tape record; also repair of recording equipment for community groups
Enid Meston	Continuity Writer	Member St. Michael and All Angels' Church; member Beta Sigma Phi; Kelowna Arts Council; Kelowna Little Theatre.
Robert Leckie	Continuity Editor	Holy Name Society; (former executive Prince George Music and Drama Festival Association); Junior Chamber of Commerce; Regatta Publicity Committee.
Dennis Reid	Assistant Manager	Central Okanagan Boy Scouts' Association. On executive Badge secretary Publicity Director; Executive Kelowna Athletic Round Table (organization which promotes recreation of all types, such as organizing children's playgrounds, etc.)

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKOV, Kelowna, B.C.—*Conc.*		
J. C. Thompson	Announcer	Frequently called upon to M.C. concerts, amateur hours, and special occasions for various community groups; Kelowna Kiwanis Club; member 20-year Radio Club.
J. Patrick Moss	Librarian	C.Y.O.; Junior Chamber of Commerce; Young Liberal Association; Kelowna Aquatic Association.
Mrs. Freda Woodhouse	Program Director	L.A. to Canadian Legion (Branch 26); publicity chairman, 48th International Kelowna Regatta.
Judith Wilson	Continuity Writer	Member St. Michael and All Angels' Church.
Robert Hall	News Editor	President Interior Basketball Referee's Association; e.g. director North Okanagan Teen Towns; publicity director Kelowna Male Chorus.
Eric M. Boyle	Announcer	National Flood Relief; Anglican Young People's Association; March of Dimes; Shower of Dimes; Red Cross.
Robert Ross	Announcer	National Flood Relief; U.N. Radio Association; March of Dimes; Red Cross.
Jill Angle	Bookkeeper	National Flood Relief Fund; Red Cross Blood Donor Clinic; March of Dimes; Publicity Committee, Kelowna International Regatta.
Fred Weber	Chief Engineer	Has built radio equipment for a number of community groups at no charge; repairs radios free of charge for local pastor who purchases radios for shut-ins of his church; spends many hours each year tape recording local groups such as Kinette Choir, High School Clubs; this assists these organizations in their training; president Rotary Club of Kelowna.
Mari Nishi	Receptionist	National Flood Relief Fund; March of Dimes; Community Chest.
Mrs. Marion E. Bews	Secretary-Treasurer	Arthritis Society; Blood Donor Clinic (Red Cross); March of Dimes; member Anglican Church.
CFJC, Kamloops, B.C.		
Ian G. Clark	Manager	Past President Shrine Club, A.F. and A.M.; director Cancer Society; Warden St. Paul's Church; member Board of Trade.
R. J. Innes	Sales Manager	Member Board of Trade; Junior Chamber Commerce—past president B.C. Chamber.
W. Harwood	Producing Manager	Member Elks Lodge; member Cancer Society.
Pat Marini	Traffic	Secretary Ski Club; secretary Business and Professional Women's Club; secretary Legion of Mary.
Elda Martin	Accountant	Legion of Mary—president.
Ralph Field	Chief Announcer	Member Elks Club, Oddfellows, A.F. and A.M., Junior Chamber.
Emmett Cronin	Announcer	Committee chairman Junior Chamber.
CKLN, Nelson, B.C.		
Alan R. Ramsden	Manager	Junior Chamber of Commerce—executive at large; secretary Nelson and District Boy Scouts Association; member Kootenay Lake General Hospital Society.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKWX, Vancouver, B.C.		
Frank H. Elphicke	Vice-President and General Manager	President Rotary Club of Vancouver; director Pacific National Exhibition; director Better Business Bureau; vice-president Vancouver Tourist Association; member Board of Trade; past chairman Ad & Sales Bureau; member Finance Committee Board of Trade; past director Community Chests; past chairman Community Chests Campaign; member Community Arts Council.
Sam G. Ross	Assistant Manager	Chairman Ad Sales Bureau, Board of Trade; member of Council, Vancouver Art Gallery; director Kiwanis Club.
J. L. Sayers	Sales Manager	Past president Vancouver Executive; former director Kinsmen Club; former director Ad. Club; member Sales Executive Club of Vancouver, also Ad. and Sales Bureau, Board of Trade; canvasses on Community Chests, Red Cross and Tourist Association Drives; past president Norgate Park Comm. Association.
D. S. Greig	Acct. Executive	Member Ad. and Sales Bureau; Vancouver Board of Trade; member Capilano Comm. Association.
Clare Copeland	Retail Sales Manager	Ad. and Sales Club, Board of Trade and Ad. Club.
Richard H. Smith	Account Executive	Kinsmen Club of Vancouver—member 3 years.
Laurie Irving	Production Manager	Community Bowling League; licensed radio amateur VE70B.
John E. W. Ansell	Program Manager	Director Point Frey Athletic Society; member Kerrisdale Minor Hockey Club; coach same organization; handles public address system at community arena for hockey, lacrosse, etc.
Calvin George	Announcer Supervisor	Member Westbridge Community Ratepayers Association.
Norman W. Griffin	Farm Service Director	B.C. Institute of Agrologists.
Robert John Hutton	Senior Announcer	A.F. & A.M.; P.T.A.
John Sharpe	Announcer	Actively interested in amateur radio emergency and disaster work.
Harold Reid Francis	Announcer	Holy Name Society (St. Andrews Cathedral), Victoria, B.C.
Fred Bass	Librarian	Secretary South Vancouver Kiwanis Club; president Service Clubs of Greater Vancouver.
A. G. Cannings	Director News and Special Events.	Vice-President B.C. Newsmen's Club; executive P.N.E. Press-Radio Gallery.
Joe Midmore	News Editor-announcer	West Point Grey Community Association; Queen Mary School P.T.A.; Vancouver Rotary; Musical Club.
David Green	News Editor	Masons.
Edith O'Reilly	Secretary	Capilano Highlands Home Owner's Association—member.
Mrs. Nina F. Anthony	Continuity Editor	Vancouver Symphony Society; Canadian Women's Press Club—past president.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKWX, Vancouver, B.C.—*Conc.*		
Phil Ashton	Writer	Assistant Adult Director B.C. Teen Town Association (12,000 membership) chairman Provincial Teen-Aid Comm. (teen leadership training and research) recreation sub-committee Vancouver Mayor's Youth Committee; MacMillan Fine Arts Clubs Publicity Comm.; Y.M.C.A. Phalanx Fraternity.
Miss Leslie M. Mathers	Continuity Writer	Active member Venture Club of Vancouver since April, 1951.
Patricia Danby	Continuity Writer	Active member of Venture Club of Vancouver.
Kenneth W. Hughes	Promotion Manager	Lord Nelson P.T.A. (executive).
Jack Hughes	Traffic Manager	Vancouver Tip Topper Club; Vancouver Home Movie Society; Lower Mainland Railroad Association.
Raymond W. Atkinson	Transmitter Operator	Y.M.C.A.
CHUB, Nanaimo, B.C.		
Chuck Rudd	Manager	Rotary Club of Nanaimo (past director); chairman Bowen Park Development; Elks Club; Rotary Club are aiming to set up an 88-acre park housing, an open-air threatre, swimming pool, etc.
Sheila Hassell	Nat. Sales Director. Publicity and Prom.	Soroptimist Club of Nanaimo—public relations director. Working with club to set up low-rental housing for persons over 60 years of age; Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service—monthly work.
Larry Thomas	News Editor	Junior Chamber of Commerce.
Frank Wheeler	Accountant	Chamber of Commerce.
Lew Fox	Acct. Executive	Lion's Club of Nanaimo.
Gerry Black	Acct. Eexcutive	Gyro Club of Nanaimo.
CKNW, New Westminster, B.C.		
Wm. Rea, Jr	Owner-Manager	Vancouver Board of Trade—member; Ad. and Sales Bureau—member; Better Business Bureau—member; Advertising Club (Vancouver)—member; Community Arts Council—member (sponsor); Borstal Association—member; British Empire Games Publicity Committee—member; Mayor's Youth Council—advisor; Red Cross (Radio)—Blood Donor Comm.; B.C. Tourist Association—member; B.C. Automobile Association—member; Y's Men's Club (Y.M.C.A.)—past president; New Westminster Board of Trade—committee, Sales Executives Club—member; Loyal Protestant Home for Children—director.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKNW, New Westminster, B.C.—*Conc.*		
Phil Baldwin	Assistant Manager	Vancouver Board of Trade—member; Ad. and Sales Bureau—Fellowship and Show Committees; Advertising Club (Vancouver)—vice-chairman; Red Cross-Radio Press Committee; Mayor's Youth Council—advisor; British Empire Games—Events Committee; Symphony Society (Vancouver)—Publicity Committee; Canadian Legion—Poppy Fund Promotion; Community Arts Council—member; Sales Executives Club—member; Community Chests—committee member.
Rolly Ford	National Sales Manager	Board of Trade—member; Ad. and Sales Bureau—member; Advertising Club—member.
Al Klenman	Sales	Member Vancouver Amateur Radio Club, Sales Executives Club, Vancouver Board of Trade, Canadian Legion, Vancouver Advertising Club, National Sales Executive Club.
Al Goodwin	Sales	Boys Leader Optomist Club; member Board of Trade; member Canadian Legion.
Fin Anthony	Sales	Attendance member Kinsmen Club, Quarter Back Club.
Hugh Wallace	NW Sales Manager	Member Board of Trade, New Westminster, B.C.
Bill Hughes	Sales	Publicity Committee, Community Chest, New Westminster, B.C.
Hal Davis	Production Manager	Junior Chamber of Commerce—publicity and promotion; director Vagabond Players; Community Chest; Red Cross (N.W. and Valley)—committee member.
Hal MacInnes	Ass't Chief Engineer	Member Board of Trade; member Junior Chamber of Commerce.
Clare Purvis	Engineer	Kinsmen Club—committee chairman; member Canadian Legion.
Jim Morris	Music Director	Member Masons.
Fred McCurdy	Continuity Writer	Optomist Club—boys' work plans.
Joe Chesney	Announcer	President Kinsmen Club (Whalley).
Bill Duncan	Chief Announcer	Boy Scouts—advisor; Parent Teacher Association—member; Junior Chamber of Commerce (New Westminster)—member; Masons—member.
Les White	News Editor (PM)	Burnaby Chamber of Commerce—Program Committee; Parent Teachers Association — executive; Knights of Columbus—member.
Bob Giles	News Editor (AM)	Associated Commercial Travellers Association—Talent Committee Arthritis Fund.
Earl Toppings	Newsman	Tyro Leader Port Kells United Church — boys' leader — Sunday School Teacher; Vagabond Players—member.
Anne Shelling	Accountant	Seamens Club (N.W.) — volunteer worker.
Elsie Hall	Stenographer	Alpha Iota Sorority—social service worker.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CFCN—Calgary, Alberta		
H. G. Love	President	Canadian Chamber of Commerce—director; Alta. Assoc. C. of C. and Agric.—director; Calgary Chamber of Commerce—past president, member of Council; Calgary Exhibition & Stampede—director; Alberta Motor Assoc.—director; Salvation Army—advisory comm.; Shriners Hosp. for Crippled Children, Wpg.—governor; Rotary Club—member; Canadian Red Cross — committee; Fraternal Societies — active; Stampeder Football Club — governor; Stampede Hockey Club—director; Community Chest—committee; Calgary Y.M.C.A.—director; Calgary Zoological Soc.—director; Prov. Civil Defence Org.—advisory comm.
R. A. Kerr	Announcer	Calgary Allied Arts Centre (Coste House)—lecturer; Y.M.C.A. So-Ed Club—lecturer; Various young people groups addressed during year on musical appreciation—lecturer.
Leo Trainer	Salesman	Calgary Zoological Soc.—director; St. Mary's Cathedral Choir—active; Canadian Legion—active.
Frank Brand	Announcer	Recently arrived Calgary but past work in Boy Scouts United Church youth groups.
Mrs. Bette Best	Receptionist	Handicapped Club Y.M.C.A.—handicraft supervisor; Canadian Red Cross—vol. worker; C.G.I.T.—group leader.
Cyril Hunter	Trans. Operator	Asst. Scoutmaster 13 years—A.Y.P.A.
Margaret Waldie	Secretary	Workshop 14 Assoc. (Amateur Dramatic Club)—secretary.
Pat Lundie	Copy Writer	Cal. Allied Arts Centre—active; Girls Town; Cancer Society; Cal. Womens Press Club; Bet Sigma Phi (service society).
R. W. Lamb	Chief Engineer	S.W. Kiwanis Club—member; Cal. Jr. Cham. of Comm.—member; Cal. Amateur Radio Club (active civil defence)—member; St. Marks Anglican Church—sidesman; S.A.B. Engineers—committee; Community Chest—worker; Y.M.C.A.—worker.
G. L. Carter	Commercial Dept.	Air Force Branch A.U.SI.—past pres.; Alta. United Services Inst.—director; Ad. and Sales Club—past pres. and standing director; Cal. Chamber Commerce—member and past council member; Junior Chamber Comm.—member; Cal. Exhibition and Stampede—assoc. director; Cal. Flying Club—member; Fraternal Societies—active member.
James A. Love	Program Manager	Camp Chief Hector Y.M.C.A. Boys' Camp — committee; Rotary Club — community service comm.; Fraternal Societies—active; Cal. Chamber of Comm.—tourist and roads comm.; Alta. United Services Inst.—active; Community Chest—radio comm.; Ad. and Sales Club—active.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CFCN, Calgary, Alberta—*Conc.*		
Henry Viney	Sports Director	During past year 1952 travelled to Korea and Europe on behalf of Canadian Government (Dept. of External Affairs) speaking to service personnel and showing sports pictures. On return was sought as public speaker for Service Clubs, Charitable Organizations and Community Clubs. Member of the Canadian Legion, former president of Calgary Press Radio Club.
Emma E. Bruce	Accountant	Calgary Bus. and Prof. Women's Club —treasurer; Cathedral Church of the Redeemer Sunday School—treasurer; Fraternal Activities—past matron.
Dora Dibney	Women's Director	Public relations through CFCN for church and welfare organizations, Red Cross, Cancer Society, Cerebral Palsy Assn.; hospitals, Women's Institutes, YWCA, YMCA; Calgary Family Bureau (director for three years); H. and S. Assoc., Library, orphanages; Boys' Town, Girls' Town, Coste House; Calgary Women's Musical Club; Calgary Symphony Orchestra; Drama groups; local, provincial and federal services such as post office; telephones; fire department; police transit system; health; education, Prov. Inst. of Tech. Interviews with visitors to city and others. Attend 3 to 6 or more meetings weekly (All this week of April 6-11 Alta. Council on Child and Family Welfare); address innumerable organizations rural and urban 3-4 times monthly.
E. H. McGuire	Commercial Manager	Kiwanis—member.
CFRN, Edmonton, Alberta		
G. R. A. Rice	Pres. & Manager	Canadian Cancer Society—pres. Alberta Division.
Mrs. Eve Henderson	Women's Commentator	Friendship Club—founder and pres. of board. Canadian Women's Press Club —prov. vice-pres., national vice-pres.
Helen Ramsay	Continuity Editor	Y.M.C.A. Program Board—director.
Eric Candy	Librarian	Edmonton Drama Council—executive.
CJCA Edmonton, Alberta		
Gerry Gaetz	Manager	Chamber of Commerce—3rd vice-pres.; Western Association Brdcast.—president; Can. Association Broadcasters—director; Alberta Civil Defence—chairman, Liaison Comm; Can. Arthritis Society—publicity chairman, Alberta; Can. Red Cross—director of publicity, Northern Alberta; Ed. Golf and Country Club—member; Edmonton Club—member; Ed. Petroleum Club — member; National Ballet — patron.
Rolfe Barnes	Assistant Manager	Chamber of Commerce—member; Advertising and Sales Executive Club—president; Gyro Club—member; Edmonton Petroleum Club—member; Ed. Golf and Country Club—member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CJCA, Edmonton, Alberta—*Conc.*		
Dalt Elton	Production Manager	Kiwanis Club—member; Ed. Theatre Groups (1952 Kerr Award for Best Actor)—member; Church of Latter Day Saints—member.
Doug Homersham	Assist. Prod. Mgr.	Alberta Jr. Chamber of Commerce—immediate past president, national chairman extension committee. Alberta Drama Board—chairman; Edmonton Drama Council—president; Ed. Committee of Trans-Canada Highway Assoc. (Yellowhead Route)—chairman; Alberta Drama League—zone president; Edmonton Citizenship and Immigration Planning Committee—exec. member; Personnel Association of Edmonton — member; Anglican Church—member.
Steve Woodman	Announcer	Ed. Fish and Game Assoc.—member; St. Joseph Cathedral (RC)—member.
Keith Rich	Announcer	Mallard Gun Club—member; Ed. Yacht Club—member; Ed. Fish and Game Assoc.—member; Holy Trinity Church—member.
Jack Wilson	Announcer	Short Story Association of America—member; First Baptist Church—member.
John Mackin	Announcer	Jr. Chamber of Commerce—member; Kinsmen Club—member; Can. Legion B.E.S.L.—member; Ed. Civic Opera Society—member; H.M.C.S. Nonsuch Wardroom—member; Anglican Church—member.
George Payne	Announcer	CJCA Drama Club—member; Anglican Church—member.
Bill Gilmour	Announcer	Ed. Kennel Club—member; Robertson United Church—member.
Andy Philip	Announcer	Alberta Humane Society—director; Parkallen Home and School—member; St. Paul's Men's Club—member; St. Paul's United Church—member.
Mrs. C. Biggs	Voice Coach	Women's Auxiliary—Life member; All-Saints' Anglican Church—member; Can. Women's Theatre Guild—member.
Joe McKenzie	Sales Manager	Ed. Jr. Chamber Commerce—personnel chairman; Can. Legion B.E.S.L.—publicity chairman, 1953 convention; Presbyterian Church—member.
Bob Simmermon	Salesman	Church Latter Day Saints—member.
Ken Lee	Salesman	Tri-Y Fraternity—exec. member; United Church—member.
Ruth Rankin	Accountant	Junior Hospital League—sec-treas. Volunteer Bureau; Nat. Office Management—member; Edmonton Symphony Society Women's Committee — member; St. Anthony's Cathedral—member.
Shirley Brown	Assist. Acct.	CGIT Group Leader, Pleasantview United Church.
Bill McAfee	Continuity Editor	Ed. Unitarian Fellowship—pub. director; Unitarian Service Comm.—member; Garneau Community League—member; Canadian Legion B.E.S.L.—member; Ad. and Sales Exec. Club—member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CJCA, Edmonton, Alberta—*Conc.*		
Peggy Miller	Continuity Writer	Ed. Eskimos Ladies Quarterback Club—pub. director; Can. Women's Press Club—member; Holy Trinity Ang. Church—member.
Dick Morton	Continuity Writer	Ed. Unitarian Fellowship—president; Ed. Radio Productions—vice-pres.; Unitarian Service Comm.—member; Norwood Young Peoples' Operetta—director.
Frank Dolphin	Continuity Writer	Catholic Young Peoples' Paper—editor; Knights of Columbus—member; St. Patrick's Cathedral—member.
Ed Arrol	Continuity Writer	Forest Heights Comm. League—member; Canadian Legion B.E.S.L.—member; Forest Heights United Church—member.
Frank Hollingworth	Chief Engineer	Alpine Club of Canada—member; Baptist Church—member.
Merrel Dahlgren	Assist. Engineer	Fairview Home and School—pres.; Civil Defence—on course; North. Alta. Radio Club— member; United Church—member.
Larry Hartman	Trans. Operator	Petty Officers' Club—member. United Church—member.
Ken Anholt	Studio Operator	North. Alta. Radio Club—member; Church Latter Day Saints—member.
Jack Fry	Trans. Engineer	Home and School Assoc.—chairman; United Church—member.
Bill Seeback	Studio Operator	Eskimo Ski Club—member.
Wally Everitt	Studio Operator	Ed. Fish and Game Assoc.—member; Anglican Church—member.
Gordon Skuttle	Studio Operator	North. Alta. Radio Club—member; Anglican Church—member.
Bob Keith	Trans. Operator	Home and School Assoc.—member; United Church—member.
Win Sutton	Promotion Director	Can. Women's Press Club—member; Christ Church—member.
Don Clayton	Farm Director	Jr. Chamber of Commerce—member; Ed. District Agricultural Society—member; Alberta Humane Society—director; Agricultural Inss. of Can.—member; St. James Cathedral—member.
Russ Sheppard	News Director	Jr. Chamber of Commerce—member; Alta. Press Gallery—president; Nat. Assoc. Radio News Directors—member; Metropolitan United Church—member.
Joe Carbury	Sports Editor	Sports Writers' Assoc.—secretary; Little Flower Church (R.C.)—member.
Walt Rutherford	News Reporter	Jr. Chamber of Commerce—member; Home and School Assoc.—executive; Curling Club (Royal)—member; St. Johns Anglican Church—member.
Al Slaight	News Reporter	Ed. Ring of the Brotherhood of Magicians—member.
Frank Hutton	News Reporter	Knights of Columbus—member; St. Joseph's Cathedral—member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CHAT—Medicine Hat, Alberta		
Jackie Cove	Copy Writer	Robert Bullen Melody Maids—member; Medicine Hat Teen Association—member; M. H. Figure Skating Club—member.
Eva Biel	Promotion Director	Robert Bullen Melody Maids—president.
Mervyn Stone	Announcer	Civic Theatre Association—member; B'Nai Brith—member; Winnipeg Symphony Society—member.
Bob Buss	Station Manager	M.H. Branch—Canadian Council of Christians and Jews—co-chairman; Local Can. Nat. Institute for the Blind—chairman; M.H. Exhibition Company—director; Chamber of Commerce—1st vice-pres.; Horticulture Society—patron; Rotary Club—member.
Ron Hill	Announcer	Civic Theatre Association—member.
Ian Carson	Chief Engineer	Medicine Hat Lions Club—president.
Orville Kope	Sales Manager	Medicine Hat Kinsmen Club—district bulletin editor.
Ken Lapp	Production Manager	Medicine Hat Kiwanis Club—member.
CFGP—Grande Prairie, Alberta		
A. J. Balfour	Manager	Rotary Club—past pres.; Canadian National Institute for the Blind—chairman; Western Music Board—Nor. Alta. Rep.; Chamber of Commerce—committee chairman; Peace River Fire Relief—chairman; Civil Defence — communications; Town Board of Health—member; Canadian Legion—past pres.
John A. Wilson	Production Manager	Rotary Club—director; Musical Festival Association—pres.; Canadian Legion—member; A.F. & A.M.—member.
Jack Soars	Sales Manager	Kinsmen Club—director; United Commercial Travellers—member; Junior Chamber of Commerce—past vice-pres.; Canadian Legion—member.
John Barron	Writer	K. of C.—member; Musical Festival Association—director; Canadian Legion—member.
Jim deRoaldes	Chief Engineer	Kinsmen Club—member.
Edna Balfour	Accountant	I.O.D.E.—treasurer; Order of Eastern Star—member; Local Cancer Society—treasurer.
Ruth Panter	Traffic Manager	Red Cross, Civil Defence.
P. D. Scanlan	Salesman	Kiwanis Club, R.C.A.F.A.—pres. wing 401; Canadian Legion.
D. R. Lawrie	Manager	Kinsmen Club, Pet. Sales and Ad.; Pet. Chamber of Commerce; Pet. Cancer Society.
G. F. Grady	Commercial Manager	Pet. Sales and Ad. Club; Chamber of Commerce.
Hazel Newcombe	Traffic Clerk	Order of Eastern Star—officer.
Bob Butchart	Announcer	Canadian Legion—member.
Francis Tanner	Engineer	Canadian Legion—member.
Cecil Morton	Librarian	Civil Defence—communications; Church Men's Club—pianist; Church Choir—member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CFQC, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan		
Vern Dallin	Station Manager	University of Saskatoon Dramatic Society—past president; Saskatoon Kiwanis Club—past president and still a member; Civilian Committee Voluntary Recruiting during '40-'44—member; 4th consecutive 2-year term on Saskatoon Collegiate Board—member; Masonic Lodge—past master; Royal Arch Masons—past first principal Grand Lodge officer; Saskatoon Preceptory—past preceptor; Canadian Legion Poppy Day—publicity committee; Engineering Institute of Canada—member.
Blair Nelson	Commercial Manager	Masonic Order; chairman of National Convention of Kinsmen Club 1954; St. John's Anglican Church—member of select vestry and treasurer; Saskatoon Club—director; Riverside Country Club—past pres. during re-organization; Saskatoon Industrial Exhibition—publicity comm.; Community Chest—former publicity committee member.
Mrs. L. Bergsteinson	Traffic Manageress	Canadian Red Cross Corps 1939 and on—commandant; Executive Council, prov. and local Red Cross—member; Cdn. Girl Guides—member of executive; St. James Anglican W.A.—treasurer; Eastern Star I.O.D.E., V.O.N.
Margaret Morrison	Continuity Ed.	St. Thomas Wesley United Church choir — president; Saskatoon Lyric Theatre Society—secretary; Y.P.U. Prov. Drama Festival—writer and director of winning play; Greystone Theatre—performer; U. of S. Alumni Association—member.
Mr. Harry Dekker	Production Manager	Optimist Club—chairman of publicity; Y.M.C.A.; S.L.I. Reserve. At many charitable performances he and his wife do M.C. work. Mrs. Dekker is receptionist at CFQC.
Godfrey Hudson	New Service Director	Advisor and speaker to various charitable organizational e.g., Sask. Community Chest and Council on Public Relations via Radio; also at career nights at two of Saskatoon's collegiates. These have been in the last month.
Carl O'Brien	Transmitter Supervisor	Saskatoon Cdn. Cancer Soc.—Director; Saskatoon Amateur Radio Club — member and past president.
Wilf. Gilby	Special Events	Life member of Saskatchewan Anti-T.B. League still an active member—MC— producer of amateur shows for 11 years.
Harvey Tate	News Service Reporter	B'Nai Brith—publicity chairman; Y.M.C.A.—member.
Les Edwards	News Service Reporter	Bedford Road Collegiate—Alumni President.
Mrs. Huibrecht't Hart	Librarian	C.G.I.T.—Group leader; Dutch Flood Relief Committee—secretary.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CFQC, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan—*Conc.*		
Alex Mylymok	News Service Secretary	Ukrainian National Youth Federation—choir director, member of club; Knox United Church—choir member; Y.M.C.A.
Roy Currie	Chief Announcer	Cosmopolitan Club—publicity; Rate Payers Assoc.,—vice-president; Officer Reserve Army—quarter master R.C.-D.C. #10 Company, Sec. Saskatoon Garrison Officers Mess.
Margaret Brown	Continuity Writer	University of Sask. Players—performer; Little Theatre—performer; Department of Mental Health Adulr Ed. Plays—performer; Adjudicates fot Saskatchewan Recreation Movement.
CJGX, Yorkton, Sask.		
J. M. Shortreed	Manager	Kinsmen Kids Project A.C.T. Anti-T.B. Life Member Anti-T.B. Assoc.
J. Willms	Librarian	Yorkton Little Theatre—cast business manager.
G. G. Gallagher	Commercial Manager	A.C.T. Anti-T.B. League.
Bill Mass	Announcer	Yorkton Little Theatre—cast.
J. C. Goodman	Production Manager	A.C.T. Anti-T.B.—director; life member Sask. Anti-T.B. League; Kiwani youth project—director.
Donna Monroe	Continuity writer	Yorkton Little Theatre—cast.
Charita Paulson	Continuity writer	Yorkton Little Theatre—cast.
M. G. Phillips	Special Events Director	Yorkton Film Council.
CFAR, Flin Flon, Manitoba		
C. H. Witney	Manager	Chamber of Commerce—pres.; Manitoba Chambers of Commerce—ex. director.
E. Smallwood	Program Director	Flin Flon Film Council—secretary.
J. Thiele	Sales Director	Canadian Legion—ex. dir.
J. Wardle	Sportscaster	Kinsmen—Member.
CJNB, North Battleford, Saskatchewan		
A. Clint Nichol	Chief Engineer	Officer-commanding (F/O) Royal Canadian Air Cadets Corps; member, Board of Stewards, 3rd Avenue United Church; member, North Battleford Curling Club; member, Canadian Legion.
Thomas O. Nelson	Production Manager	Member, B.P.O. Elks; member, Canadian Legion; member, N.B. Curling Club.
Eldon M. Elliott	Sports Announcer	Member, Canadian Legion Publicity Chairman, Minor League Sports Organization.
G. G. B. Ayres	Continuity	Member, Canadian Legion.
Allan H. Klassen	Sales	Member, Kinsmen Club; member, Jr. Chamber of Commerce.
Robert A. Barr	Regional Sales	Member, Canadian Legion; member, United Commercial Travellers.
Dorothy S. Nichol	Continuity	Member, Beta Sigma Phi.
Eva M. Lethbridge	Accountant	Member, Mental Health Assoc.; member Anti-T.B. League; chairman, publicity comm. Canadian Red Cross Society.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CJNB, North Battleford, Saskatchewan—*Conc.*		
Hume A. Lethbridge	General Manager	Director, N.B. Agricultural Society director, N.B. Board of Trade; director, N.B. Branch, Canadian Cancer Society; director, N.B. Branch Navy League of Canada; director, K-40 Club (Kinsmen); member, Rotary Club of N.B.; member, United Commercial Travellers; member, Board of Managers, Knox St. Andrews Presbyterian Church; chairman, publicity committee, Anti-T.B. League; chairman, communications committee, N.B. Civil Defence Organization.
CKRM—Regina, Saskatchewan		
Gwenn Bell	Traffic Dept	Hewettes (Girls Choral Group)—member.
Gerry Cornish	Engineering Dept	Y.M.C.A.—member C.Y.C.—member.
H. C. Dane	Commercial Manager	Associated Can. Travellers—member.
Win Dufty	Office Manager	Soroptimist Club—treasurer.
Johnnie Esaw	Sports Commentator	Kinsmen Club—member.
Gerry Gordon	Sales Department	Associated Can. Travellers—member.
Bob Hill	Program Manager	Regina Branch Canadian Cancer Society—member; Assoc. Can. Travellers—member.; Regina Little Theatre—publicity.
Art Kennard	News Department	Canadian Legion—member.
Bill Leoppky	Continuity Editor	Royal Antediluvian Order of Buffaloes—member.
Cliff Mann	Engineering Dept	Regina Amateur Radio Association—member; Association of Canadian Travellers—member; Regina Camera Club—member.
Evelyn Marshall	Promotion Dept	Regina Little Theatre—member.
Helen Martenson	Continuity Dept	Order of Eastern Star—member; Business and Professional Women's Club—secretary-treasurer; Ladies Aux. to Can. Legion—member.
Joe MacDonald	Sales Department	Associated Can. Travellers—member; Campion College Alumni—member.
Alla McLellan	Receptionist	Ladies Aux. to Can. Legion—member.
D. J. Oaks	Station Manager	Rotary Club—president; United Commercial Travellers—past senior counsellor; United Services Inst.—director; Lion's Club—past president; Saskatchewan Motor Club — director; I.O.O.F.—past noble grand. Regina Little Theatre—patron; Regina Symphony Orchestra—patron; Canadian Cancer Society—chairman of finance campaign; Regina Chamber of Commerce—member.
Doug Painter	Continuity Dept	Regina Symphony Orchestra—member; Regina Legion Band—member.
Allan Paul	Announcer	Regina Little Theatre—member.
Bill Rees	Sales Department	Junior Chamber of Commerce—president; Vestry of Pro-Cathedral—secretary; Prov. Anglican Young People Assoc.—Vice-President; Regina Unit Canadian Cancer Society—member; Regina Chamber of Commerce—board member.
A. J. Smith	Executive Assistant and Accountant	Kiwanis Club—member.
Rita Spicer	Promotion Manager	Soroptimist Club—member.
Jim Terrell	Announcer	St. John's Ambulance Soc.—member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CJOB—Winnipeg, Manitoba		
John O. Blick	President	Y.M.C.A.—director; Winnipeg Ballet—director; Boy Scouts of Manitoba—director; St. John's Ambulance Corps—director; United Services Institute—vice-pres. Sales and Advertising Club—member; Kiwanis Club of Winnipeg member; Canadian Club—member; Empire Club—director; Man. Highway Safety Council—president.
Alan Bready	News Editor	Alcoholism for Manitoba—radio liaison; Manitoba Assoc. Retarded Children—P.R.; St. Paul's Library Guild—member; Community Chest of Gr. Winnipeg—radio advisor; Boy Scouts—member.
James Crowe	Salesman	Optimist Club—member; Y.M.C.A.—finance committee.
David Darby	Accountant	Lions Club—member.
George Davies	Production Manager	Assoc. Commercial Travellers; Raising money to fight T.B. in Manitoba—production.
Clifford Gardner	Announcer	Donates time and talent to all charitable and church organizations—entertainer.
Tony Messner	Commercial Manager	Mason—member
Frances Sprague	Office Manager and Secretary	Soroptimist Club of Winnipeg—publicity and membership; Women's Ad. Club of Wpg.—president; Winnipeg Ballet—member; Winnipeg Symphony—member.
Diane Heaton	Receptionist	Kelvin Grads. Musical Society (sponsored by Lions Club), entertainer.
CKY LTD., Winnipeg, Manitoba		
Norman Aldred	Sales Representative	Kinsmen Club—active member; Radio and Press Club—active member; Rod and Gun Club (conservation of forests)—active member; Merchant Seamen's Association—member; Young Progressive Conservative's Organization—member.
George Balcaen	Feature Announcer	Little Theatre—Acting—active member; Radio and Press Club—member; Broadcaster's Club—member.
Allen Barker	Studio Manager	Westminster United Church—active member; Winnipeg Junior Chamber of Commerce—active member.
Len Carlson	Feature Announcer	Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks—active member.
"Porky" Charbonneau	Feature Announcer and Broadcast Supervisor.	Optimist Club—active member (Boys' work); Radio and Press Club—executive member.
Wilf Collier	National Sales Manager.	Kinsmen Club—past pres., past district secretary; Masonic Lodge—active member; Norwood United Church—active member; Home and School Association—member of board.
Ruth Drew	Advertising Writer	Beta Sigma Phi Sorority (Charity and Cultural Dev.)—vice-president; St. Ignatius Church—member of choir; Women's Sales and Ad. Club—member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKY LTD., Winnipeg, Manitoba—*Conc.*		
Maurice Eyolfson	Sales Representative	Winnipeg Junior Chamber of Commerce—member of traffic safety and publicity committees; Assoc. Comm. Travellers—member.
Charles Ferland	Transmitter Operator	Societies Lyoiri—member of choir.
Clay Hawkins	Local Sales Manager	Masonic Lodge—active member.
Michael Hopkins	Feature Announcer	Radio and Press Club—member; Broadcaster's Club—member; Lion's Club—member; Kinsmen Club—member.
Des Kearney	Feature Announcer	Actor's Guild of Winnipeg—active member; Radio and Press Club—member; Wildewood Community Club—public relations committee.
George Keith	Traffic-Librarian	St. Giles United Church—member of the session.
Bill Liska	Features Co-ordinator	Ukranian Professional and Business Men's Club—active member; Broadcaster's Club—active member.
Al Loewan	Sales Representative	Radio and Press Club—member; St. James Community Club—active member; Sales and Ad. Club—active member.
Alistair MacKenzie	General Manager	Gyro Club—active member; Kiwanis Club—active member; Sales and Ad. Club—active member.
Allison Malcolm	General Secretary	Red Cross—volunteer work; SHARE—organizing work; Children's Aid—relief work; General Hospital—entertainment.
Dolores Mann	Director of Special Features.	Winnipeg Little Theatre—active member; Crucible Club of Y.M.C.A.—active member; Wildewood Community Club—active member; Women's Sales and Ad. Club—member; Fireside Group—speaker's committee.
Jean McEachern	Advertising Writer	Junior League—welfare work; Children's Hospital—relief work; Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra—past publicity director of women's committee Symphony Ball.
Reg Stapley	Sales Representative	Kinsmen Club—active member.
Dorothy Thomson	Advertising Editor	Women's Sales and Ad. Club—active member.
Wendy Warren	Feature Announcer	Manitoba Chapter of the Multiple Sclerosis Society of Canada—honorary chairman for 1953; Women's Sales and Ad. Club—active member.
Jack Wells	Sports Specialist	Radio and Press Club — executive member.
Sadie Yankowski	Ad. Service Secretary.	Ukrainian Catholic Youth of Canada—dominion secretary; St. Vladimir and Olga Cathedral (Welfare)—active member; Ukr. Can. Committee—instructor; St. John's Ambulance—senior first aid.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKX, Brandon, Manitoba		
J. B. Craig	President and Managing Director.	Brandon Chamber of Commerce—director and past president; Manitoba Associated Chambers of Commerce—past president; Brandon Kinsmen Club—life member and past president; Management Board, Wheat City Arena—member; Y.M.C.A.—director; Brandon General Hospital Board—life member; Commuity Chest—director; International Peace Garden Committee—Executive Director; St. Paul's United Church—Elder.
E. D. Holland	Commercial Manager	Brandon Kinsmen Club—member.
Eric Davis	Production Manager	Brandon Chamber of Commerce—member; Brandon Kinsmen Club—chairman, service committee; Brandon College Square Dance Club—past president; Brandon Little Theatre—member.
A. W. Olson	Promotion Manager	Masonic Lodge—past master; Community Chest—director; Chamber of Commerce—councillor and chairman, Tourist and Conv.; Brandon Flying Club—director; International Peace Garden Committee—voting member.
E. H. Davies	Chief Engineer	Brandon Kiwanis Club—past president; Brandon Amateur Radio Club—past president; Brandon Choral Society—past president; Community Chest—director; R.C.S.C. Swiftsure—former C.O.; Coronation Celebration Committee—music chairman; St. Matthew's Cathedral—choir director; Brandon Little Theatre—past president.
D. A. Lee	Assistant Production Manager.	Masonic Lodge—member; R.C.S.C. Swiftsure—executive officer; United Services Organization—president; Jr. Chamber of Commerce—member; Brandon Kinsmen Club—member; Civil Defence—project co-ordinator; Brandon Little Theatre—member.
CKX, Brandon, Manitoba		
Harold Donogh	Asst. Engineer	Youth for Christ Movement—treasurer; Bdn. Amateur Radio Club—past president; Christian and Missionary Alliance—chairman, board of trustees.
Harold Roberts	Announcer	Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks—secretary; Loyal Order of Moose—member.
Helen Morrow	Bookkeeper	Co-workers' Club—vice pres.; Local Council of Women—member; YPU Christian Youth Caravans—Corresponding sec.; First Church United—Sunday school teacher.
Mae Tucker	Traffic	Young Women's Auxiliary—member; St. George's Anglican Church—Sunday school teacher.
Betty Murphy	Continuity Writer	University Women's Club—member.
Bill Bain	Continuity Writer	Y.M.C.A.—member; Brandon Figure Skating Club—prof. member; Brandon Little Theatre—member.
W. L. Donnelly	Librarian	Brandon Kiwanis Club — member; S.P.E.B.S.Q.S.A.—exec. member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKX, Brandon, Manitoba—*Conc.*		
K. L. Milton	Sports Director	Brandon Kinsmen Club—member; Royal Canadian Flying Clubs Assoc.—Lic. Pilot; Brandon Flying Club—Lic. Pilot; Central Manitoba Senior Amateur Baseball Assoc.—past president; Brandon Athletics Baseball Club—past president.
CKPR, Fort William, Ontario		
G. D. Jeffrey	Commercial Manager	P.A.—F. W. Kiwanis Club; Ontario Society for Crippled Children; Canadian Legion; Rural Churches; Lakehead Music and Arts Club; Fort William Guild Players; Fort Wm. Public Library.
J. P. Friesen	Program Director	Canadian Legion; Music and Arts Club; Fort William Guild Players; Fort Wm. Library; Rural Churches.
D. Hyatt	Announcer	Music and Arts Society; Public Library.
J. Masters	Announcer	Port Arthur Community Players; Junior Farmers; Secondary Schools Music and Arts Club.
P. Chorniuk	Women Commentator	Vocational School Night-school Orchestra; Choir Director Broadway United Church.
E. Chicorli	Librarian	Ukranian National Youth.
E. Erickson	Accountant	Sec. Treasurer Zion Lutheran Sunday School; Member of the Lutheran League.
V. Hebert	Continuity	Y.W.C.A. Society.
CFOS, Owen Sound, Ontario		
Wm. N. Hawkins	Manager	Owen Sound Chamber of Commerce—Vice-president; Owen Sound Industrial Comm. — secretary-treasurer; Owen Sound Hospital—board of governors; Victorian Order of Nurses—director of publicity; Canadian Cancer Society — board of directors; Canadian Save The Children Fund—director of local chapter; Community Chest—board member.
Denys Ferry	Asst. Manager and Sales Manager	Victorian Order of Nurses—vice-president, local branch; Community Chest —board member; Home and School Association—Radio conv. for all Owen Sound groups.
Everett Smith	Program Director	"Y" Triangle Club—member of program committee; Knox United Church —choir member and member of boys' work board.
Mrs. L. Lamb	Bookkeeper	Community Centre—teaches leather craft, weekly.
G. W. R. Tomlinson	Assistant Sales Manager	Junior Chamber of Commerce—radio representative.
Lawrence Phillips	Farm Editor	Owen Sound Agricultural Society—associate director.
Bill McGee	Announcer	Y's Men and Y's Women Club—member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CJIC, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario		
Lionel H. McAuley	News Editor	Lions Club—life member, past president; Sault Ste. Marie Historical Society—publicity committee; Reserve Officers Club; Chamber of Commerce Tourist and Publicity Committee; Sault Ste. Marie Safety Council—publicity committee; Branch 25 Canadian Legion.
Dave N. Irwin	Chief Engineer	St. John's Anglican Church; Masonic Lodge; Twin City Radio Club—director.
John Mislan	Sports Editor	Precious Blood Church.
Russ Ramsay	Sportscaster	Central United Church; Rotary Club—chairman of youth services committee; Soo Greyhounds Hockey Club—secretary; Boys Hi-Y-mentor; Soo Structural Steel Basketball Team—coach; Soo Boxing Club—secretary-treasurer.
Gene Plouffe	Production Manager	Precious Blood Church; St. Mary's River Boat Club—public relations director; Junior Chamber of Commerce—vice-president and public relations director.
Eb Vance	Sales Manager	Lions Club—past president and past district governor; Soo Concert Assoc.—director; Red Cross Society—publicity committee; Red Feather Society—publicity committee; Masonic Lodge; Can. Legion.
CJIC—Sault Ste. Marie		
Val McAdam	Salesman	Amateur Radio Club; Soo Ski Club—president; Soo Boating Club—secretary-treasur; Algoma Art Soc.
Bill O'Malley	Announcer-Operator	Elks Club; Masonic Lodge; Lodge of Profection.
Sam Pitt	Announcer-Operator	Westminster Presbyterian Church; Sons of Scotland Benevolent Association; Scottish Association of Sault Ste. Marie; Sault Theatre Workshop; Pipes and Drums of the 49th H.A.A. Reft. R.C.A. (Reserve).
Don Stephen	Librarian	Precious Blood Church; Regis Club—treasurer; Legion of Mary; Y's Men.
Helen Johnston	Program Director	St. Andrews United Church; May Court Club—courtesy convenor; Canadian Institute for the Blind—board member.
Sheila Harvey	Secretary	St. John's Anglican Church—choir member; Anglican Young People's Association—social convenor; Soo Theatre Workshop.
Andy Walsh	Announcer-Operator	Precious Blood Church.
Bill Thorne	Announcer-Operator	Elim Lutheran Church.
Mina Brown	Bookkeeper	Presbyterian Church.
Diana Dorken	Women's Editor	St. Luke's Anglican Church; Soo Theatre Workshop.
Don Ramsay	Announcer-Operator	Anglican Church; Red Cross Society; Ontario Motor League and District Representative.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CJCS—Stratford, Ontario		
S. E. Tapley	Manager	Shakespeare Recreational Assoc.—city council representative; Sr. Chamber of Commerce—member; Jr. Chamber of Comm.—member (Honorary); Lions Club—director and 3rd vice-president; Red Cross Society—director; Boy Scouts Association—director; Stratford City Council—alderman.
Alex L. Smith	Program Director	Stratford Little Theatre—past president; Stratford Shakespearean Festival Foundation of Canada—actor.
Chas. Trethewey	Accountant	Stratford Community Concert Assoc.—3rd Vice-president; Perth County Children's Aid Society—member; Kitchener—Waterloo Symphony Orch. and Chamber Music Society—violin cellist; Stratford Music Teachers' Association (O.R.M.T.A.)—member: Stratford Record Club—president.
William Inkol	Sports Announcer	Stratford Minor Hockey Association—coach; Strat. Minor Baseball Association—coach; Municipal Golf Club—publicity; Stratford Country Club—publicity; Knights of Columbus.
F. M. Squires	General Manager	Director Y.M.C.A.; Stratford Turf Club—director; Law Society of Upper Canada—member; Stratford Community Chest—director.
John Phillips	Salesman.	
Lloyd Robertson	Announcer	Stratford Little Theatre—actor.
Norine Scharf	Traffic Manager	St. Paul's Anglican Church Young People's Society—member; Pilot Club—member; Red Cross Society—blood donor.
John Grigg	Chief Engineer	Stratford Y's Men's Club—president; Stratford Minor Hockey Association—Member.
Harold Lamb	Assistant Engineer	Air Cadet Squadron #19—Sgt.
Robt. Willan	Announcer	United Church Young People's—member.
CKLB—Oshawa, Ontario		
John Wacko	Chief Announcer	M.C. for Teen Towners High School Social Organ; has done shows for Ukranian Business and Professional Association.
Paul Summerville	Sports Director	M.C. for all major sporting events; banquets, celebrities nights, etc.; Exec. member, Oshawa Baseball Association.
Burt McCollum	News Editor	Oshawa Youth for Christ—assistant director; King's Radio Quintette—staff member; Stouffville Youth for Christ—technical advisor; Volal Soloist; Sunday School of the Air (first religious organ. to broadcast from any reform institution in Canada)—broadcast producer and technician; Training School for Boys at Bowmanville; Composer Arranger Oshawa Y.F.C. Male Trio—director; Oshawa Radio Drama League—past director; Young Peoples Rec. Association—president.
Graham Bickle	Accountant	Guild Carillonneurs in North America—member. Played for numerous radio broadcasts; Canadian National Exhibition Choir—member for 3 years.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKLB, Oshawa, Ontario—*Conc.*		
Bill Marchand	Chief Engineer	Institute of Radio Engineers—member; active in local church activities.
Kim Sanderson	Librarian	William's Memorial Galleries—member; Nash Prevue Galleries (Art)—member; McIntosh Fine Arts; University of Western Ontario—member; London Hunt Club—member.
Fred Russell	Commercial Dept.	Oshawa Citadel Band—cornet soloist; Oshawa Young Peoples' Band—bandleader; Long Branch Silver Band—organized and trained; Wingham Band—bandmaster; Oshawa Youth for Christ—cornet soloist; Radio Dramatics—participant; prepares concert of symphonic music—composer-arranger.
Gordon Garrison	Commercial Manager	Kinsmen Club of Oshawa—member; Elmer the Safety Elephant—chairman; Greater Oshawa Community Chest—canvass chairman; Oshawa General Booster Club—founder.
A. H. Collins	General Manager	Oshawa Baseball Club—executive; Rotary Club—member.
CHLW Windsor, Ontario		
S. C. Ritchie	Program Director	Public Relations Committee, Windsor Community Fund—chairman; Windsor Lions Club—director; Special Services Committee Windsor Lions Club—chairman; Executive Comm. Windsor District Boy Scouts—member; Gen. Program Co-ordination Committee Windsor Centennial Festival Inc.—chairman.
Robert Johnston	Canadian Sales Manager	Community Fund; Essex Health Association; St. George's Church; Goodfellows; Windsor Jr. Chamber of Commerce; Y.M.C.A.
Margaret Marshall	Traffic Manager	Public Relations Committee; Y.M.-Y.W.C.A.; Charter Member — Women's Advertising and Sales Club of Windsor.
Bruce H. Chick	Continuity Director	Windsor Advertising and Sales Club.
Vivian Shaw	Assistant Continuity Director	Publications Convenor—Essex Presbyterian Young Peoples Union; Giles United Church Bible Class—director; Giles United Church—choir member.
Gene Saunders	Director-Public Service Broadcasting	Optimist Club; Speakers Bureau-Community Fund; Red Cross Windsor Branch—blood committee; Nutrition Council of Windsor; Windsor Centennial Festival Inc.—publicity committee; All Saints' Anglican Church Men's Club—radio publicity; Educational Council, Windsor Traffic Safety Conference.
W. J. Carter	Station Manager	Windsor Rotary—Crippled Children, Cerebral Palsy—past president and director. Plans Committee, Rotary Swimming Pool—chairman; Church Building Committee.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CHLW, Windsor, Ontario—*Conc.*		
W. H. Gatfield	Secretary-Treasurer	Chamber of Commerce; Jr. Chamber of Commerce; Holy Name Society; Society of Industrial and Cost Accountants of Ontario; Toastmasters Club of Windsor.
Don Sharon	Producer—Eddie Chase Show	Windsor Jr. Chamber of Commerce—special event chairman; Essex Regiment (R.C.A.C.) Association—pres; Goodfellows Newspaper; varied Church Groups; Branch 94, Canadian Legion.
Art Boulden	Announcer	Can. National Institute for the Blind—reading to blind at Windsor's Alexander Hall; St. George's Anglican Church—funds, drives, etc.
Giles McMahon	Announcer	Knights of Columbus; Windsor Royals Football Club—director; Windsor Mic-Mac Athletic Club.
Annette Bernard	Secretary	Singing with Orchestra-Benefits; Immaculate Conception Church—funds, etc.
Frank Merrifield	Studio Technician	Member of Sandwich West School Board.
Derrick Baines	Courier	Regis Club—member.
Pearl Rundle	Receptionist	Circle 6—Lincoln Road United Church
Walter Rudak	Studio Technician	St. Angelo de Merici Church.
Gordon Pfaff	Announcer	W. Ont. Lutheran Council—president' Council, First Lutheran Church, Windsor—president; Ada C. Richards Home and School; Choir—First Lutheran Church—Ass't. director.
CFOR, Orillia, Ontario		
Pete McGarvey	Program Director	Y's Mens Club—director; Chamber of Commerce—director; Fire Emergency Co-ordinating Committee.
Gordon E. Smith	Owner-Manager	Lions Club—president.
Alex Gilmour	Commrecial Manager	Rotary Club—member.
Barbara Chase	Women's Editor	Business and Professional Women's Club—member.
CKOX, Woodstock, Ontario		
M. J. Werry	Manager	Rotary Club—member; Board of Trade—president; Arena Board—member; Hockey Club—president.
Geoffrey Lewis	Sales Manager	Y's Mens Club—member.
Al d'Eon	Salesman	Knights of Columbus; Kinsmen's Club.
Mrs. A. Munro	Women's Commentator	I.O.D.E.—secretary; Children's Theatre—director; past chairman; Women's Assoc.—member; Hospital Auxiliary—past vice-president.
Mrs. A. B. Brown	Bookkeeper	I.O.D.E.—treasurer; Business and Professional Women's Club — member; Little Theatre—member.
Barbara Horning	Copywriter	Chalmers Church Choir—member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKPC, Brantford, Ontario		
Mrs. F. M. Buchanan	Managing Director	Brantford Zonta Club—pres.; Brant County Unit—Canadian Cancer Society—president; Ont. Division Canadian Cancer Society—vice-president; Canadian Girl Guide Assoc.—life member; Brant County Historical Soc.—life member; Red Cross Society—board member; Victorian Order of Nurses—board member; Brantford Rec. Comm.—elected member; Brantford Twp. Recreation—elected member; Court Carnation I.O.O.F.—hon. member; Radio Chairman; Prov. Council of Women—member; Chairman of Public Relations for Zonta International; Hamilton Press Club—member; Hamilton Sales and Ad Club—member; Brant County Children's Aid Society—member; Red Cross Transport Corp.—driver; Cerebral Palsy Committee—member; Board of Trade—member.
Hugh Bremner	Manager	Brant County Historical Society—president; Canadian Cancer Society—chairman; Brant County Board of Trade—member; Air Force Club—member; Community Chest—member.
CKFI—Fort Frances, Ontario		
Victor Price	Announcer	
Andy Marquis	Announcer	
Chuck Renaud	Announcer	Fort Frances Branch Canadian Legion—executive member; Fort Frances Boy Scout Comm.—executive member and senior scout master; Jr. Chamber of Commerce—member; Sportsman Club—member; Radio Broadcasters Club—member; Fort Frances Disaster Comm.—exec. member; Credit Union Civil Defence—member.
Gordon McBride	Program Director	
Edward Ashton	Salesman	Junior Chamber of Commerce—member.
Joyce Taylor	Continuity Writer Women's Editor	Rebecca Lodge—officer; Order of Eastern Star—member; Fort Frances Community Credit Union—secretary; St. John's Ambulance Brigade—secretary; Young People's Union, Knox United Church—member; Rainycrest Auxiliary—member; Cooking Schools, Fashion Shows—commentator.
Richard Endseth	Engineer	
Robert Kennett	Office Manager	Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks—member; A.O.T.S. Knox United Church—officer.
Jack McLaren	General Manager	Junior Chamber of Commerce—member; Civil Defence—publicity director; Stamp Club— member and President; Border Concert Assoc.—president.
William McLennan	Managing Director	Jr. Chamber of Commerce—member; Sr. Chamber of Commerce (U.S.)—officer; International Order of Foresters—member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CFCH—North Bay, Ontario		
Keith Packer	Manager	North Bay Rorab Shrine Club—president; N.B. Chamber of Commerce—director; Associated Canadian Travellers—director; Community Concert Association—director.
Phil Clayton	Program Director	Publicity, Education Week Committee—chairman; Oratorical Contests—judge.
Bill King	Sales Manager	North Bay Lions Club—member.
Jack Barnaby	Chief Engineer	Gateway Amateur Radio Club—emergency co-ordinator for Civil Defence Communications; West Ferris Public School Board—member.
Fred Sherratt	Salesman	North Bay Kinsmen Club—member; N. B. Juvenile Hockey League—Convener; N. B. Sportsmen's Club—director; Northland Camera Club—member; N. B. Fastball League—member of executive.
Ted Fielder	Announcer	Sigma Chi Fraternity—member.
Allan Cupples	Salesman	North Bay Kiwanis Club—member; Trinity United Church—member of Finance Committee.
Mrs. Christine McFadden	Secretary	Fifty-fifty Married Couples Club, St. Andrew's United Church—member.
Mrs. Melba Rainville	Traffic Manager	St. John's Ambulance First Aid—member; Children of Mary's Society—member; N. B. Figure Skating Club—member; Aerial's Bowling Team—captain.
John Size	Announcer	Married Couples Club, Trinity United Church—member; Gateway Theatre Guild—director and actor.
Rita Virgilli	Continuity Editor	Pro Cathedral Choir—member; Calamen Club—member; Legion of Mary Auxiliary—member.
Erna Higgins	Operator	St. John's Ambulance—member; Calamen Club—member; Holy Name Church Ladies Auxiliary—member; Catholic Womens League—member; Legion of Mary Auxiliary—member; Children of Mary Auxiliary—member; St. Joseph's Hospital Ladies Auxiliary—member.
CKSF—Cornwall, Ontario		
F. H. Pemberton	Manager	Cornwall Rotary Club—member; Operator—Amateur Experimental Radio Station VE 3 COP.
Carl Fisher	Production Director	Foreman's Club—member.
Jack Reid	Chief Announcer	Cornwall Sea Cadet Corps—HMCS "Stormont"—ex. officer; Navy League of Can. Cornwall Branch—executive.
Mahlon Clark	Chief Engineer	Montreal Amateur Radio Club—member; Oddfellows Club—member.
Bob Eadie	Continuity Editor	Cornwall Art Club B.M.I. Affiliate—member; Musicians Union, Local 800—member.
Roly Forget	French Announcer	
George Lawrence	Salesman	CKSF Drama Workshop—member.
Bob Rowe	Salesman	Cornwall Boy Scouts Club—leader; Junior Baseball Club—member of executive body.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKSF. Cornwall, Ontario—*Conc.*		
John Hussey	Announcer	CKSF Drama Workshop—member; Kiwanis Air Cadet Corps—member civilian sports officer.
Hugh Moreland	Announcer	CKSF Drama Workshop—producer and director.
Lyal Nixon	Control Operator	The Oddfellows Club—member; Young Young People's, St. John's Church—member.
Miss Morin	Librarian	St. Columban's Social and Dramatic Club—member.
Miss Howald	Traffic Supervisor	The Luther League—member.
Miss Larocque	Secretary	CKSF Drama Workshop—typist.
CJBQ—Belleville, Ontario		
A. M. Haig	President and Managing Director.	Mayor of Belleville—Ontario Chamber of Commerce—director; Belleville C. of C.—past president; Belleville Rotary Club—past president and member; R.C.A.F. Association—member.
W. H. Stovin	Manager	Kiwanis Club—member; Belleville Sales and Ad.—past president; Publicity Director of V.O.N. Red Cross—board member; Civil Defence Committee—member HQ section; R.C.A.F. Association—member; Belleville Chamber of Commerce Public Relations Committee—chairman.
F. C. Murray	Asst. Manager	Belleville Rotary Club — member; Drive for C.N.I.B.—publicity chairman; Belleville Chamber of Commerce —member; Coronation Committee—member; Belleville Sales and Ad.—member.
J. Devine	Sports	Belleville Parks Board—commissioner; Belleville Optimist Club—past president; Central Ontario Baseball League —president; Ontario Athletic Committee—representative.
Lee Jourard	Announcer	Belleville Theatre Guild—member.
Maria Blatherwick	Copy Writer	Belleville Theatre Guild—member.
CKWS—Kingston, Ontario		
Bill Luxton	Program Director	Kingston Drama Group—publicity director; Ad. and Sales Club—member.
Bert Cullen	Announcer	Frontenac Hockey Association—publicity director; Kingston City Hockey League—executive; Air Force Association—member; Young Liberals Association—executive.
Ted Snider	Announcer	Y.M.C.A. and Trail Rangers—sports director and leader.
Jim Chorley	Announcer	Canadian Legion, Sports Benefit games —player.
Bill Straiton	Announcer	TB Survey Research—writer; University Settlement House, Toronto—welfare worker.
Marion Fleming	Traffic Head	MacDonald Public School H. and S. Association—class-mother; Sydenham Street Church—worker.
Ann Swarbrick	Continuity Writer	Domino Theatre Co. (Amateur) of Kingston—member; Canada Packers Operatic Society—member.
Carol Cain	Library Assistant	Domino Theatre Company of Kingston —member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKWS, Kingston, Ontario—*Conc.*		
Don Murphy	Operator	Church Hockey League—coach.
Gordon Ruttan	Operator	Domino Theatre Company of Kingston —member.
Wayne Harrison	Operator	Y.M.C.A.—recreation committee.
Jack Pollie	Promotion Manager	Kingston Rotary Club — program chairman and director; Rotary Festival of Music—publicity committee; Ad. and Sales Club—editor of bulletin; Kingston Board of Education—advisory-vocational committee.
Bert Cobb	Chief Engineer	Kingston Air Cadets—instructor.
Don Slater	Salesman	Ad. and Sales Club—member; Kinsmen Club—member.
El. Jones	Commercial Manager	Ad. and Sales Club—director; A.C.T. Club—member; Kinsmen Club—member; Cataraqui Golf Club—member.
Roy Hofstetter	Station Manager	Ad. and Sales Club—past president; Kiwanis Club—committee chairman; Chamber of Commerce—national affairs committee—Community Chest—publicity committee; Cataraqui Golf Club—house committee; Kingston Springtime Ex.—director.
CKNX—Wingham, Ontario		
John Brent	Talent Manager	Holy Name Society, Wingham; Sacred Heart Church—president.
Robert Clark	Continuity Writer	St. Paul's Anglican Church, Wingham —auditor and sidesman.
W. T. Cruickshank	General Manager	Wingham Chamber of Commerce—secretary; Radio Comm. Presbyterian Church of Canada—director; Central Canada Association of Broadcasters—secretary.
J. J. Cruickshank	Station Manager	Wingham Branch of the Canadian Legion—executive member; Wingham Golf Club—secretary.
Vincent Dittmer	Sales Promotion Manager.	Wingham Chamber of Commerce—director.
Mary L. Flack	Accounting Department	Young Ladies Sodality, Wingham Sacred Heart Church—president.
Mildred Jones	Continuity Department	Young Women's Mission Circle—president; Young People's Society—president; Youth for Christ Clinton area—executive member.
Scott Reid	Chief Engineer	Wingham Kinsmen Club—immediate past president.
CFRB—Toronto, Ontario		
Wishart Campbell, M.B.E.	Musical Director	Royal Canadian Air Force.
Jim Cooper	Transmitter Engineer	Civil Defence Committee, Clinton, Ontario.
Waldo Holden	Director of Sales	Ontario Society for Crippled Children; Community Chest.
Frank Lehman	Transmitter Operator	Air Force Reserve (Radar)—commissioned officer.
Ken Marsden	Director of Promotion	Community Chest; Health League of Canada; St. John Ambulance.
Lloyd Moore	Station Manager	Rotary Club of Toronto—past president; Special Events Committee, bringing Metropolitan Opera to Toronto for a full week—treasurer.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CFRB—Toronto, Ontario—*Conc.*		
M. W. McCutcheon, C.B.E., Q.C.	Director	Wartime appointments: Deputy Administrator of Services, Wartime Prices and Trade Board 1941. Administrator of Services 1943. Acting Administrator of Hides and Leather 1944. Chief of Prices Division 1944. Deputy Chairman of the Board 1945.
Wes. McKnight	Program Director and Chief Announcer	Ontario Society for Crippled Children; Ontario Golf Assoc.—vice-president.
W. E. Phillips, C.B.E., D.S.O., M.C., LL.D.	Director	Board of Governors, University of Toronto—chairman; Board of Trustees, Toronto Gen. Hospital; Ontario Cancer Institute; Research Council of Ontario —member.
Samuel Rogers, Q.C.	Secretary	Y.M.C.A.—director; Pickering College —chairman of board.
Harry Sedgwick	President and Managing Director	National Radio Committee—chairman; Canadian Red Cross Society; National Radio Committee, Canadian Cancer Society—chairman; Radio Committee Women's College Hospital —chairman; Canadian Wartime Information, New York City—director (voluntary), 1942-45.
Jack Sharpe	Superintendent of Maintenance	Progress Club of Toronto.
George Sleeth	Transmitter Oper.	Civil Defence Emergency Amateur Radio Network.
Harry Swaby	Transmitter Oper.	Past District Governor, Boy Scouts Assoc. Has deeded some of his farm land to Boy Scouts Assoc.
Bill Valentine	Salesman	Kinsmens Clubs of Toronto—past president; Assoc. of Kinsmens Clubs—deputy governor. 1953, National Convention Committee — chairman; recently nominated for National vice-chairman, Assoc. of Kinsmens Clubs of Canada.
CKGB—Timmins, Ontario		
H. C. Freeman	Manager	Red Cross Society—vice-president and campaign chairman; Canadian Cancer Society — board of directors; Lions Club—on program committee; Porcupine Combines—executive; Hockey Club—member.
E. Mott	Engineer	Porcupine Fish and Game Protective Association—publicity chairman.
D. Sutherland	Salesman	Lions Club—member; Canadian Cancer Society—publicity chairman.
G. Hall	Salesman	Kiwanis Club—member.
A. Valentich	Secretary	Porcupine Ski Club—secretary.
L. Palmer	Traffic Manager	Porcupine Ski Club—committee member; Girl Guides—leader.
T. Wittrup	Chief Announcer	Vita Linders Players—member.
W. Nadeau	Program Director	Vita Linders Players—publicity director; Y's Mens Club—member.
W. Rewegan	Commercial Manager	Rotary Club—member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CFCF—Montreal, P.Q.		
Reo Thompson	Program Manager	Prior to going into Service did special recruiting shows for all Services in Edmonton, Alberta. Organized and ran Jr. Service Bureau, under sponsorship of Edmonton Board of Trade, to promote sale of War Savings Stamps, Chamber won National award on this idea (1942-43). While in Air Force, conducted a Radio Broadcasting course for servicemen, under auspices of Canadian Legion Services and Radio Station CJCJ, Calgary. Worked with "Teen Town" organization in B.C. running special shows to publicize their activities, CKWX, Vancouver. In 1950-51 conducted a commercial radio course, under CKWX sponsorship, for Gordon House Community Assoc. in Vancouver. Was on the board of directors of this organization. Ran more extensive Radio Course for students of U. of B. C.—placing 13 graduates in the industry at conclusion of the free 20-week course. On moving to Montreal, arranged to conduct similar course for students at McGill University. Was instrumental in organizing "Tiny Tim" campaign idea, first for Christmas support of Crippled Children's Hospital in Vancouver and for past two years, for the benefit of Children's Memorial Hospital in Montreal. Helped to organize first Blood Donor marathons—the second of which set world record last January 10th and 11th, with over 2,000 pints of free blood collected in 36 hours. During past 12 to 15 years has worked closely with all major Charities—lining up and broadcasting Radio Fund Raising campaigns.
W. V. George	Broadcasting Manager	Canadian Red Cross—chairman of N.D.G. section.
W. M. Petty	Director of Public Service Broadcasts	Combined Hospital Appeal—committee member.
T. J. Quigley	Commercial Manager	Combined Hospital Appeal—committee member.
B. Bankier	Continuity Writer	Verdun Operatic Soc. which gave proceeds from concert to Lions Club. Canvassed for Red Feather.
Barry Ogden	Engineer	Vice-president of Verdun Amateur Radio Club—active in Civil Defence Work.
CJAD Montreal, P.Q.		
Miss Anna Watt	Record Librarian and Musical Arranger	Affiliated with "Ladies Morning Musical Club", Montreal; P.R.O. for "Musica Society".
Mrs. W. Wardrop	Switchboard Operator	Regular Red Cross blood donor.
Hamilton Grant	News Commentator	P.R.O. Van Horne Home and School Assoc., Montreal.
Miss Gay Dansereau	Secretary	Red Cross—one night each week in canteen.
F. Williams	Announcer	Lectures on broadcasting to students and women's organizations.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CJAD, Montreal, P.Q.—*Conc.*		
Grace Bartholomew	Women's Commentator	Canadian Women's Press Club—Ways and Means Committee; Fashion Shows, Talks to Women's Clubs—commentator.
A. Leonard	Announcer-newscaster	M.C. for Welfare Federation each year. Talks to Women's organizations.
J. Tapp	President of the Radio Time Sales	Red Feather Org.—radio committee; Children's Hospital—radio comm.; Dorval Citizen's League—publicity committee.
Lee Fortune	Musical Producer and Announcer	Gives musical lectures and talks on conducting radio programmes to women's organizations. Does book reviews; Y.N.H.A.—education committee; on Advisory Board of the National Ballet of Canada; Citizens Community Assoc.—publicity committee.
Murray Morrison	Vice-president of Radio Time Sales	Gives talks on radio to women's organizations; regular Red Cross blood donor; United Church of Montreal—publicity representative.
Al Cauley	Announcer and Newscaster	Collects for St. Mary's Hospital.
Norman Kihl	Disc Jockey	M.C. for innumerable charity shows—annually for the Red Feather and McGill University.
Betty Loggie	Secretary to McGibbon and McCurdy	Active member of Canadian Red Cross Corps since 1945 and regular blood donor.
Ed. McGibbon	Director of Station Relations	Member of Square Dance Council of Greater Mtl. Services loaned to some 30 Campaigns in course of each year.
J. Art Dupont	General Manager	Vice-president in charge of Special Names Committee of Federated Charities.
CHLP, Montreal, P.Q.		
Flavius M. Daniel	Manager	Canadian Red Cross—publicity man; La Ligue Anti-tuberculeuse—publicity man; Fusiliers Mont-Royal-Veterans—publicity man.
CKCV, Quebec, P.Q.		
Normand Maltais	Announcer and Scriptwriter	Jeune Commerce, Union des Artistes Lyriques et Dramatiques de Québec—member; Société Canadienne du Cancer—member.
Roger Lachance	Pianist and Singer	Union des Artistes Lyriques et Dramatiques de Québec; Association des Musiciens de Québec, Loc. 119 de A.F.M.—member.
Albert Duberger	Chief Engineer	Société Royale d'Astronomie du Canada—member; Association Provinciale des Radio-Amateurs; Radio Club de Québec.
Guy Samson	Announcer and Salesman	Vente-Publicité Club, Lorette Golf Club—member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKCV, Quebec, P.Q.—*Conc.*		
Christo Christy	Motion Picture Commentator	Club des 4C; Union des Artistes Lyriques et Dramatiques de Québec—president and member respectively.
Marthe Paradis	Secretary	Y.W.C.A. — member, New Comers Club.
Ben Nadeau	Salesman	Kinsmen — Vente — Publicité Club — member.
Paul Lepage	General Manager	Kiwanis Club, Réforme Club, Garrison Club, Lorette Golf Club, Vente-Publicité Club, Chamber of Commerce; Société Nationale St. Jean Baptiste, Ligue des citoyens de St. Sacrement.
Marie-Paul Vachon	Ass't. Manager	Altrusa Club—member.
St-Georges Coté	Announcer and Salesman	Kiwanis Club; Chamber of Commerce; Vente-Publicité Club; Lorette Golf Club—member; membre Protecteur des Scouts de St-Malo; Union des Artistes Lyriques et Dramatiques de Québec.
Roger Bruneau	News Editor	Société des Poètes Canadiens-français; Société Nationale St-Jean-Baptiste—publicist and member.
Marcel Lebœuf	Program Director	Société Nationale St-Jean-Baptiste—member; Union des Artistes Lyriques et Dramatiques—secretary.
Richard Desmeules	Office Clerk	Jeunesse Ouvrière Catholique—member.
CHRC—Quebec, P.Q.		
T. A. Gareau	Chief of Continuity Service	Knights of Columbus; Canadian Legion
Miss G. Lacroix	Continuity Writer	Red Cross; St. Vincent-de-Paul Society.
Miss A. Duberger	Clerk	Red Cross Society.
Henri Veilleux	Continuity Writer	Compagnon de la Rampe—artist.
CJSO—Sorel, P.Q.		
Maurice Boulianne	Manager	Red Cross Sorel Committee—chairman of publicity; chairman of publicity for most of the charitable and welfare campaigns in Sorel.
Henri Olivier	Treasurer	Club Richelieu, Sorel—director.
J. A. Villeneuve	President	Club Richelieu, Sorel—director.
CKVM—Ville Marie, Quebec		
Louis Bilodeau	Manager	Canadian Red Cross Society—vice-president; Chamber of Commerce—director; Knights of Columbus—member; Club sportif—director.
Georges Lefort	Assistant Manager	Chamber of Commerce—vice-president; U.C.C.—member; School Board—district pres. and local vice-president; Lacordaire—member.
Gaston Tasset	Engineer	Knights of Columbus—member.
Guy Burelle	Scripter-announc	Chamber of Commerce—member.
Gisele Loiselle	Traffic	Canadian Red Cross Society—treasurer.
CKLD—Thetford Mines, Quebec		
Elixabeth Bolduc	Discothecaire	Cercle Ste-Jeanne d'Arc Anti-Alcoolique.
Guy Vachon	Comptable	Chevalier de Colomb.
Emile Rousseau	Gerant du soir	Chevalier de Colomb.
Bertrand Potvin	Chef annonceur	Chevalier de Colomb.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKRS—Jonquière, Quebec		
Tom Burham	Manager	Jonquière Chamber of Commerce—director.
Jos. A. Dion	Salesman	Jonquière Chamber of Commerce—secretary; Chevalier de Colomb—member.
Robert H. Singfield	Salesman	Jonquière Band—Conductor-director.
Raymond Maynard	Sales director	Jonquière Chamber of Commerce—member.
Paul H. Bouchard	Program director	Jonquière Jr. Chamber of Commerce—member; Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member.
Lionel Tremblay	News writer	Jonquière Band—member; Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member.
Fernand Drolet	News writer	Ligue du Sacré-Coeur—member.
Jean Renauld	News writer	Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member.
Maurice Simard	Accountant	Ligue du Sacré-Coeur—member.
Jean Martin	Clerk	Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member; Chevalier de Colomb—member.
Mrs. Jean Renauld	Librarian	Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member.
Henry Forrest	Chief announcer	Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member; Ligue du Sacré-Coeur—member.
Guy Boivin	Announcer	Boy Scouts Assoc.—member; Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member.
France Fortin	Announcer	Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member.
Pierre Boivin	Announcer	Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member.
Gilles Dufour	Announcer	Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member; Canadian Concert Society—publicity director.
Rose-Alma Asselin	Women's commentator	Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member; Honorary Jonquière Jr. Chamber of Commerce—member.
Janine Tremblay	Secretary	Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member.
CKRS—Jonquière, Quebec *(Continued)*		
Guy Bouchard	Operator	Jeunesses Musicales Canadiennes—member; St. John's Ambulance Society—member; Choeur-Joie (chorale)—member.
CHGB—Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, Quebec		
Julien Giasson	Speaker	Union Catholique des Cultivateurs.
Leonard LaPlante	Speaker	Pres. of Board of Trade.
Henri Genereux	Speaker	Pres. Corporation des Agronomes.
Dr. Albert Alarie	Speaker	Pres. Société St-Jean Baptiste.
Gilbert Dube	Speaker	D. D. Knight of Columbus.
Abbé Armand Dube	Speaker	Société Historique.
Mme. Ls. Philippe Roy	Artist	
Mlle. Laurette Drapeau	Artist	
Roland Trudel	Artist	
Georges Pelletier	Artist	
Armand Duquette	Artist	
Mlle Monique Grenier	Artist	
Jean Grenier	Artist	
Hélnè Martel	Artist	
Jeannine Morad	Artist	
Thérèse Martel	Artist	
Reine Beaulieu	Artist	
Gilles Gourde	Artist	

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CKBW—Bridgewater, Nova Scotia		
John F. Hirtle	General Manager	Bridgewater Board of Trade—vice-president; South Shore Community Concert Assoc.—vice-president; Kinsmen Club of Bridgewater—exec. member; Victorian Order of Nurses—publicity chairman; Can. Legion Branch #24—member.
Lester L. Rogers	Sales Manager	Home and School Assoc.—president; Bridgewater Baptist Church — treasurer; South Shore Kennel Club—vice-president; Bridgewater Board of Trade —chairman industrial committee.
James A. MacLeod	Station Manager	La Have River Yacht Club—executive member; Kinsmen Club of Bridgewater—exec. member and publicity chairman; Bridgewater Board of Trade —publicity Chairman; Halifax Press Club—member.
Douglas Hirtle	Chief Engineer	Riverside Lodge I.O.O.F.—past grand; Lunenburg County Fish and Game Assoc.—exec. member.
Donald Nicolle	Announcer	Anglican Young Peoples Assoc.—publicity chairman and diocesan exec.; Cathedral Players Guild—member; Boy Scouts Assoc.—scout leader.
Michael MacNeil	Announcer	Cape Breton Students Congress—past pres.; League of the Sacred Heart—past pres.
Max Ramey	Program Director	Kinsmen Club of Bridgewater—Chairman entertainment committee; Bridgewater Film Council—executive member.
CJCH—Halifax, Nova Scotia		
Lorna O'Brien	Traffic Clerk	St. Peter's Church Club 46—committee member.
Syd. Pilkington	Continuity Manager	Canadian Red Cross Society—member; Knights of Columbus—fin.-sec.; member of St. Peter's Church Club 46, American Philatelic Society, Catholic Poetry Assoc., Canadian Cancer Society, St. Peter's Choral Society, St. Peter's Credit Union, Holy Name Society, Dartmouth Fish and Game Assoc., Dartmouth Housing Study Club.
Clair Chambers	Sales Manager	Canadian Red Cross Society; Commercial Club of Halifax; Halifax Ad and Sales Club.
James Straughan	Office Clerk	St. Phillips Men's Club.
Allen Campbell	Chief Operator	Canadian Legion—pub. committee member of: Knights of Columbus, Can. Red Cross Society, Holy Name Society, Sunnybrae Avenue Improvement Assoc.
Howard Gerard	Business Manager	Jr. Board of Trade, Dartmouth Curling Club.
Basil Russell	Program Supervisor	Maritime Repertory Theatre—actor.
Pat Connolly	Sports Director	Sydney Academy Army Cadets; Charitable Irish Society.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Con.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
CJCH—Halifax, Nova Scotia—*Conc.*		
Arnie Patterson	Sports Commentator	Holy Name Society; Charitable Irish Society; Dartmouth Curling Club; Mic Mac Rowing Club—past chairman; Eastern Harness Assoc.; Dartmouth Boys Club—secretary; Halifax Press Club; St. Mary's College Alumni; Halifax Police Boys Club.
Cy Lynch	Chief Librarian	Sodality of the Blessed Virgin Mary; St. Mary's College Alumni—public relations officer; Lieut. Reserve Army—public relations officer; Maritime Repertory Theatre—actor.
Bill Fulton	Exec. Assistant	Maritime Repertory Theatre—actor; Theatre Arts Guild—actor; Halifax Police Boys Club; Canadian Red Cross Society.
Lloyd Chester	Announcer	Jr. Board of Trade; Canadian Red Cross; Maritime Repertory Theatre—actor.
Graham Muttart	Librarian	Lieut. Reserve Army—adjutant—Canadian Red Cross.
Tom MacDonald	Operator	Reserve Army—signalman; Jr. Board of Trade; Canadian Red Cross—blood donor; Civil Defence Organization.
Finlay MacDonald	Station Manager	Community Chest—director; Halifax Symphonette; Theatre Arts Guild; Y.M.C.A.; N.S. Polio Foundation—director.
Shirley O'Regan	Receptionist	Northwest Arm Rowing Club; Sacred Heart Convent Alumni.
Lucy Stevenson	Bookkeeper	Halifax Ballet Guild; Y.W.C.A.; Canadian Red Cross; United Church Missionary Society—past president.
Lena Spruin	Bookkeeper	Theatre Arts Guild; Halifax Opera Assoc.; Canadian Red Cross; Can. Cancer Society.
Bert Steeves	Transmitter Op.	Community Chest; Can. Red Cross; Jubilee Boat Club.
Russ Bailey	Salesman	Masonic Lodge; Mayflower Curling Club; Canadian Red Cross.
Vern Glazebrook	Assistant Engineer	Dartmouth Fish and Game Assoc.; Canadian Red Cross.
Reg. MacWilliams	Chief Engineer	Canadian Red Cross—blood donor.
Vincent Currie	Operator	Halifax Jr. Board of Trade—2nd vice-pres.; Halifax Toastmaster's Club; Bluenose Chess Club—sec.-treas.; Canadian Red Cross.
Bill Pitcher	Operator	Army Cadet Signal Corps—lieutenant; Phalanx Fraternity—past secretary; I.E.B.W. Local 1318—secretary; Halifax Youth Band—Assistant Super.; Junior Board of Trade—committee chairman.
VOCM—St. John's, Newfoundland		
Barbara J. Brookes	Librarian	Theatre Guild—member; Students' Representative Council of Memorial College—member; Social Committee of Arts and Sciences Society—member; Women's Club of Memorial College—vice-president.
John F. Dodge	Announcer	Theatre Guild—member.

STATION PERSONNEL SOCIETY AFFILIATIONS—*Conc.*

Name of Person	Position in Station	Associated with:
VOCM, St. John's, Newfoundland—*Conc.*		
John W. Holmes	Announcer	Theatre Guild—member; St. John's Players—member.
James M. Murdoch	Program Director	Lions Club—member; St. Andrew's Society—member.
Fred M. Ruggles	Accountant	St. Andrew's Masonic Lodge—past master; Canadian Red Cross—member
Mengie Shulman	Sales Manager	Tasker Masonic Lodge—life member; Hebrew Congregation of Newfoundland—past president; Nfld. Board of Trade—member; St. Johns Ambulance Society—member; John Howard Society—member—Canadian Red Cross—member; Nfld. Flying Club—life member; Sergeants' Mess, N.F. Regiment—associate member.
David V. Warren	Operator	Theatre Guild—member.
Sylvia Wigh	Announcer and Women's Editor.	Theatre Guild—member.
Fred R. Woolridge	Announcer	Theatre Guild—member.
CFNB—Fredericton, N.B.		
D. Malcolm Neill	General Manager	Rotary—member; Canadian National Institute for the Blind—secretary; Victoria Public Hospital—director; Chamber of Commerce (presently organizing.) Fredericton Exhibition Ltd.—vice-president and director; Canadian Cancer Society—member; St. Johns Ambulance—member; N. B. Safety League—director; regular Red Cross blood donor; Agricultural Society No. 34—member.
Jack T. H. Fenety	Program Director	Salvation Army—member of executive; Canadian Cancer Society—member; St. Johns Ambulance—member; Agricultural Society No. 34—member.
H. L. McFee	Sales and Promotion Manager	Fredericton Civic Orchestra—secretary-treasurer; Canadian Legion—past 1st vice-president.
George Mountain	Continuity Editor	Boy Scouts Association—Group Leader.
CKMR—Newcastle, New Brunswick		
R. J. Wallace	Acting Manager	Masonic Lodge—master mason; R.C.A.F.A.—member.
P. A. Hansen	Operator-Announcer	R.C.A.F.A.—member.
B. L. Trevors	Transmitter Operator	Masonic Lodge—master mason.
F. L. Haining	Operator-Announcer	Canadian Legion—member; R.C.A.F.A.—member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Seventh Session—Twenty-first Parliament
1952-53

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. ROBINSON

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 10

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1953

Submission of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association

Statement by Radio Station CFRB, Toronto

WITNESSES:

Mr. W. H. Cranston, Chairman, Parliamentary Committee of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association; Mr. Harry Sedgwick, representing CFRB, Toronto; and Mr. Joseph Sedgwick, Q.C., Toronto.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1953

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, April 30, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presided, except for a period when the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Pierre Gauthier, was in the Chair.

Members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Carter, Dinsdale, Fleming, Gauthier *(Portneuf)*, Goode, Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk *(Digby-Yarmouth)*, Knight, MacLean *(Queens, P.E.I.)*, McCann, Riley and Robinson.

In attendance: From the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association: Mr. W. H. Cranston, Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee of the Association, and Mr. W. E. McCartney, Managing Director.

Mr. Cranston was called, presented the submission of the Canadian Newspapers Association and, assisted by Mr. McCartney, answered questions thereon.

The witness was thanked and retired.

At 5.50 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 8.30 o'clock this evening.

EVENING SITTING

The Committee resumed at 8.30 o'clock p.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presiding.

Members present: Messrs, Beaudry, Boisvert, Carter, Dinsdale, Fleming, Gauthier *(Portneuf)*, Gauthier *(Sudbury)*, Goode, Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk *(Digby-Yarmouth)*, Knight, MacLean *(Queens, P.E.I.)*, McCann, Riley and Robinson.

In attendance: Mr. Harry Sedgwick and Mr. Joseph Sedgwick, Q.C., representing Station CFRB, Toronto.

Mr. Harry Sedgwick presented a prepared statement in answer to certain inferences made in the Committee by Mr. Coldwell on April 19, 1953, and was questioned by the Committee.

Mr. Joseph Sedgwick addressed the Committee briefly, proposing certain changes in The Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936.

The witnesses were thanked and retired.

Agreed,—That an appropriate official from the Department of Transport and Mr. Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the C.B.C., should be present at the next meeting of this Committee.

At 10.05 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until 3.30 o'clock p.m., Tuesday, May 5.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

74518—1½

EVIDENCE

APRIL 30, 1953,
3.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum.

We have with us this afternoon Mr. W. H. Cranston, publisher of the Midland *Free Press Herald* who is chairman of the parliamentary committee of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association; also Mr. W. E. McCartney, managing director of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association.

I understand Mr. Cranston will be making the presentation to the committee and that he has a brief for distribution.

I may say that Mr. Cranston is the publisher of a very fine weekly newspaper in my own home town. I will allow him to explain his position with the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association which we agreed to hear this afternoon.

Mr. W. H. Cranston, Publisher, Midland *Free Press*, Chairman, Parliamentary Committee of Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have with me on my right the secretary manager of our association, Mr. McCartney. I represent the association here myself in the capacity of chairman of our parliamentary committee and have been asked to appear before you by our board of directors.

We come before you today, gentlemen, not as any organized pressure group. What we have to say to you, we say in questions, not demands.

Nor do we claim that the 530 members of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association all think alike on the issues which we will raise. Although this submission received the unanimous endorsation of our directorate, representing newspapers from coast to coast, there are undoubtedly those among us who would differ.

The Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association speaks to you today, moreover, for itself alone. What we say has not been the subject of any prior consultation or collaboration. Indeed we say it knowing full well that if you were to act on our suggestions, we, as newspaper publishers, might be somewhat worse off financially.

We speak as independent newspaper publishers, as we speak on our editorial pages—independently. Indeed so independently that we are not sure that even one member of the committee here today will endorse even in part what we have to submit.

Over the past months we have attempted to read with some care the statements of policy on radio and TV broadcasting put forward by some of you gentlement and by others who speak on behalf of the parties you represent. The statements which you have made have been thought-provoking but they have not perhaps elicited from the general public the attention which they have merited.

The issues which you debate are large—not only financially but politically, and we use that latter term in its broadest sense.

In no sense today do we wish to invade the field of party politics. Our membership is of all shades of opinion and none as to which party will, and which party should, be returned to power in the forthcoming election.

We do believe, however, on the eve of such an election, that the principles which you are here debating are worthy of a wide forum and that every citizen group, newspaper editors included, has not only a right but a responsibility to examine them and volunteer its viewpoint.

With that background, and fully cognizant of the fact that when editors take to the air they enter a foreign element—I recall there are three basic elements as the Greeks looked at them, fire, water and air, and I think it is a fair statement to say the newspaper editors as a whole are less well acquainted with air than they are with fire or water or perhaps even a conjunction of fire and water—

You have before you a copy of our printed brief which I will take the liberty to read:

The Minister of Finance, on behalf of the Government of Canada, has forecast for the twelve months ending March 31st, 1954, an expenditure of tax funds of just under four and a half billion dollars.

This is over $300 for every Canadian—man, woman, and child.

We realize that close to half this sum is for a wise investment in preparedness and that much of the balance will provide needful federal services.

But as our representatives at Ottawa seem this year to be interested in some tax reductions for individual electors, might it be opportune for us, as a nation, once more to review the policies which are leading us into a rapidly expanding expenditure on public entertainment?

When the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was sired by the Conservative party in 1932, the statement of policy which preceded the initial capital advances indicated that the public entry into this field of mass communication was being taken because:

(1) privately-owned and privately-operated radio stations and networks could not and would not provide an equitable nation-wide service for a land in which sparsely settled areas militated against profitable private operation; and

(2) public ownership and operation of a limited number of "key" stations, joined together in one or more national networks, would safeguard the public interest by protecting freedom of speech and ensuring impartial treatment of news reporting.

There was also some talk of the need to foster a Canadian radio system which would not be dominated by the larger commercial interests of the neighboring United States and which would promote national unity. Basically, however, radio was presented by the sponsors of the nationalization policy as a vital public utility whose control could not safely be left in the hands of individual citizens.

Fostered Utility Concept

This "public utility" concept of radio was judiciously fostered by the publishers of a number of Canada's newspapers and magazines. While they would have been the first to protest any government entry into the periodical field as a means of ensuring for all parts of Canada an equitable presentation of news and education and the promotion of national unity, these publishers not only failed to object to, but actively supported, the investment of millions of dollars of tax funds in government radio.

Just how general was this thinking we do not know, but at least some of the press support for nationalized radio came from men who saw in a publicly-owned radio system a much less strenuous competitor for the advertising dollar than would be found in the more sales-conscious and efficient private station operator. Indeed there were a number of newspapers and magazines

which openly advocated a policy of government ownership and operation of all Canadian radio, with a strict ban on all advertising. Their policies were close to their purse.

In more recent years, and especially since the publication of the findings of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, a new "justification" has appeared for our constantly growing public investment in, and control over, the air waves. And this new approach has played directly into the hands of the publishers who would protect their advertising revenues at the expense of the taxpaying citizenry.

Culture Comes In

The new watchword of radio's "publicans" is "culture"—spelled in capital letters. (You know what culture is—that thing which few of us understand, yet many aspire to. And the less our comprehension, the greater our aspiration). Actively spurred on by those directly and indirectly associated with our national radio system, and patted genteely on the back by editorials in the metropolitan press, they cry out that Canadianism is endangered by the crass commercialism of the United States and that only through a major investment of tax funds in public radio can we safeguard and develop our true, native culture.

These self-appointed leaders of Canadian culture have fastened on public radio as their chief arm largely, if not entirely, because it is a *public* system—not dependent for its existence on public acceptance of its products and, therefore, more amenable to the argument that it could and should become a bellweather in the field of mass entertainment for a higher standard of appreciation of the arts.

We admit freely that, in this latest development, the press of Canada, both weekly and daily, must accept full responsibility for its failure to assess objectively the pros and cons of the issues involved. We have been more concerned with protecting our pockets than with safeguarding the basic interests of our individual citizens—not only financial but political.

How Did We Get Here?

The Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association made no sumission to the Massey Commission on the question of public ownership of mass communication media, and the Canadian Daily Newspapers Association dealt very largely, in its submission, with the danger to the press from facsimile broadcasting.

This nation's periodical press, in company with the majority of its electors and elected, has been content for on to two decades to skate carefully around the basic issues involved in government ownership and subsidization of a mass medium whose prime function is the provision of public entertainment.

However, now that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, with the implied blessing of the government, and hiding almost entirely behind a cloak of Canadian culture, is proposing to invest millions more of our tax monies in public television, perhaps we should again explore thoroughly how we got into the position in which we now find ourselves.

The Points At Issue

Is there any valid basis of comparison between public utilities, such as an electric power system or a national railway, and a radio broadcasting system?

Granted that there must be governmental allocation of broadcasting channels because of their limited nature and the necessity of international agreement, what is the basic reason for government ownership and operation of radio stations?

Is the fact that, in matters political and economic, we attempt to "merge" British and United States thinking, a sufficient justification for our adoption of a public broadcasting policy which appears as a linchpin between British public monopoly and American private enterprise?

Could not private stations, given comparable power, now, individually or in groups, provide as equitable a nation-wide coverage as publicly-owned stations? And would they not be prepared to do so?

Why is the mass medium of radio basically any different from that of national magazines or newspapers? If we sanction public participation through government in the one, why not in the other?

Why do we believe that radio exercises a greater influence on Canadian cultural development than Canadian magazines or newspapers? The latter certainly carry a higher percentage of Canadian content of educational and cultural information than do even the government-owned radio stations, and that without benefit of public subsidy or direction.

We have a National Film Board making government-sponsored films, but do we believe it necessary publicly to own and operate a chain of motion picture theatres to be sure that everyone has a chance to see these films? Why not?

We invest hundreds of thousands of tax dollars in government publicity departments and for government advertising campaigns, yet do we believe it necessary to own publicly the newspapers and magazines in which those publicity releases and advertisements appear so as to be sure that every citizen will see them? Why not?

Private And Public Trust

We apparently trust entertainment, education, and government propaganda to certain types of mass media which are privately owned but are afraid to do so in the field of radio. Why? Are the owners of our private radio stations subversive? prejudiced? or otherwise untrustworthy? We are content to leave to private enterprise the building of motion picture theatres, and the publication of magazines and of daily and weekly newspapers which even the Massey Report admits are perhaps the major influence on Canadian thought and action. Yet we apparently believe that we cannot trust radio to private ownership!

Not only do we act as though we consider the owners of Canada's private radio stations far less trustworthy than the owners of her periodicals and her motion picture theatres, but we apparently feel that mere public ownership and operation is not enough. To ensure a proper cultural level of public radio operation, we must not only own but subsidize radio, both public and private, out of tax funds. And to the extent of many millions of dollars annually.

Indeed some of us have come to feel that the extent of our cultural investment is measured in direct proportion to the extent of the operating deficit of our public radio system.

Do we sincerely believe that culture, which is properly defined as intellectual development through mental tillage—that is, through active individual participation—is a communicable disease which Canadians can catch through exposure to a national radio network? We do not deny that culture in its true sense is developed in the participating artists by the organization of Canadian musical, literary, stage, and other artistic productions. But to what extent is it a public responsibility to provide for these productions through tax subsidies a national audience?

Costs Are Going Up

Our national radio system has been, until recently, largely self sustaining through advertising revenue and licence fees. The financial issue has not been large and the more fundamental considerations have, therefore, been given little thought.

However, with the advent of television, the cost of our national experiment in radio can no longer be reckoned in terms of a million or two dollars a year. This is no one-ring circus. It is a big multi-tented, three-ring production, with a whole string of sideshows, and the investment in both capital equipment and personnel is equally big.

At a cost of literally tens of millions of dollars public TV stations are to be erected in, and given a monopoly over, at least six of the major metropolitan centres of this nation.

And the money for this experiment in entertainment is to come, at least in part, from all the people in all parts of the nation. From people who can afford a $500 investment for a TV set, after paying their income tax, and from the citizens who cannot. From the people who live within a TV reception area and from those who do not.

There is much less talk now of a national public utility, of equalized reception facilities in all parts of the nation. Television at hundreds of dollars for each receiver, and a million or more dollars for each transmitter and studio, is not something which today, at least, is going to be available to all Canadian homes—perhaps not even to half of them for some years yet.

And few people argue that TV must remain in government hands because only through public ownership may we protect freedom of speech and balance of public expression.

Metropolitan Culture

It is frankly admitted that the metropolitan public monopoly in the TV field affects primarily and almost exclusively entertainment—circuses for the citizenry. And this policy is defended on the ground that, if we are to foster and protect Canadian culture. we must not permit the apparently weaker urban mind to be polluted by the crass commercialism which has pervaded TV productions in the United States. Yet in at least one of the two centres in Canada in which public TV is now operative, pollsters report that the majority of the sets are tuned to either of two U.S. stations—a fact borne out by the recent reduction in C.B.C.-TV advertising rates in an attempt to attract more commercial programs.

The Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association does not wish to deny that urban culture is weaker than its rural counterpart, and that it therefore needs greater support. But we do question why we should have to put up tax funds to strengthen it at a time when the smaller centres in which we live are apparently to be left largely to the uncultured ravages of private television.

The government's decision to invest tens of millions of tax dollars over the next five years in C.B.C.-owned and operated TV and radio has caused, and is still causing, some serious misgivings in the minds of senior C.B.C. officials, themselves! There are those on the C.B.C. staff today who believe the government would be wise to forget the whole thing and let private capital undertake the risks in this new field of TV entertainment. They see operational hurdles which can result in nothing but headaches, big headaches, and equally large deficits, for years ahead.

Entertainment vs. Defence

They cannot see, nor can many other Canadians, how this nation can justify a multi-million dollar investment in public entertainment when defence expenditures are conscripting nearly half our savings, not only this year but for all the forseeable future.

They do not believe, nor do we, that Canada's cultural advance must be halted by preparation for war. Neither, however, do we believe that our cultural advance is nearly as closely linked to the public operation of radio and TV as many would have us believe.

History has never recorded that the cultural life of any nation required for its progress a public monopoly of its direction.

Who buys the admission tickets for citizen circuses has little effect on the destiny of a nation, provided the buyer is not the government. Indeed when the government pays the bill for national circuses there may be a suspicion in the minds of some of the electors that their public authorities are a wee bit short of bread.

A plebiscite tomorrow asking which the electors of Canada would prefer—a $10 million cut in their federal taxes or the expenditure of a like sum to expand public radio and TV facilities—would have only one result.

But the financial and the cultural considerations are the superficial aspects of this issue. They will undoubtedly have some bearing on the final result but they should not be permitted to becloud the prime factor.

Here Is the Prime Factor

How would the elected and the electors of this nation receive a suggestion that the federal government should establish and operate two national magazines or newspapers, one in French, one in English, which would either be distributed free of charge to every citizen, or for which each citizen would be required to pay an additional income tax levy of, say one per cent?

We are reasonably confident that both the electors and the elected would laugh such a proposal out of court. They would say there is no place for that sort of thing in a free democracy; we can trust the dissemination of printed information to the private, competitive, unsubsidized press. Leaders of government have repeatedly re-iterated this belief and, in recent months, they have paid tribute to the impartiality and competence with which the press of this nation performs its reportorial, educational, and inspirational functions.

Indeed some of these same political leaders in recent weeks have not been equally complimentary in discussing the impartiality and competence of the radio system which they, themselves, control through parliament.

We believe much of this criticism of the C.B.C. as biased in its news reporting and selection of commentators is largely unfounded. Over the years this government has, in the main, exercised a commendable restraint in using its national radio system for partisan purposes. It has given to the electors of Canada a radio practise which, on this ground, is open to few complaints. In fact the C.B.C. has done almost as competent a job as could have been expected of private enterprise—although, of course, at a cost to the taxpayer of many millions of dollars which, if they had not been taken from his weekly wages, would in all probability have been invested by the individual citizen in something more nationally durable than entertainment.

Potentiality For Evil

But have we fully realized the potentiality for evil, as well as for good, which lies in the man-made, tax-financed colossus of communication which we are building in radio and TV?

If the government has in the past 15 years used the C.B.C. with restraint, and permitted it to operate in large measure with the independence which the public has come to associate with privately owned media, what assurance is there that this policy would continue if another party came to power?

Is there a member of today's government who can look at the leaders of political thought in the ten provincial capitals of this nation and then honestly say he would be prepared to have national radio and TV come under the control of any or all of them? It is not unnatural for the party in power to believe that what is best for itself is best for the nation.

Owned and operated by private enterprise, radio can and will sell its time—even to Liberals. Publicly owned radio and TV is another matter.

You may say that any prostitution of this public "utility" for partisan political purposes should be met with a great public outcry, that parliament itself can be trusted to protect the balance.

How difficult would it be to alter gradually the type of commentators engaged by the C.B.C. to change the personnel on panels, to revise slowly but surely the formula governing free time political broadcasts? Where would the protection against this be found—in public radio, or in the public legislature? If anywhere, the outcry would come from the privately owned and operated press.

Most Parties Agree

In recent weeks members of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association have interviewed several of the leading members of parties now in opposition at Ottawa. We were not altogether surprised to discover that they would not welcome a return to private enterprise in the field of radio and TV. They believe in the continuance of public radio. But are we sure that all parties would adopt the same operational policy?

The Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association believes that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation can perform a useful continuing service as a regulatory body and, as well, perhaps as an organization which would create for the various departments of government educational radio programs, much as does now the National Film Board in another sphere. Charged back directly to such Departments of government, the cost of creating such radio programs might well be held to be a legitimate part of their publicity function.

But in the face of the long terms tax need for defence, in the face of the current difficulties and costs bedevilling the public operation of TV, and, much more important, in face of the potential threat which public ownership of any mass medium poses to individual freedom of thought and action, we suggest that the government might well be wise to reconsider its present policies.

Ownership of radio and TV is not a prerequisite to control, if control there must be. In the current licensing system lie all the necessary safeguards. But private ownership and operation provides the balance which ensures that public regulation shall not be used for partisan purposes.

Chain ownership of radio or TV can be restricted, indeed might well be restricted in all forms of mass media.

But we are confident that an enlightened citizenry is a still more effective safeguard of our public interests, public morals, and "public" culture (if such there be), than the most enlightened form of government regulation.

We cannot go to heaven on a law, on an editorial campaign, or on a diet of publicly prepared culture, well salted with subsidies, and served fourteen hours daily over a national network.

The electors in the mass have, and can have, no higher standard of intelligence or culture than have the sum total of individual electors. And

those individual electors can, we believe, be best served over the years by media whose individual ownership makes them fully and at all time directly responsive to public will.

(The Vice-Chairman assumed the chair.)

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much Mr. Cranston.

The WITNESS: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Now questions gentlemen.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. That is an interesting brief and I must congratulate you on the manner in which it was presented. However, it is a pretty condemning piece of work, and I am wondering if this is a reflection of the feeling of the association of which you are a member. I ask you that because I know quite a few weekly newspaper owners, and I am surprised to find that they would be endorsing a brief such as this, as condemning as this in respect of the C.B.C. You say it was prepared by a parliamentary committee of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association?—A. It was endorsed unanimously by the board of directors of the association for presentation to this committee. I did say at the start of my remarks, however, that we are not claiming it is 100 per cent representative of the views of our membership because we have many shades and differences of opinion in our membership, and undoubtedly you may know some people who will not be in complete accord. I would like to make one suggestion, we are not condemning the C.B.C. in this brief. I think I made that clear. We are asking for a reconsideration of the overall policy with respect to mass communication. We said the C.B.C., we thought, had done a reasonably good job.

Q. I would take the inference from it that it is condemning the C.B.C. as such, and not the officials themselves, but the underlying principle behind the C.B.C. You say it was prepared by your parliamentary committee.—A. I think, Mr. Chairman, that I do not want to be drawn out on this point. I said this had the unanimous endorsation of the board of directors of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association as printed on the front.

Q. Has this brief been circulated among the membership of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association before being presented here? Have your membership had a chance to examine this brief before its presentation?—A. On the matter of all briefs presented to government, they are the product of the directors who are elected annually—32 directors representing every province across Canada, and this is the normal procedure in the matter of briefs.

Q. I take it your membership generally has not seen the brief?—A. Our membership generally has discussed it, but I will not say that every member has seen it.

Q. I just want to ask you a few questions, because this is a rather startling brief. How many members of your organization would have seen this? You are appearing here as a representative of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association?—A. That is correct.

Q. How many members would have seen this brief?—A. I cannot answer that question. It is printed on the front, that it has been approved by the board of directors on which basis we handle all briefs in our association. I said very clearly in my preamble that I did not claim it represented the thinking of all members. There will be some differences of opinion.

Q. Does it represent the thinking of your parliamentary committee?—A. It would not have been approved by them if it did not represent the thinking of the majority of the members of the parliamentary committee.

Q. Is your parliamentary committee made up on the basis of regional representation? How many members would there be on the parliamentary committee?—A. This is a rather odd line of questioning.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Riley just wants to know how many members of your association have seen or discussed this brief.

The WITNESS: It was approved by the entire directorate of the association and I am presenting it to you, and it was unanimously endorsed.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. Was it approved by your parliamentary committee?—A. By the entire directorate of the association as well as the parliamentary committee.

Q. How many directors are there?—A. Thirty-two.

Q. Are they representative of the whole of Canada?—A. The entire Dominion of Canada.

Q. Are they selected on a regional basis?—A. They are elected regionally.

Q. Have all members of your directorate reviewed this brief?—A. Yes, they all read it before it was approved.

Q. But the membership generally has not?—A. I would presume that a considerable number of the membership have, but I cannot answer that question directly. I do not know.

Q. Who prepared the brief?—A. I do not think that need necessarily be said. It was prepared on behalf of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association by members of the association without any assistance from any outside agency, and it was prepared by newspaper editors in the association.

Q. I do not want you to get me wrong, but I know a number of weekly newspaper men who have different views from that which are presented in this brief.—A. I would not doubt that.

Q. And for that reason I would like to know how representative of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association membership are the views expressed in this brief.—A. All I can do is to reiterate what I said before. There are 32 directors of the association, they met in Ottawa on February 24, read the brief, and approved it unanimously. I might add that the officers, directors and committee chairmen who make up the board of directors are annually elected by popular vote at our annual meeting. Their views are presumed to be approved before election to the board.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. Just as in any other group?—A. Yes. They speak for a membership of about 534, and we have a very large board of directors.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. I notice on page 9, the second paragraph it states: "There are those on the C.B.C. staff today who believe the government would be wise to forget the whole thing and let private capital undertake the risks in this new field of TV entertainment."

Above that you say: "The government's decision to invest tens of millions of tax dollars over the next five years in the C.B.C.-owned and operated TV and radio has caused and is still causing some serious misgivings in the minds of senior C.B.C. officials themselves."

And two paragraphs down you say: "They do not believe..." and I presume you are still referring to the C.B.C. senior officials among others... "they do not believe, nor do we that Canada's cultural advance must be halted by preparation for war."

You say this feeling prevails among senior officials of the C.B.C.?—A. I said some.

Mr. HANSELL: A point of order. Are we going to skip here there and all over in our questioning, or are we going to follow some logical reasoning process in our questions. I have waited for Mr. Riley to get through his questioning concerning how many members of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association have been informed of this brief. Now we go on to another completely different subject. I would like to ask one or two questions in respect of the previous subject, so that we may have a continuity of questions and answers, and reasoned thought.

Mr. RILEY: It is quite agreeable to me.

Mr. KNIGHT: I think I had a claim for one question.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: So has Mr. Fleming.

Mr. KNIGHT: On a point of order. I think Mr. Hansell is right. I think we are now discussing the origin of this brief and the responsibility for it.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Let us get the origin of the brief, and after that go on to another point.

Mr. KNIGHT: I have a question on the same line.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Would we be right in supposing that this brief is largely the work of one man. I am not suggesting who he is. I do not know, and I have not the faintest idea, but is or is not that true.—A. The final writing of any brief is largely the result of one man's effort, but the actual brief, I do not think I am disclosing any confidences, was the result of the work of about 5 people.

Q. Would you agree that the principles outlined here would be very hard to find among five men.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: It was read after tht by the 32 directors, and approved by them.

The WITNESS: That is right.

Mr. GOODE: This is the work then of 32 men, not of 5.

The WITNESS: That is right.

Mr. KNIGHT: I suggest it is the work largely of one man who seems to have a persuasive influence over the thoughts of his fellow directors.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Knight, the witness said five men, and it was approved by 32 directors.

Mr. FLEMING: That is a pretty serious reflection on the mentality of the other 31 if one man can so dominate the thoughts of all.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: But Mr. Fleming—

Mr. FLEMING: But that is a very serious reflection, Mr. Chairman on the other 31.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: The witness has stated that it was the work of five men, it was evolved by them, and discussed and approved by the 32 directors.

The WITNESS: It was read in full detail by them.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Did they follow Mr. Hansell's method of taking it subject by subject, or simply reading it over and saying "it is all right with us."—A. I would like to suggest that we are getting away from the point. We are trying to put forward the views and ideas of the association, not discuss the mechanics of how this brief was composed.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: You will understand Mr. Cranston that the members of the committee are interested in knowing where the opinions in this brief came from.

The WITNESS: They came from the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association, and it has been approved by the board of directors.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: According to the questions put by Mr. Riley and your answers, all your membership has not come into cognizance with this.

The WITNESS: I do not know what percentage has.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, Mr. Hansell.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Could you give us a reasonable assurance that that which is presented in your brief represents the views of the individual weekly newspapers throughout the country.—A. Mr. Chairman, I quite frankly do not know how to answer that question, beyond the fact that this is not an unusual procedure when any body is presenting views to the government. There was complete unanimity of agreement among the board of directors, and these 32 people represent all the provinces of Canada. Since they have endorsed the brief, I would presume that it would be reasonably representative of the thinking of the people concerned. I cannot say that it is, but I would presume it would be.

Q. I think you are right. Now, I have this other question, which, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, is an observation. I am surprised that the same line of questioning was not put before the Canadian Congress of Labour the other night. I am quite sure the Canadian Congress of Labour—I am not saying it did not represent the thought of the labour unions throughout Canada—did not represent the thinking of the labour unions any more than this brief represents the thinking of the individual weekly newspapers.

Mr. GOODE: On a point of order. Although I agree with Mr. Hansell's line of reasoning, and I think I am going to agree with him all the way through, I asked a question of the C.C.L. the other night, and you will remember the exchange between us here, and they were very put out when I asked that question, and the witness was not too sure in what he answered. I said to him: "Does this represent the views of your association?" And he was not very confident in his reply. Still speaking to the point of order, Mr. Hansell's point is well taken. This committee did not ask the same question of anyone else. or some of the personalities in this committee did not ask the same question.

Mr. HANSELL: The reason I make that observation is this Mr. Chairman, that there is liable to be a bit of reflection on members of the committee, and I will recall to your mind that some years ago the Canadian Federation of Agriculture presented a brief here before the radio committee and I made a statement that might not perhaps, on second thought, have been so extreme, when I suggested that I doubted whether individual farm groups necessarily knew very much about radio policy, and therefore were not acquainted with their brief, and I was in rather serious trouble with one of my farm groups in saying that. The same thing might go for the labour organizations.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Go ahead with your question Mr. Hansell.

Mr. HANSELL: I think for my part I will take this brief as being fairly representative of the weekly newspapers throughout Canada.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Just for purposes of the record, may I say that Mr. Riley said he was not here on the night when the C.C.L. brief was presented.

Mr. FLEMING: I would like to ask a few questions concerning the reference to finances in this brief at the bottom of page 7 in the last paragraph where you say:

> "Our national radio system has been, until recently, largely self-sustaining through advertising revenue and license fees."

When you make that statement do you give to the C.B.C. credit for the $2.50 license fee charged upon radio receiving sets, as though it was part of a self-supporting operation of the C.B.C.?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I think your question is pretty suggestive, is it not?

Mr. FLEMING: Not particularly, not as much as some we have heard around here.

The WITNESS: If I might make a reply, I think that is a rather general statement in that final paragraph on page 7, and if I were to restate it I would say that until the advent of television and the somewhat different mehod of financing it, the government had admitted that financial considerations were not as large. Today $1 million does not seem so very much, except when it comes out of the pocket book of the weekly newspapers.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. This brief was written I believe after the budget was introduced or about the same time, and you are aware of course of the new position which is that the license fee of $2.50 has been abolished, and that an excise tax estimated to aggregate $12 million this year is proposed to be made available to the C.B.C.; and that in addition this year parliament is to be asked to vote an additional loan. I am only speaking from memory, but I think the figure is $5 million. Do any of these subsequent developments qualify your opinion or thinking on this subject, and if so, how?—A. Mr. Chairman, I do not think so basically. I admit very definitely, as the last gentleman pointed out, that the alteration in the method of financing has made some change. But referring to the testimony which you have heard in the last couple of weeks, it has been pointed out that the cost of television in the opinion of the television officials will grow increasingly large as the size of the operation expands. I think that even Mr. Dunton and some others have suggested that very considerable assistance is going to continue to be necessary.

Q. You are aware now that the figure which is expected to be made available to the C.B.C. this fiscal year which commenced on April 1st for radio and television is, I think, $26\frac{1}{4}$ million.

Mr. GOODE: I do not like to speak on a point of order again, but I thought we were discussing one subject. You checked up Mr. Riley because of his going from one subject, the responsibility of this pamphlet, and I think we should establish that responsibility. I suggest that members of this committee have been continuing with some other items. You took that stand with respect to Mr. Riley and I suggest you take it too with Mr. Fleming. I have some questions to put with respect to this pamphlet before we go on to something else.

Mr. FLEMING: I thought I made it clear that my questions were on the subject of finance.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Have you any other questions to ask?

Mr. GOODE: Yes, I have.

Mr. FLEMING: I shall be through in three or four minutes now.

Mr. GOODE: Very well. Perhaps Mr. Fleming should be allowed to finish.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I do not think you have answered my last question. I mentioned the fact that we now find that there is $26\frac{1}{4}$ million to be made available to the C.B.C. this year. Have you any comment to make on that, in the light of the assertion in your brief, particularly on page 7?—A. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the somewhat altered method of financing has altered the basic considerations which we wish to put forward to you today.

Q. Or the amount, which is a very considerably increased amount?—A. It merely confirms the fact that the government operation of television and radio is becoming an increasing expensive operation.

Q. When you speak about finances in relation to popularity and culture you say, at the bottom of page 9:

> A plebiscite tomorrow asking which the electors of Canada would prefer—a $10 million cut in their federal taxes or the expenditure of a like sum to expand public radio and TV facilities—would have only one result.

We are very slow around parliament here to grasp the hidden meaning of these things, so would you please be more explicit and say what you think the result will be?—A. I think the answer would be "no".

Q. Which would they choose?—A. I think they would choose the tax cut.

Q. On page 8 you say:

> Yet in at least one of the two centres in Canada in which public TV is now operative, pollsters report that the majority of the sets are tuned to either of two U.S. stations . . .

Which of the two are you referring to, Toronto or Montreal?—A. Toronto, I think.

Q. And what polls?—A. The Elliott-Haynes ones. I believe that fact was confirmed by some of the C.B.C. people who appeared before your committee.

Q. They were a little reluctant to commit themselves on information derived from polls. They did admit an acquaintance with the services of Elliott-Haynes but hesitated to commit themselves to any one of them.—A. A number of radio stations over the past few years have used these polls as a basis for advertising promotional material and I would consider that they are not entirely unreliable.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Goode.

Mr. GOODE: I want to get back to this matter of responsibility. Your name is Mr. Cranston?

Mr. CRANSTON: Yes.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Cranston, how many directors have you from British Columbia?

Mr. MCCARTNEY: Five.

Mr. GOODE: Are they present?

Mr. MCCARTNEY: No.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I would like to know if the directors from British Columbia were able to distribute this brief to the owners of weekly newspapers who belong to this association in that province?—A. Would you mind repeating your question?

Q. I want to know this: Whether the governors or directors from British Columbia were given the opportunity of issuing this brief to their members in that province? And if so, what were the members reactions? If you cannot give me that information now, I would like to have it later.—A. I do not think that that request was ever received, but all the members of the Weekly Newspapers Association are receiving this brief which is in their hands or will be in the next couple of days if it is not there now. There is no attempt to withhold it from the membership, and the directors all got it well in advance of our coming before you today, months in advance.

Have you any information on the attitude of the directors from British Columbia? Were they included in the 32 you mentioned as being in support of it?—A. That is right.

Q. That is all I wanted to know.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. Along the same line of questioning as Mr. Goode, the directors of the Weekly Newspaper Association endorsed this back in January?—A. No, on February 24 at our annual directors meeting.

Q. Is it not rather unusual that a brief such as this is going to be presented before a parliamentary committee such as we are and that some effort would not be made in the interim, with all the time which has passed, to acquaint the members of the feeling of the directors or the views of the directors in respect to it?—A. I am only one member of thirty-two directors in this association. I speak only on behalf of the thirty-two today, not generally. I am not a senior officer of the association and I do not wish to presume to comment on the general policies of the association. It was the decision of the directors that day that this brief should be submitted to this committee. Until such time, it was not to be made public other than in discussion with members of the association.

Q. Then the directorate of the association, I take it, had not authorized distribution of the brief to its membership until now?—A. Yes, it was to be released approximately simultaneously, but there was no resolution of any type to prevent any of the directors discussing it with any members of the association they wished to discuss it with and get their opinion of it. We are a very democratic association, and of all shades of opinion, and, as I pointed out, there was no attempt to come before you today as a pressure group. We are intending to set before you questions that come up in our minds. We are independent and many of us quite small publishers.

Mr. BOISVERT: How many weekly newspapers are members of your association?

Mr. W. E. MCCARTNEY (Managing Director, Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association): Five hundred and thirty-four.

Mr. BOISVERT: How many are from the province of Quebec?

Mr. MCCARTNEY: About thirty.

Mr. BOISVERT: How many directors represent the province of Quebec?

Mr. MCCARTNEY: Three.

Mr. BOISVERT: Are they from Montreal?

Mr. MCCARTNEY: One from Montreal, one from Valleyfield and one from Rimouski.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: What is that newspaper in Valleyfield?

Mr. MCCARTNEY: *Le Progrès.*

Mr. KNIGHT: Coming from Saskatchewan, I would like to know how many of your directors represent the Saskatchewan newspapers.

Mr. MCCARTNEY: Our principal officer, the president, and four directors.

The WITNESS: We will know a little more about our association when we get through here.

Mr. KNIGHT: We find that we have to know a lot about a lot of things.

The WITNESS: We did not expect to talk about that; we thought we were discussing radio.

Mr. GOODE: I take a little exception to that, Mr. Chairman. Some of us are partially friendly to your brief, but we reserve the right to ask all the questions a member of parliament thinks he should ask for the benefit of his constituents. Mr. Chairman, I will say this, that I ask questions that I consider are very fair. I am taking no sides on this. This committee will make up its mind when it has heard all the representations from everybody.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry—

Mr. GOODE: Just minute, let me finish. I did not like what you said. It is when we have heard all sides that we will make up our mind, and when I have heard all sides I will make up my mind.

The WITNESS: I had no intention to give offence. I was, quite frankly, not prepared for the analysis of the distribution of our directorate, and I am very happy that Mr. McCartney is here to be able to answer those questions, and I must say that I did not mean to give any offence in that respect.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. Along the line that Mr. Goode started there. As Mr. Cranston well knows, he has posed a very serious series of questions to the committee and it is quite in order for the committee to ask him just how much strength there is, among the electorate, behind what he has been advocating here today because some mention of this will have to be made in our report, some recommendation will have to be considered, and the questions that have been asked from the beginning have been designed, as Mr. Goode points out, to give us information to which we are entitled in order to consider the question.—A. Mr. Chairman, we will do our best to answer those questions, but you will forgive some hesitancy in our answers because we are not prepared for this sort of questions, although we understand the reasons why you are asking them.

Q. I would like to know, since the question has been raised by the members of the committee, how many members of the directorate are there from the Atlantic provinces, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland.

Mr. MCCARTNEY: There are none from Prince Edward Island or Newfoundland. From Nova Scotia there are three, and I am not positive but I think there are three from New Brunswick as well.

The WITNESS: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that these people are elected regionally.

Mr. FULTON: In proportion to the number of weekly newspapers in that region?

Mr. MCCARTNEY: The number of members in that region.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. What proportion of the weekly newspapers in Canada are members of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association?—A. I believe, Mr. Chairman, about eighty-five per cent. The French weeklies have a separate organization, although a considerable number of them are also members of the Canadian organization and it is very difficult to define exactly the percentage of membership because, in the main, the weekly newspaper association is representative of the town, village and rural areas, and not the metropolitan weeklies. There are some exceptions to that, but when you take the over-all total, something a little over seven hundred, that includes a considerable number of what we call controlled or free distribution papers in the metropolitan centres. We are primarily the non-metropolitan weeklies in Canada.

Q. Perhaps it would be a much higher percentage then if you did not take into account the French weekly newspapers and the metropolitan weekly newspapers?—A. Yes.

Mr. KNIGHT: I would like to ask the witness a few questions on some of the assertions in this brief.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are we through with the origin of the brief now?

By Mr. Kirk:

Q. As Mr. Cranston says, these men are elected to the directorate regionally, and I gather from that that all the members of your association from the four Atlantic provinces will elect three directors.—A. I am going to be subject to correction by our managing director, but the names of the various directors and the committee chairmen are brought in by a nominating committee and their selection is based on regional considerations particularly, and that nominating committee report is presented to the annual meeting of the association and that meeting rejects, revises or adopts the report of the nominating committee, so that the nominating committee report takes into consideration the regional representation, but the election is by the entire membership.

Q. And in addition to the annual or more than annual meetings of your directorate, you have an annual meeting of your whole association?—A. That is right. They are democratically elected by the whole membership of the entire association.

Q. Was the preparation of such a brief as this discussed at the last annual meeting—the brief on this subject?—A. The discussions of an exact brief on the subject—I cannot tell you because we are split into various groups at the annual meeting for forum discussion, but the general discussion of radio and TV policy has been on our agenda almost every year. We do have a special committee on this subject.

Q. I would like to get the picture clear. Am I right in assuming, then, that over a period of years you have had discussions on this general problem at your annual meetings, and that you did so at the last annual meeting, and following that, that there was a specific direction from your directorate to a particular committee to get to work?—A. Again, Mr. Chairman, I am going to be subject to correction by our managing director. The executive body of this organization is its directorate and action is initiated by the directorate and approved or not approved by the annual meeting if such is felt to be necessary, but the initiative comes from the directorate, and I think always has.

Q. This approval or disapproval from the annual meeting would have come at your last annual meeting?—A. Any briefs that we have presented to the government have been briefs formulated and presented by the directors, and that has been our traditional policy for many years.

Q. What I was trying to get at is this: I am just trying to find out if the general membership at its last annual meeting was cognizant of the fact that a brief on this subject was going to be prepared or whether they will become cognizant of it after they received in the mail these pages so they will have an opportunity to discuss them at its next annual meeting?—A. A considerable number of our membership now know of it. I cannot tell you exactly what percentage, but it might be well the subject of discusison at our next annual meeting.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Carter, were you going to question on the same line?

By Mr. Carter:

Q. Mr. Cranston emphasized the democratic processes by which these directors are elected and he used that as an argument that they were therefore representing the views of the people that they were elected by. Are these people elected on any sort of a platform at all?—A. No, Mr. Chairman. We have no politics in the party sense in the C.W.N.A.

Q. How would it follow then that because they represent people geographically that they also represent their views and their thinking?

Mr. McCARTNEY: Perhaps I could help answer that question. The nominating committee is always representative of all parts of the country and is usually headed by the past president and the members will be from British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and right across. Those members of the nominating committee approach the general membership throughout their period prior to the annual meetings and the members in attendance at the annual meetings and they discuss the nominees they are going to recommend from their own particular part of the country; so I think as far as possible the gentlemen who are elected to the Board have the approval of their particular area of the country and they have some knowledge of the thinking of those who have approved of their selection to the office of director. Does that answer your question?

Mr. CARTER: Partly. It does not convince me that the people that they represent actually approve of the views they have put forward here in their name.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement you have made, Mr. Carter?

Mr. CARTER: I was just amplifying my question.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: And you want an answer?

By Mr. Carter:

Q. If he can give an answer.—A. I said in my preamble, and I will say it again, that I do not believe that it represents 100 per cent of the thinking of our membership, and I merely said that it had been unanimously approved by our 32 directors whom we felt were representative of the association. We are not claiming in presenting this brief that this has 100 per cent of the backing of the members.

Mr. FULTON: Your directors are also responsible to the general membership of the association, are they not?

The WITNESS: Yes.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: Are you through, Mr. Carter?

By Mr. Carter:

Q. You have 32 directors representing some 500 publishers and it is to me very vague whether these 32 represent 85 per cent or 75 per cent or even 25 per cent.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: I think the witness said he could not say.

Mr. CARTER: You do not know what representative opinion of the body of the whole is being brought forward.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. This is along the same line Mr. Cranston. Is it proper for us to assume that because of the close relationship between radio and newspaper and periodical publications in respect to a media of information, because of the close relationship of the subject, that at your conventions you would spend some little time discussing radio?—A. We consider, Mr. Chairman, that radio is one of the media in the mass communication field and we have various standing committees of our association dealing with some of our competitive media or some cooperative media, as the case may be.

Q. Then it would be correct to assume that the board of directors would know fairly well the tenor of opinion held by the entire weekly newspaper organization?—A. I am going to answer that question a little obliquely. In my —perhaps you think I have answered a lot of questions obliquely. In my

newspaper I write editorials and I "kid" myself into thinking from time to time I am expressing the public viewpoint as long as people keep buying my newspaper. I may be very wrong but I assume that, when I write my editorials; and I would assume, equally that the directors in approving such a brief as this for presentation to this committee would believe that they were taking a stand that was representative of the majority of the members of the association, or else certainly they would not have approved of it. I cannot prove that to you one way or the other.

Q. Is there to your knowledge any member of your association who is diametrically opposed to this brief?

Mr. McCARTNEY: I would say no, sir.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Mr. Cranston, you expressed surprise that you should be quizzed in this manner on this brief as to what extent these views are held. Did it not occur to you that this brief was so startling in some of its ideas that some of us could not conceive that this would be the general belief of the Canadian Weekly newspapers?—A. Mr. Chairman, I apologized to one gentleman before. I am not surprised at the questioning on this point, but merely at the detailed aspect of the questions for which I was not prepared. I did tell you, I think, that the brief was approved by 32 of the directors of the association at the annual directors meeting and I cannot honestly enlarge on that point.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. One more question on this. I think, Mr. Cranston, you struck the nail squarely on the head a few moments ago when you stated that in your editorials you were reflecting public opinion. I think that that is what presents some measure of alarm to us because—

Mr. FULTON: I think you should say "some of us", Mr. Riley.

Mr. RILEY: To some of us, yes. Particularly since as you say newspapers reflect public opinion and if this brief is a reflection of public opinion through the weekly newspapers then there is something seriously wrong with the whole broadcasting system here in this country.

The WITNESS: I assume that was a question, sir?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Was it a question, Mr. Riley?

By Mr. Riley:

Q. Would you consider it to be fair for us to assume that this brief is a reflection of the public opinion across the country as expressed by the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association?—A. I did not use the word, and I hesitate to ask the reporter to read back, but I do not think I said I felt I was reflecting public opinion in my editorials. I think I said I kidded myself I was reflecting public opinion, and all I can suggest to you now is that this is, apparently, representative of the thinking of the weekly newspaper editors who are represented on the directorate at the annual meeting of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association. I do not want to suggest to you that any fixed percentage of the population of Canada think this way. I do not know.

Mr. HANSELL: When you referred to writing your editorial, that was in answer to a question I asked, and merely elucidates.

Mr. KNIGHT: Along these lines I was going to suggest to Mr. Cranston, that when he says that when he writes editorials he sometimes kids himself about representing public opinion, I am going to ask him if it is not possible he is kidding himself here today.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: To be fair to the witness, he said before he was not trying to give the impression to the committee that it was the thought of the general public his newspapers were serving.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not think Mr. Knight's point is well taken. Mr. Knight is assuming that Mr. Cranston wrote the brief.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: No he is not.

Mr. HANSELL: Yes he is.

Mr. GOODE: I do not think Mr. Cranston is in any different position from any other member of the committee. Sometimes we kid ourselves that we are reflecting the views of our people.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Have you any questions, Mr. Dinsdale?

Mr. DINSDALE: They are on the brief generally.

Mr. GOODE: I have one question. Does this board of directors control the financial policy of your organization as far as dues, et cetera are concerned?

Mr. MCCARTNEY: Yes.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Do you think we can finish with these gentlemen this afternoon, or are you going to sit tonight?

Mr. FULTON: I think we want to hear Mr. Sedgwick tonight.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Very well gentlemen.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. This question of culture is in this brief. I would like to say a word on that. I am terribly disappointed in the views of the brief upon culture. It simply assumes—and may I say that it is sarcastic about such a thing as national culture, or a national Canadian culture, and as a matter of fact, in one place it hints that such does not exist. Is not that correct?—A. Is that a question, Mr. Chairman?

Q. Is it not true that this brief negatives or attacks the idea that there is a distinctive Canadian culture which should be preserved?—A. No Mr. Chairman, the brief does not say that, and did not imply that. If I seemed to imply that, I did not mean it to appear so. I did say however—and I will refer back to the brief—that a definition of the word "culture"—and I think it is correct —is "as intellectual development through mental tillage—that is through active individual participation"—and if I may make a further point in that section, I presume some of you may have read that column in the Vancouver paper not so long ago in which Mr. Eric Nicol, who is certainly quite a cultured member of our Canadian literary group—

Mr. GOODE: You are expressing your own personal opinion.

The WITNESS: Yes, very definitely. I think he writes very well—pointed out that a good deal of this problem is not one of culture at all, but of the fact that there is a certain interest in this issue by people who are involved in the production of C.B.C. programs, and he went as far as to suggest that people who are interested in the protection of Canadian culture should appear before the tariff board, headed by Mr. Hector McKinnon, in order to ask for protection for the Canadian television industry, and that:

> Parliament should pass a law imposing an import duty on all American programs bought by Canadian television stations, private or C.B.C. As far as I know, nobody has proposed this method of dealing with competitive American television. This despite the fact that the protective tariff is a basic and established element of our economy.

> Why has nobody looked at our television industry from this point of view? The answer obviously is that the people who make up this Canadian industry—singers, writers, actors, musicians, directors, technicians—have never impressed themselves upon the public as workers. All the gabble about culture has fogged the fact that that a number of Canadians are just trying to make a living.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. I put this question to you as a newspaper editor. I will not be prejudiced no matter what your answer is. Opinions differ. Do you consider you have a responsibility, shall we say, to maintain or to raise the level of Canadian morality or culture, or do you consider you are simply running a business organization which must give the public what the public wants. Now, I know that is a difficult question, but I would like your opinion on that. I have asked that question of other newspaper editors.—A. I would like the privilege of answering that. I think it is a fair statement to make that the average Canadian weekly newspaper does more, without benefit of public assistance in any way, to raise the cultural level of the communities which it serves than any other agency, radio not excluded. In the matter of history, just to give you an example, more historical articles and more historical research is carried on by weekly newspaper editors than any other comparable body in the Dominion of Canada, a fact which I just discussed recently with the Prime Minister, and I think it is a fair statement to say he agreed.

Mr. KNIGHT: I notice a startling note on page 12.

Mr. RILEY: Could we not stick to that point?

Mr. KNIGHT: This is a similar question. It is in relation to my assertion in regard to culture that generally a good deal of sarcasm is directed to the matter of culture in this particular brief, and to some other things, which, by way, I hold rather dear. On page 12, it states: "The electors in the mass have and can have no higher standard of enjoyment or culture than have the sum total of individual electors."

It would not be fair to ask you if that could be applied to Canadian editors, but do you not think we should have in the direction of weekly newspapers or in the direction of radio, men of superior intelligence and culture if we are going to do some of the things that I think should be done?

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that it was acknowledged in both public and private radio and in the private publishing field that the editors and writers are somewhat above average intelligence and somewhat above the average in cultural appreciation. The point made at the bottom of page 12 was merely that there was no disembodied cultural element in Canada as distinct from the culture which is inherent in the individual electors of the nation, and that it is not something which floats about in the air to which the C.B.C. or the newspapers or any other agencies for mass communication have particular claim.

Mr. GOODE: You cannot buy it in cans.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. I have one last question. I notice your reference to "a wee bit short of bread" at the foot of page 9. I suggest to you that the emphasis is on bread throughout this whole brief. Your main objection to the present system of radio is the cost to the taxpayers as such.—A. The answer to that is also contained in the brief when we say at the top of the following page 10:

> But the financial and the cultural considerations are the superficial aspects of this issue.

We do believe that the basic consideration is public ownership and control of the mass communication medium.

Q. May I say that I think this brief is pretty heavily weighted by the dollar sign.—A. If you have taken that impression, we did not intend to give it, Mr. Knight.

Q. Would you admit that there is a bit of sarcasm all through this brief, especially "when the government pays the bills of the national circuses there may be a suspicion in the minds of some of the electors that their public authorities are a wee bit short of bread." I wonder if that is a fair statement to make?—A. I am not too sure that I am answering a question, but if it is a question, then the point we are trying to make is that television, as I think most people will admit who have seen it, or even just read about it, is an entertainment medium and it is as such that we think that the government might well reconsider the desirability of continuing in the entertainment field. I could grant you, sir, that that is perhaps a sarcastic statement.

Q. And there is another one on page 8:

> And this policy is defended on the ground that, if we are to foster and protect Canadian culture, we must not permit the apparently weaker urban mind to be polluted by the crass commercialism which has pervaded TV productions in the United States.

Mr. GOODE: Which is worse, that or "slimy sinuosity"?

The WITNESS: I suggest that the last speaker could have read our brief much better than I.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. It is the constant recurrence of these little things all through this brief which leads me to ask if this brief was not the work of one strong-minded man who imposed his opinions on the others?—A. We have in our association a number of able writers and editors.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Dinsdale.

Mr. DINSDALE: There has been quite a discussion about the motives behind it, and so far the point which appeals to me is that it is presented in the form of questions and queries, not in terms of definitive statements. I think they are putting out feelers more than anything else. I have looked at the same area, and some of the same questions occurred to me. For example, incidentally, the mass idea reflection is one point in discussing this brief.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

Mr. DINSDALE: I hope that I do not have to stick to one area of discussion.

Mr. RILEY: In fairness to the witness I thought there should be, Mr. Dinsdale.

Mr. DINSDALE: Yes, but in discussing this brief, we have not had any similar restrictions.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: We agreed that we were to question on all the brief after we had covered origins.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. There is this problem of the expense of television, the new medium of television, and as I look at that problem in the development of television in Canada, we are going to get into things we have tried to avoid in our public policy in broadcasting, namely, Americanization and commercialization in spite of ourselves, because of the tremendous sums of money involved, and we are going to be forced in that direction. And the other day when we were discussing the matter with representatives of the C.B.C., I made a suggestion more or less to the C.B.C. in the form of a question that such a program

as the "Big Review" was a rather strange function for a public body. I think I used the analogy that it was almost like the circus games and programs held at Rome in its declining years. In reference to that and this brief, I have a question concerning the activities of the National Film Board as a programming source. I believe it is put out in quaere form. There is a slight error in that regard. Does the witness know that the National Film Board has regional outlets which handle the distributions of various National Film Board productions?—A. Is that a question?

Q. Yes.—A. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly a complete and proper comparison with the National Film Board. I happen to be a member of a local Film Council, and I know that the National Film Board has a distribution agency but not a showing agency. In other words, they rent projectors, it is true, to, let us say, Farm Forum Groups and so on, but they do not actually own halls and stage showings, to the best of my knowledge. They do create programs. I think that is correct.

Q. That is right, and they established local councils for distribution of their films.—A. That is right.

Q. And on that point I made some remarks on March 18 when I offered a possible solution to this huge expenditure brought about in the supplying of physical equipment. They are to be found on page 3058 of Hansard.

> One of the major problems in television, which does not necessarily apply in radio broadcasting, is the tremendous expense involved in establishing stations—just providing the mechanical equipment. Before even considering the huge expenditure necessary for programming it is necessary to sink millions of dollars into the provision of mechanical equipment. It may be, with the excellent facilities for television programming available through the national film board, we might emphasize the Canadian view point much more effectively and much more cheaply, by the use of national film board resources under a policy of control by an independent regulatory body, thereby assuring that the programs that appeal to Canadian audiences would be presented even though telecasting facilities may be provided by private sources.

You presented your ideas in the form of questions. Is that something similar to which you had in mind?—A. I have been reasonably careful so far to distinguish in my answers what are my personal opinions and what are the opinions of the directors of the C.W.A., because I have been asked that question very carefully on numerous occasions today. I think if I were called upon to answer that question I would have to express my own personal opinion. And I do not feel that I should attempt to interject my own personal opinions into it here. We have raised the question, and I think that the answer is reasonably to be found in the question being raised.

Q. I am interested in that aspect of broadcasting and telecasting in relation to it being a medium of developing culture. I think our problems are largely matters of definition. You hold to the popular idea of culture, that it has to do with esthetics, but I submit we must have regard to culture as a way of life, or as expressing a particular way of life, and in that regard it would, I think, suggest that there is such a thing as a way of life which appeals to certain people and to a national group, for example.

Indeed, the problem with culture in reference to broadcasting seems to be this: We regard television as a panacea, just as the press was regarded as a panacea for solving all the problems of democracy. That was a popular conception of the press when it first developed. I think that is where our difficulty arises in all this discussion, pro and con, concerning culture and mass media, that it is strictly limited in its impact upon a distinctive Canadian way of life, and that the real source of development and culture to a

way of life arises from institutions which are much more important than radio and television and which are largely the media of entertainment. Would you care to comment on that?—A. Mr. Chairman, I am really getting out on long limbs today. May I refer to the passage in our brief on page 7? We attempted to get from a good dictionary a definition of culture. It was "intellectual development through mental tillage", and that is not confined, I think, to artistic development, as you may have suggested. And we suggested again in the brief that the impact upon Canadian culture of newspapers and magazines was quite widespread; but basically I think all of us must agree that it is in individual development that culture really flowers and it is not something that can be caught like a disease from any mass communication media. But we are not attempting in this instance to look at culture solely from the basis of the art. Our Canadian culture is entirely the Canadian way of life.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. One final question on this matter of regulation. As I look at the emphasis in the brief, the suggestion is to dispense with regulations entirely and I know that regulation is perhaps—I am misconstruing it there, but you can comment on it when I finish, but the problem of regulating broadcasting and telecasting is one of the issues that have come up repeatedly during the deliberations of this committee, and it seems to me we have been very often skirting around the point instead of meeting it head on. I noticed that particularly with reference to the C.A.B., they seemed to be aware of a Damocles sword suspended over their head, and cannot come directly to the point. Now the problem of regulation as I look at the situation it seems to me to be necessary—maybe it is an ideal situation in a democracy to have no regulation, but in the practical situation that Canada is in you have to have some form of regulation of a means of communication as important as broadcsting. Is that your viewpoint or do you go further in your interpretation of the problem of regulation?—A. Again I would refer you to page 12 of the brief, where we point out that "ownership of radio and TV is not a prerequisite to control, if control there must be. In the current licensing system lie all the necessary safeguards." We are not suggesting here today any particular course of action. We are, as one of the earlier speakers pointed out, attempting to raise a number of questions. We do not pretend to have all the answers. Our basic reason in coming before you today was not, as might have been the reason of the other bodies coming before you—we are not in the radio business, we do not look upon it at the present time as a sort of Damocles sword hanging over our heads—was to raise questions. We are interested in a full public discussion of the basic issues that are involved in the growing participation by the state in a form of mass communication. We are not trying to provide you with a series of answers that will be a penacae at all, but we do feel the public is, particularly at this time when you are starting on your new venture, interested in discussing the matter very thoroughly and being quite sure that they have the answers you have in your minds before you go too far ahead with it.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. Just one question in the light of what you just said, Mr. Cranston, and while we are on the subject of definitions, on page 4 of your brief you have a paragraph titled "Culture Comes In", and the first sentence of it reads: "The new watchword of radio's 'publicans' is 'culture'—spelled in capital letters." The words "publicans" and "culture" are in quotes. Now how do you define "publicans" and why is it in quotation marks?—A. May I rely on Mr. Knight to answer that.

Mr. KNIGHT: It is perfectly evident. The allusion there is to the New Testament. You can go to your New Testament and find out about publicans.

Mr. FLEMING: "Publican" means tax-gatherer. In the new revised standard version of the Bible you do not find the word "Publican" at all, it is "tax-gatherer".

Mr. RILEY: I asked the witness to give his definition of it and to tell us why it is used there.

Mr. KNIGHT: He referred it to me.

The WITNESS: I would assume that what is meant there is that the people who are supporting the growing state support of radio and television—in other words, the people who believe in extensive public participation in this public means of communication media —

By Mr. Knight:

Q. You do not believe in the subsidization of radio communication, in other words?—A. You are asking me again a personal question, sir.

Q. My question is: Do you believe in the subsidization of mass communication?—A. The brief, Mr. Chairman, puts before us today what we consider to be a considerable number of dangers which are allied to the subsidization of mass communication.

Q. Would you apply that to the subsidization by the dominion government of the weekly newspapers in the matter of postal rates and in the matter of tax exemptions?—A. Well, Mr. Chairman, I had not considered, and I do not think our association considers, that the weekly newspapers are subsidized through tax exemption at all.

Q. Mr. Chairman, I have received an answer to half of my question, but I would like the witness's reaction to the other half. He says there are no subsidies in the matter of tax exemptions to the weekly newspapers. What about the subsidization in the matter of postal rates? I am not stating any view, I am asking the witness's.

Mr. MCCARTNEY: The best answer I can give to that is this, that it has long been a recognized fact that the postal privileges as allowed by the federal Post Office Department, is granted to the readers of newspapers, magazines and publications of various kinds which they would otherwise have to pay in circulation rates. It was felt in the original establishment of postal privileges that, prior to the days of radio and television, there were many people who lived so far from the sources of publication that, without the postal services as they were established by the Post Office Department, would not have newspapers and publications made available to them.

Mr. CARTER: Is that not the same thing in radio?

Mr. KNIGHT: If time is the element and time gives precedent and right in that direction, would you say that the fact that the C.B.C. has been doing a little subsidization since the passing of the Radio Act in 1934 would also give some precedents which should not be broken?

The WITNESS: Is that a question, Mr. Chairman?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is a question.

The WITNESS: Well, I must confess I would like to have the question restated. I am not quite sure of what the honourable member just means.

Mr. KNIGHT: If I have to restate it, I shall have to go back to my friend's answer. He said that it had been a long established custom, this subsidizing of weekly newspapers—and, mind you, I am not finding any fault with it—but he said it had been a long established custom, this subsidization in the matter of postal rates to weekly newspapers, and he argued therefrom that that was a good thing and that it should so continue.

Mr. McCARTNEY: I did not say it should continue.

Mr. FULTON: I think you were taking issue with the concept of that special postal rate privilege.

Mr. KNIGHT: I see. My question was, if that creates a precedent and a priority, that privilege on postal rates, it is a subsidization of weekly newspapers, and that that very time element, that precedent, called for some consideration in regard to the subsidization of communication through radio by the C.B.C. since it has been in existence, in 1934. That was my question.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I would like, if we could, to confine ourselves generally to this brief. As I pointed out earlier, I was criticized very considerably, or at least the implication may have been there—I am sorry, I withdraw the word "criticized". When this brief was presented today it was said that it was the work of a very small group. We tried to explain how it came about. I do not want to put on record my personal opinions here, and I did not have instructions from my association to answer such particular questions that you raised, and if I did answer I would like it to be understood that the answers are my personal opinions and would not necessarily the opinion of the association. We have tried to stay within the bounds of the brief.

Mr. KNIGHT: I, in turn, have to compliment the weekly newspapers and to extend my gratitude to them for what they have done, and I would like to see you in the same position in regard to radio.

Mr. GOODE: Let us proceed further on Mr. Knight's line of questioning.

By Hon. Mr. McCann:

Q. When you prepared your brief did you take that factor into consideration, that the newspapers get preferred postal rates and they get a total exemption of sales tax on newsprint? Or did you have that knowledge when you prepared your brief?—A. Mr. Minister, when we originally prepared the brief there was a sales tax on newsprint. That removal was something very recent.

Q. The very same association that is here today made representations before that time to have the sales tax removed, so you must have had knowledge.—A. We made those representations, but we did not ask that they be for weekly newspapers alone. We asked specifically in our brief that all forms of media should be treated the same. As a matter of fact, we did not ask the government for the removal of the 10 per cent sales tax.

Q. Oh yes, a number of times throughout the last five years.—A. The last time in February I happened to speak to the minister concerned.

Q. I know you were there.—A. We asked we all be treated on the same basis. We were content if the sales tax applied to other periodicals.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. How many people do the weekly newspapers employ throughout Canada? About how many?

Mr. McCARTNEY: Four to five thousand approximately.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. How many of those weekly newspapers would be in business if this "subsidy", as Mr. Knight calls it, given to the weekly newspapers were not in effect?—A. Every one of them.

Q. That is the answer you should have given Mr. Knight?—A. That is my personal opinion and you talked me into it.

Q. That is my personal opinion too.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. On this point of postage, could I ask this question of the witness. Do you see anything wrong in this form of assistance given to facilitate communication in a democracy? That is what it is really.—A. Are you referring to radio or newspapers?

Q. Newspapers. The postage concession.—A. Not all weekly newspapers by a long shot benefit by that. It is only the very small newspapers that do. You are asking me a personal question and I will answer it personally. I am not one of those who benefit by it.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. I want to call attention to the second paragraph from the bottom of page 5 where it says:

> This nation's periodical press, in company with the majority of its electors and elected, has been content for one to two decades to skate carefully around the basic issues involved in government ownership and subsidization of a mass medium whose prime function is the provision of public entertainment.

I wish to go on to inquire just which particular medium he had in mind in this sentence. Is he referring to the press, to television or to radio, or to all mediums?—A. Mr. Chairman, I think it is correct to say that the only major mass medium which has been subsidized in any great degree over the past two decades is radio.

Q. Do you make the same contentions with respect to television?—A. The very reason for our brief today is to endeavour to promote, not only here but right across Canada, a thorough examination by all the electors of the issues involved in this public participation in mass communication media.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: There is too much talking in this meeting. The reporter cannot hear what is being said. Please do not carry on separate conversations, gentlemen.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. In your reference to the mass medium here in this sentence are you referring only to the radio in Canada or are you referring to it generally anywhere?—A. I said, Mr. Chairman, at the start of that particular paragraph, "this nation's periodical press", so I am referring to Canada, and I am condemning as I read that to you our association itself as well as other newspapers for not discussing these issues more thoroughly. We are taking responsibility for this ourselves. We are not trying to dodge it.

Q. You are saying that the prime function of radio in Canada is the provision of public entertainment. Is that right?—A. I think that, Mr. Chairman, is a fair statement. Yes, that is what the brief says.

By Hon. Mr. McCann:

Q. On what do you base that?—A. On an analysis of the program content of an average C.B.C. or private radio station.

Q. Do you lose sight of its educational, documentary and other values? Entertainment is only a small part of it. There is even advertising value.—A. I would be the first person to deny advertising does not have value, even radio advertising. But I do suggest that the prime function of the radio programs today, on either C.B.C. or private stations, is an entertainment function. That does not mean that the others are not important at all.

Hon. Mr. MCCANN: It is only one point of view, the point of view of your association.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. Would you say that it is the prime responsibility of radio to provide entertainment?—A. Mr. Chairman, the questioner is asking me personally again to express an opinion that is not set out in the brief.

Q. I am trying to amplify what your brief means.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: On what page?

By Mr. Carter:

Q. Page 5, second paragraph from the bottom. I want to know what this paragraph does mean?—A. You are asking the question, if I may restate it, what should be the prime purpose of radio?

Q. No. I asked you further back whether it was the opinion of your body that the prime function of radio in Canada was to provide entertainment and you said you thought that was a fair statement, and Dr. McCann asked you what about education and culture and other things which are perhaps even more important than entertainment. Now, I am asking you what is the prime responsibility of this mass medium, or any mass medium, but take the one you refer to here, the radio. We want to get at the bottom of this so we do not go out and make mistakes.—A. I wish I had sufficient knowledge to help myself not make any mistakes let alone anyone else.

Hon. Mr. MCCANN: You are doing alright.

The WITNESS: But I think it is a fair statement that one of the major functions if not the major function of, for example, the magazines of Canada or the radio stations of Canada is to provide entertainment. I think that the circulations of the various media would bear out that statement. I think also an analysis of one of the C.B.C.'s operating schedules for a week would bear that out. That does not mean that radio does not perform, both private and public, very many useful functions in other fields, but so do the newspapers.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. But you say of these functions, the prime function is entertainment?—A. I would say radio would not have high listenership, or weekend magazines and papers a high readership, if they did not provide entertainment.

Mr. GOODE: What is entertainment?

Mr. CARTER: If I may continue—would you say that the prime form of radio in Russia is to provide entertainment?

Mr. GOODE: That is culture.

The VICE CHAIRMAN: With a "K".

The WITNESS: Very fortunately I have not had occasion to experience that personally and therefore cannot answer the question.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. Could you give an opinion on it? I will put it this way: I will ask you if you agree with my opinion of radio, and I think television and also press media and means of mass communication, that the prime function is security in the times we are living in.—A. The prime function is security?

Q. Security of our particular way of life, the preservation of our way of life. I think that should be the prime function that overrides everything else.—It is not a question Mr. Chairman.

Q. I wonder if the witness would care to comment on that?—A. Mr. Chairman it has been obvious that some of the statements which this brief has made to you today have been open to several interpretations which I have found it difficult to clarify and I am afraid I would have to categorize the last question put to me in the same class.

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fulton has been asking for the floor.

By Mr. Fulton:

Q. I have one or two questions, but before I ask them, I would like to say, particularly with reference to the witness himself, that I think this is a most valuable and useful brief, because it compels us to take a look at the situation and to think about where we are going. I would like to ask Mr. Cranston whether I am right in my attempt to understand the main purport of the argument he presents here—and I want to be fair and I want to understand it—is that, while it is true that you are putting up a number of questions to us, and asking us to think out the answers to them, and you yourself have not attempted to be dogmatic or to suggest one solution, is it not the case, or is it not inherent in your argument—or let me put it this way; would you say there is a danger of subsidization and control of this important means of communication, rather than the elimination of any regulation in the sense that there should be public regulation of the standards to which this medium of communication must conform.—A. Mr. Chairman, if I may again refer to the brief. On page 10 we said: "The financial and cultural considerations are the superficial aspects of this issue", and it is this, just as in any other question of public ownership and control of a mass communication media which poses or is the basis for many of the questions which we raise today, and in which we believe are inherent some of the potential dangers.

Q. I think it would be fair to say that in raising the whole question of public ownership of radio communications you go beyond what any members of the committee have yet been prepared to go, but I would like to ask you whether you insist unequivocably on some public regulation of the standards to which broadcasting and television should conform. I want to be sure in your brief you are not arguing for the elimination of control of broadcasts in the sense of regulation. I do not mean mostly control exercised by the laws on libel and slander and so on, but control in the positive sense. Regulation of standards. Are you contending that that should be eliminated?—A. Again I am asked to give a personal opinion. I am going to have to refer back to the brief, and about the fourth paragraph on page 12, we say: "In the current licensing system lie all the necessary safeguards," and we admit furthermore that there must be governmental allocation of broadcasting channels because of their limited nature and the necessity of international agreement. The question we are basically raising is the reason why there should be a government ownership, control and operation of radio stations.

Q. I appreciate that, but that paragraph you have referred to does raise a question in my mind which I would like to be made clear, and I am not asking for your opinion, I am asking you whether you think we should take from this brief that your association goes as far as to suggest there should be no regulations in the sense of the regulation or the standards of broadcasting.—A. Mr. Chairman, that is not in the brief, and I do not know what the opinion of the majority of the members on that point would be. But again, restating our case, we were hoping this would lead to a further general discussion of the basic issues, and we are not technical experts in the field of radio as I have ably demonstrated today. We are merely people who come to "read", for a change, an editorial before the committee of the House of Commons, and we are fully cognizant of the fact that in doing so we are as vulnerable to the charge of not being representative of public opinion as we are when we put our ordinary editorials into print, but we do hope there will be further public discussion of the basic issues.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. I am not questioning that, but there are some pretty condemning statements in the brief itself, and I think it is only fair that we should be able to ask you, who are presenting the brief, for an interpretation of some of them. —A. I will do my best, but there are occasions on which my limitations become very obvious, and I just have to say I do not know.

Q. But there are in the statement, or rather you know what the intention of the group is when they make these statements.—A. Mr. Chairman, this wording was approved, as is by the directorate. I cannot tell you what the individual interpretation on each sentence would be, and if I went into it, I would be getting into personal opinions. I will do my best to answer the questions along that line, and subject to that limitation.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hansell, did you have a question.

Mr. HANSELL: I was going to butt in on another matter, but it is too late now.

By Mr. Boisvert:

Q. Do you admit that radio broadcasting and television are mediums of education?—A. I would certainly think so, yes.

Q. Are you aware that 600,000 children are getting programs adjusted to the program of their study in Canada?—A. I am not aware of the exact quantity, but I do know that school programs are carried.

Q. Did you know that 35 per cent of the English speaking schools of Canada have receiving sets for the purpose of using C.B.C. programs to help them in the teaching of the children attending their schools?—A. Again, I did not know the exact percentage, but I was aware that there were such programs.

Q. There are many wide implications in your brief, and from some of them I would like to ask you if you are ready to suggest that the government of this country has any duty with respect to the general and educational culture of our citizens?—A. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the Prime Minister would mind my saying this, because it was said to a group of the members of our organization just a few days ago. I believe that the government has a very definite responsibility with respect to the culture of its citizens. I believe that many of the suggestions or ideas which the Right Hon. Mr. St. Laurent has for his All-Canada Council are calculated to see the government implement the responsibility. I point to the government's interest in its national library, national museum, historic sites, and many other related efforts. I am quite confident that they will receive the wholehearted support of the weekly press of Canada.

The question which we have raised in this brief is not whether the government has any cultural responsibility at all. We believe that radio, both publicly and privately owned, just as the press, privately owned, have large responsibilities and they are shouldering them. We did raise certain basic issues with respect to public ownership of mass communication media which we felt should be raised.

Q. Why did you say on page 12 of your brief:

> We cannot go to heaven on a law, on an editorial campaign, or on a diet of publicly prepared culture, well salted with subsidies, and served fourteen hours daily over a national network,

if the government has no duty in the way of general supervision over the culture of the country or the nation?—A. I believe that I would not be able to answer that question to the satisfaction of the hon. member.

Q. Oh, I am very easy to satisfy, you know.—A. But what I was pointing out on behalf of the association was that we, as newspaper editors, do not

believe that because we espouse a particular cause editorially, or because you, as legislators, pass certain laws, or because certain things are espoused over a national network, that you can materially raise, in a fell sweep—I know you cannot raise anything in a fell sweep, but you know what I mean—you cannot at once bring about a material change in the culture of a nation.

I remember a statement which was made not very long ago by one of the leading broadcasters and writers of the C.B.C. for whose ability I have great personal admiration. It was that every average size town and city in the Dominion of Canada should have an opera house, and that the Federal Government should see to it that it did.

I feel that is not exactly the way to develop opera singers. It may help, but to a very minor degree. But we have raised a question here in our brief which I think answers the point which you have raised, at least in some respects. We do not believe that Canada's cultural advance must be halted by her defence needs. We do not think that our cultural advance is nearly as closely linked to the public operation of radio and television as many of us have believed; and we do not think that it is a public responsibility to provide the actual staging certain people do get cultural benefits, but we do not think that the government has to provide a national audience for them. Cultural development lies in the people who are participating in the actual production. That is, I think, a basic definition of culture.

Mr. HANSELL: In other words, can it not be summed up in this way: that the government may build opera houses, but neither governments nor other institutions can put a voice in an opera singer? Doesn't that size it up?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: You mean the government cannot provide the vocal chords?

Mr. HANSELL: That is right, the government cannot provide vocal chords. I agree that culture is a principle. You cannot buy it. You cannot make a principle of life. In other words, Shakespeare, Milton, de Vinci, Rembrandt, Brahms, or any other great artist, such as Chopin—

Mr. GOODE: Or Rocky Marciano?

Mr. HANSELL: Is it not true that these great cultural artists were not the product of a subsidized media of information? As a matter of fact, that sort of art was brought forth before there was any state control in any of these things. That is the general principle I think that the brief desires to put forward.

Mr. KNIGHT: And they did not work for money either.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I think we have pretty well covered the ground that we set out to cover, and I wish, now, to thank Mr. Cranston for what he did, as well as the other members of his group.

The WITNESS: May I, on behalf of the association and personally, thank you very much for your kind and intelligent questioning.

The CHAIRMAN: We will meet again this evening at 8.30.

APRIL 30, 1953.
8.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum.

Tonight we have with us Mr. Harry Sedgwick, Director, Station CFRB, Toronto, who I understand is making the presentation which we agreed to hear today.

Mr. CARTER: Before we hear Mr. Sedgwick, may I on a point of privilege just say a word or two to clarify a statement I made at the end of the last

sitting? I asked a question of Mr. Cranston which might be interpreted that I felt that the democracies could only be preserved by concentrating power in the hands of the state or in the hands of the government. I should like to make it clear that what I was really trying to draw out from Mr. Cranston was that we all have a responsibility in seeing that the democratic way of life is preserved and that the government has a responsibility—and private stations have a responsibility—and the goal I think we should be working towards would be mutual cooperation to that end. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sedgwick?

Mr. Harry Sedgwick, Director, Station CFRB, Toronto, called:

The WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I will not take up too much of your time. The statement I have to make will be very brief, but I think it is important I make it and you will see why when I read what I have to say. At a recent meeting of your committee some statements were placed on the record regarding radio station CFRB, Toronto, of which I have the honour to be the managing-director, which are in fact not true, and as these statements received wide publicity in the press of Canada, I deemed it important that the true facts be placed before you and on the record.

The statements which referred to CFRB and to which I take exception are, and I quote:

> Mr. Coldwell—Q: So it really is an American station on Canadian soil?
>
> Mr. Coldwell—I think it is pretty well dominated by an American radio system. I would regard it as just one of the stations that is an American outlet on Canadian soil, very much like the Windsor station.

To deal with this question properly, I should first review our corporate structure. Our company is a Canadian company owned by approximately 1,000 shareholders and, of that number, 24, or approximately 2½ per cent of the total number of shareholders, are resident outside of the country, and holding less than 1 per cent of the issued stock of the company. This number, in most cases, as far as we can discover, are one-time Canadians who have moved away and taken their shares with them. There has never at any time been any financing done by our company in the United States, no shares have been sold there, no money has been borrowed there. It is 100 per cent, to all intents and purposes, a Canadian company, and always has been, and has been in business some twenty-seven years.

All of the employees of our company are Canadians, and all of our directors are Canadians. Among our directors we have such distinguished Canadians as:

Lt.-Col. Eric Phillips, C.B.E., D.S.O., M.C., LL.D., chairman of the Board of Governors of the University of Toronto;

Mr. Samuel Rogers, Q.C., chairman of the Board of Governors of Pickering College;

Mr. J. Harry Ratcliffe, C.B.E.;

Mr. W. M. McCutcheon, C.B.E., Q.C.,

and others.

So much for our corporate structure. Regarding our affiliation with the Columbia Broadcasting System, which seemed to be the main point that was worrying the gentleman who made the statements to which I have referred, we have been affiliated with the Columbia Broadcasting System for twenty-

four years. Our affiliation arrangement does not obligate this station to take any program from Columbia that we do not wish to carry. Columbio have absolutely no rights over the program time of station CFRB, and we are, in fact, in substantially the same position, as far as our affiliation is concerned with Columbia, as the C.B.C. are in connection with the arrangements they have with N.B.C., A.B.C., Mutual, etc. When Columbia want to put a program on our station, and we consider it desirable to carry such a program if it is a commercial program we are paid at a rate which is fixed by agreement; if it is a sustaining program we carry it if we think it is in the public interest, and we do not carry it if we think otherwise. There is no obligation on our part to clear time for either a Columbia commercial program or a Columbia sustaining program. And never at any time during our twenty-four years of affiliation with the Columbia Broadcasting System have they insisted that we do anything of the kind.

As to the programs we carry for the Columbia Broadcasting System, we have made an analysis of our affairs for the week of April 5, which was the week in which the statement about which I complain was made, and we find that this station in that week was on the air a total of 132½ hours, and during that time we carried a total of U.S. programs, sustaining and commercial, from the Columbia network of twenty-three hours and ten minutes, or a percentage of 17·4 per cent. However, an analysis of the activities of the C.B.C. English networks during that same week indicates that they broadcast to their networks a total of 135¾ hours during that week and they carried from various networks in the United States, including Columbia, N.B.C., A.B.C. and Mutual sustaining and commercial programs, a total of 34½ hours, or a percentage of 25·4 per cent, or something like 50 per cent more U.S. programs than were carried by CFRB. I submit, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the statements and the inferences which could be drawn from those statements made on April 9 by a member of this committee should now be corrected.

Regarding the financial value of our Columbia affiliation to CFRB, I can say that on average Columbia programs, both sustaining and commercial, occupy not more than 15 per cent of our broadcast time, and as to revenue provide approximately 6 per cent of the total revenue of this station.

I hope that what I have said will adequately dispose of the misleading statements and inferences that were placed on the record, and that the press will give similar coverage to this statement as they gave to the statement that was made on April 9.

That gentlemen, is all I have to say on that question.

There is another statement I would like to make on television, but if there are any questions on what I have just said I would be very glad to answer them at this point.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions on this portion of Mr. Sedgwick's presentation.

Mr. RILEY: Are those shares that are owned by the public common or preferred shares?

The WITNESS: All common shares.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder could we have read to us the part of the transcript from this committee to which Mr. Sedgwick is referring. Could we have the secretary read it to us, please? To be absolutely fair I would like to hear both sides. I do not remember the incident at all.

Mr. FLEMING: It is page 30, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Coldwell's question reads "Is CFRB, for example, affiliated with either of our networks, the Trans-Canada and the dominion?—A. No. It is only an affiliate of Columbia.

Q. So it really is an American station on Canadian soil?—A. It is a Columbia affiliate. They carry quite a measure of local broadcasts from Toronto, but their main affiliation is with Columbia.

Q. Their main affiliation is with an American broadcasting system?—A. Yes sir."

And I made the statement: "That does not make them an American station."

Mr. Coldwell then said: "I think it is pretty well dominated by an American radio system. I would regard it as just one of the stations that is an American outlet on Canadian soil, very much like the Windsor station."

Then he and I had some exchange of opinions after that.

Mr. GOODE: Thank, you, Mr. Fleming.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Sedgwick, you mentioned that all the employees of CFRB are Canadians. How many persons are in the employ of the station?—A. We have about 72 permanent employees in addition to which we engage a great number of artists, singers, musicians and actors who are not on the permanent staff but are engaged on a part time basis. CFRB does not retain a regular staff on production staff or writers. We arrange for all our programs on a program basis.

Q. I think that is not like the way C.B.C. operates?—A. No. They operate differently. They have a staff of operators, writers and producers who are permanent employees.

Q. May I ask a question in regard to what you have done as a Canadian station by way of developing Canadian talent?—A. As I said in my statement we have been in the broadcasting business for 27 years. I do not wish to go through the list of the people who have had their start on our station or who worked for us in the radio business including one of our good friends in the C.B.C., Mr. Bushnell and Mr. George Young, and numerous others, but as to a general statement we say this: We listen to everybody who comes to us who may have talent which could be usable on radio. We audition hundreds and hundreds of people a year and we rate them and use their services if we think they are usable and then we find a place for them, and no talent is ever turned away from our doors which we think has the slightest possibility of being usable. We had a travelling unit over the province of Ontario for about three years which was a talent search show out of which we got very little talent, and I think the C.B.C. could tell you the same; that usable talent is not growing on trees.

Q. Can you tell us how listener interest, according to the recognized surveys, on CFRB compares with the C.B.C. stations within the area you serve?—A. This may sound boastful, Mr. Chairman, and I do not want to appear so, but we think we have the largest listening audience for that matter in the Dominion of Canada for any one station, and the surveys, which of course are the only measure by which we can judge listening audience, show that. I have some of the surveys here and if any of the members want to refer to the detailed figures I can look them up. We subscribe, as well as all other radio stations, advertisers and advertising agencies, to a number of survey systems. The major one, Canada-wise, is the Elliott-Haynes survey, which gives you three facts on a monthly basis; at any time of the day or night it gives you the number of sets in the area tuned in, and it gives you a measure of the audience that each station reachable in that area is getting, and it gives you a program rating which is based on those two figures. There are other surveys, one is called the Bureau of Broadcast Measurement, which takes surveys every two years and tries to ascertain how many radio

homes there are in the area and what stations they regularly listen to, and there are individual surveys which will undertake a survey of a particular type of program to find its listener interest. Elliott-Haynes also produces a quarterly survey in which they not only survey the urban centres but the various counties surrounding those urban centres to try to find some accurate estimate as to what percentage of the audience in those areas which are not regularly surveyed by the normal telephone system, listen to any particular station. We subscribe to other surveys, the C.B.C. does, the agencies do, and they are really a measure by which a station judges its popularity and the popularity of its programs. We have very good ratings on those surveys. I have some samples here and this will just show you the way they come. They are in an elaborately bound book. In it they describe what their method of survey is and other information of interest.

Mr. FLEMING: May I interrupt you, Mr. Sedgwick, for a moment. When I was asking Mr. Dunton about the surveys he said that he was reluctant to quote any one of them because he understood they came on a confidential basis. Have you any comment to make on that?

The WITNESS: I am not afraid to quote them by any restriction placed on me by the Elliott-Haynes company. We buy them and they are regularly used in advertising and they are quoted to advertisers when you are selling time. This particular one is the April evening programs. This arrived just before I left Toronto, or rather the day before. This issue covers from Monday, April 6, to Sunday, April 12—it takes about one week to get it out. On this particular report we do pretty well. We show an average of 30·1 per cent of the audience tuned in, as against CBL with 9·5 per cent, and CJBC with 9·1 per cent, so we are a little better in that respect. That is the Elliott-Haynes nighttime survey. Here is the Elliott-Haynes daytime survey. CFRB in this issue shows 21·8 per cent of listener audience tuned in, as against CBL with 15·7 and CJBC with 14·4.

Mr. RILEY: You must have more soap operas!

The WITNESS: Not as many.

By Mr. Gauthier (Portneuf):

Q. Are any of your reports marked "confidential"?—A. Yes, they say "for the confidential use of Radio Station CFRB".

Q. So they are marked confidential? That is to say, the reports you receive from the Elliott-Haynes survey agency are marked confidential?—A. Yes, they are stamped on the outside "for the confidential use of Radio Station CFRB".

Q. That is what Mr. Dunton said.—A. Well, Elliott-Haynes never objected to using those figures.

Mr. FLEMING: I think that what they insist on is that where those figures are used they wish the source to be acknowledged.

The WITNESS: I think they are public property.

Mr. GOODE: I have half a dozen of those reports in my files and there is nothing confidential about them. They are given to everybody.

The WITNESS: Those first two reports only refer to the metropolitan Toronto area, the area that can be reached by the normal telephone service. And, quarterly, the same people put out an area listing report. This one was made in February, 1953. They put it out usually every three months.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Over the long range, Mr. Sedgwick, are any trends indicated as to listener interest as between CFRB on the one hand and CBL and CJBC on the other?—A. I would say we get a much larger listening audience than any of the others, and that is not said critically.

Q. Nor am I asking it critically.—A. There is a reason why we should get a larger audience. We are not bound to any particular policy, and we do not have pressure put on to put on those programs which are not particularly popular, as perhaps the C.B.C. does. We are a commercial station and we must make money and, therefore, we must go after audience. So the first thing a commercial station must seek is programs that receive a reasonable measure of popular support.

Q. I take it that is the reason you carry such a small percentage of American programs as you do carry?—A. No, not particularly; sometimes we are asked to put on programs, but if we do not like a particular program then we tell them that we do not want it. A lot of them are from records, but the way to make a record program is to develop a radio personality to put the records on. They are commonly referred to as disc jockeys, but they have entertainment value.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions on this portion of Mr. Sedgwick's presentation?

Mr. KNIGHT: I would like to ask Mr. Sedgwick if this station is a member of the C.A.B.

The WITNESS: It is Mr. Knight.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? Mr. Sedgwick, will you go on with the remainder of your brief?

Mr. CARTER: Are there any copies of that brief, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, Mr. Carter, but there are not enough copies available for all members of the committee.

Mr. CARTER: I wonder, then, if the witness would read a little more slowly.

The WITNESS: I shall do that. I am sorry.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal for a few minutes with the television situation in the Toronto area. As you know, there is now one television station operating in Toronto, CBLT, and there are at the present moment in the neighbourhood of 175,000 television sets within the range of that station. However, those same television sets are also within the range of Station WBEN in Buffalo, and all of the surveys since CBLT opened last September have indicated that the Buffalo station is listened to by something better than 75 per cent of the sets tuned in in the Toronto district. We believe, therefore, that if the available television channels were occupied in the Toronto area, the audience in the Toronto district which now listenes to a Buffalo station could be weaned away to listen to a Canadian station.

My company were very early applicants for television. Our first application for an experimental television license was put before the Department of Transport in 1938, and after the war, when television became an accomplished fact on this continent, we again applied for a license, and have since that time filed a detailed engineering brief, and have had hearings before the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

From recent pronouncements that were made in the House by the minister, Dr. McCann, it would appear that the time is not far distant when the C.B.C. will be prepared to grant licenses in areas where they are now operating, and I would like to urge that this Committee recommend to the Government that all available television channels should now be issued to approved applicants.

I am convinced that the present policy of only one C.B.C. station in Toronto is gradually building up almost a monopoly of Canadian television listening to the Buffalo station.

Here are what I believe to be four good reasons why the television channels should be alloted:

(1) It will be of great benefit to the dealers, distributors and manufacturers of television sets. All the records indicate that the more choice of program material that is available to viewers, the more interested they are in buying equipment.

(2) It will provide alternate programes from Canadian stations, rather than a choice between one Canadian station and United States stations for the viewers in the Toronto area.

(3) It is desired by the public. From all indications the public are anxious to have more television stations from which to choose their listening, and we think it will satisfy the present television owners and the prospective television owners in the Toronto area by having more channels allotted.

(4) The channels are available, and should be occupied. While there is nothing in the treaty that provides that we lose them by default, situations have a habit of changing, and it is possible that in default of using these channels in Canada there may be encroachments on the same channels in the United States. That situation did happen in A.M. broadcasting, and might quite conceivably happen in television.

Station CFRB is one of the pioneer stations in Canada. We have been broadcasting now for 27 years, and we feel, as has now been generally admitted, that television is an extension of sound broadcasting, and the sooner we can get into business the sooner we will be able to provide a service to the many thousands of listeners that have regularly listened to our A.M. station.

I know that the views I am expressing have the full and complete support of all of our civic and public bodies in the Toronto area, and any recommendation by this committee to the government or the C.B.C. that the channels available be now allotted will be welcomed enthusiastically by all the people in our district.

And that gentlemen is my very brief statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions on the television portion of Mr. Sedgwick's presentation?

By Mr. Riley:

Q. Mr. Sedgwick you have a given a lot of study to these television ventures, have you not?—A. Quite a bit.

Q. You are pretty well acquainted with just what is required—what has been described to us as a pretty large capital investment?—A. That is correct.

Q. How many hours a week do you calculate you would have to telecast before you could put a television station on a profitable footing?—A. My guess is a minimum of 10 hours a day.

Q. How many hours out of that 10 hours a day would you calculate you would have to run live programs?—A. Not very many.

Q. What percentage?—A. It is very difficult to guess at these things.

Q. Would you put it at 50 per cent?—A. Nothing like that. No station in Canada would ever be able to produce prgrams to the tune of 50 per cent of its available time and live. A private station operating in a metropolitan area would have to use Columbia rather than their own programs to get an audience. For example, the C.B.C. produce a big revue costing something

like $7,000 a show for one hour. That is one hour a week out of 70. That is more money than any station would ever be able to spend on any one program. It is not possible, and never will be possible in the foreseeable future to produce a program of that size and of that extent.

Q. These special event type of programs that you can pick up on a mobile unit, would they be a very expensive proposition?—A. It depends on what you do. If you happen to use the finals of a football game, it is $7,000 for the rights, and it becomes a very expensive item, though the final of some unknown junior football game may not be so expensive, but the rights of all the sporting events are getting very very dear. Last year we paid $7,500 just for the rights to broadcast the Argonaut football games.

Q. That is in order to make up to them the loss of the audience—or what the estimate would be the loss of audience.—A. That is the way they put it, but in fact you could not buy seats in the stadium anyway.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. You say it cost $7,500 to broadcast one game?—A. No, we made a deal with the Argonaut football team to broadcast their home games, and we paid them for that $7,500 and, of course, added to that were the other expenses of engineers and announcers.

Q. How many games did that cover?—A. It depends on how far they went afield. If they did not get into the final playoffs, there would not be so many, but they won it, and therefore they had more games during the season than they might have otherwise.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. Street interviews would not be very expensive.—A. No, but they do not get much audience either.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. You made reference to the fact that your first application to the Board of Transport Commissioners in the television field was for an experimental station licence in 1938. Did you follow that with an application for something more than an experimental station?—A. That was not until after the war, and I think we filed in 1948 that complete engineering brief, and a proper form was filled out as provided by the C.B.C. and the Board of Transport Commissioners.

Q. That was five years ago. What happened to that application during this period of 5 years?—A. I think it is still there. We keep it alive regularly by dropping a note to the Department of Transport Commissioners and the C.B.C. saying we are still interested, and asking them not to forget us. A policy change on applications was considered, and recently there were applications for some areas on the new form. I think it is slightly different, and we asked for that form, and they are not available to Toronto as yet until the policy changes, and we are permitted to re-apply.

Q. That is the policy as it stands now, and that includes the statement by the minister on March 30 which was mentioned earlier in the evidence today. I take it your application is just on a stand-still. It is not being entertained, and no other application in the Toronto area is being entertained as yet? —A. I think that is true. I have not heard of any.

Q. Were you prepared when you made your application in 1948, and throughout this five-year interval, to take whatever financial risks are involved in going into operation as soon as you might be given a licence to do so. —A. That is correct.

Q. Have you any more to say to the committee Mr. Sedgwick on the effects of monopoly in a large metropolitan area like Toronto. You have mentioned the fact that so much listener interest has been captured by the Buffalo station. Are there any other factors you would like to mention, bearing on that matter of monopoly?—A. The follow-up to that of course is that the Buffalo station has appointed a sales representative in Toronto. They are now selling a very considerable amount, dollarwise, in the way of business on the Buffalo station for Toronto coverage and I suppose they will do more as time goes on if that situation continues. I think they have a regular sales representative there now working the Toronto market, and attempting to sell Toronto advertisements on Buffalo time. A further change in the situation is that there will be more stations in Buffalo as time goes on, and I just do not want to see Buffalo obtain a substantial share—it is very substantial at the moment—of the TV viewers in the Toronto area.

Q. When you quoted that figure of something more than 75 per cent of listener interest tuning in on the Buffalo station, were you speaking of the total number of sets that were tuned in there?—A. Yes, I was speaking of the total number of sets tuned in in the Toronto area, during the time the CBLT is on the air, because the rest of the time Buffalo gets 100 per cent.

Q. Do I understand you are speaking now of the division of listener interest as between the two stations CBLT, which is the C.B.C. station, and the Buffalo station?—A. That is correct; and the present figure of 21 per cent which is what, according to the April tele-rating, CBL is getting in the Toronto area is for the time that CBL is on the air; and at other times, when CBL is not on the air, then the Buffalo station is the only one receivable so therefore they get 100 per cent of the listeners.

Q. While Buffalo only is turned on, Buffalo gets 100 per cent, and when CBLT is operating according to the latest figures, 79 per cent of listener interest is going to WBENT and 21 per cent to CBLT.—A. It is 75 per cent for Buffalo, 2 per cent for Erie, and 2 per cent for Rochester.

Q. And 21 per cent for CBLT?—A. That is right.

Q. And the other figures are derived from what?—A. From the April tele-rating which came in the day before yesterday.

Q. Considering the trend, have you figures there for the earlier months in order to give us a conception of what the trend of listener interest is?—A. As far as I know I think the listener trend has been gradually dropping. In January it was 82·2; in February it was 77·8; in March it was 76·6; and in April it was 72·7, which is a drop of better than 10 per cent in 4 months. That is explained by Elliott-Haynes as due to the high rating because of the fact that people who got television sets for Christmas spent a lot of time looking at them, and then things settled down.

Q. Have you the CBLT figures for the same period?—A. This is the percentage of listeners tuned in according to the monthly report. I do not see the figures here for the trend, but I would say it is not going up, and that if anything, it is probably going down a little.

Q. On which station?—A. On CBL I do not think it has ever been much higher than 25 or much lower than 21.

Q. Probably I had better finish developing this theme and stop for a while. You indicated that you had some hope of being given a licence, and if you were given a licence you would operate a Canadian station with Canadian programs, and thus win a lot of that listener interest now going to the Buffalo station. Would you enlarge on that theme and indicate to us why you are of that opinion?—A. Well the reason I feel that is so is because the same situation happened in AM. The Buffalo station did not really get sufficient audience in the Toronto area to get much of a rating on the surveys.

Q. You are speaking of the AM broadcast?—A. Yes. And while that same pattern can be followed in television, yet we feel we have enough ingenuity to be able to program our station in order to cause the listeners who are now listening to Buffalo to listen to the Canadian station. That was the pattern, I remember, which developed when the Buffalo station used to get the majority of listeners tuned in Toronto on AM. That was a long time ago, but for the past 17 or 18 years I think the Canadian station has had better than 90 per cent of the listeners.

Q. What would be the effect on that hoped-for recovery of audience for the Canadian station and for Canadian programming if the licensing of a private station in Toronto is longer delayed?—A. Well, that is something which is becoming a problem for C.B.C. to face. Whether they are able to recover that audience from Buffalo which Buffalo now has, I do not care to say. But we feel that another station in Toronto would not hurt the C.B.C. at all. In fact, it might conceivably help it and it would certainly help through the sale of sets, of course, because under the new licensing scheme this money comes by way of taxes to the C.B.C. so they should be interested in getting such help. Therefore I do not think that another station in Toronto would hurt them. Competition is a good thing and I think it would help the C.B.C. rather than hinder it.

Q. There are, I believe, two channels available in the Toronto area?—A. Yes.

Q. And I understand there are applications for licences for the same area from CKCL and from Famous Players.—A. That is right.

By Hon. Mr. McCann:

Q. How many receiving sets are there in Toronto at the present time?—A. Approximately 175,000. I have the latest Elliott-Haynes figures here, which are as of March. They showed 169,000 in area C, the area around Toronto. And I think that the radio manufacturers association guide indicates that they have been selling, in these last few weeks, at the rate of about 3,000 a week.

Q. How many were there a year ago?—A. I think, speaking from memory, possibly 40,000 to 50,000.

Q. Supposing there were 40,000. You have thus had an increase of 155,000. They had been listening to Buffalo for a long while. Why do you suppose there is this increase in the sale of sets if it is not because of CBLT? What other inducement was there for people to buy sets if it was not for the fact that there was another channel to listen to?—A. I am only quoting from the teleratings which tend to show how many people are listening there.

Q. You say that "The more choice of program material that is available to viewers, the more interested they are in buying equipment."—A. That is right.

Q. I agree that the electronics industry is growing enormously and that the outlook appears very profitable. Your second point was that you would have an alternative program. I will admit that. And the other about which I am doubtful, was that it is desired by the public. We have never felt, in sound radio or television, that the statistics which have been given as to listener interest are really of much value. I do not see how they can be. My own experience in connection with radio is that an awful lot of people and private stations have been deluded into the opinion that the appraisal that you get from Elliott-Haynes and all those people are really accurate. It has never been proven that it has been. And the next thing you said was that a channel there was available and should be occupied by CFRB because they have been in business there for twenty-seven years and that was a good reason for this

committee to make a recommendation that they be granted a licence.—A. I did not say that; I said I think this committee should recommend that the available channel should be occupied by a desirable applicant.

Q. That is a little broader, I see. With reference to your submission, you say there was an increase in sales by 135,000 sets during the past year or eight months, since CBLT, which is the C.B.C. station, went into operation in Toronto, and that a dominating factor for the increase in sales in Toronto has been because another channel was made available to Toronto listeners or to the Toronto area, and that is the CBLT channel which is operated by the C.B.C.; and that they have had the Buffalo station for years, and during the time they had only the Buffalo station they only had about 45,000 sets, but we have been in operation there for only 8 months, yet the interest has been such that there have been 135,000 more sets sold and used."—A. Last September you could not get very good signals from Buffalo. But in the meantime Buffalo moved out of town and put up a thousand foot stick and quadrupled its power. Therefore the signals from Buffalo really started to come in at Toronto which helps the situation there today.

Q. Do you not think it is a fact that the CBC operating in Toronto has been the dominating factor for the increase in sales of television sets in the Toronto area?—A. I would not say it was the dominating factor, but I will say that it will go up further after another station starts up there providing more of a choice of programs. Because the more programs you have the more people you will get listening to your station.

Q. Well no, but there will be alternate programs, perhaps not originated programs, but there will be alternate programs.—A. I do not understand that. You get programs that are not on the air anywhere else but will be produced just for CFRB.

Q. Not for CFRB but for different private television stations. Probably a lot of them will be films but will be films dealing with Canadian topics rather than have you bring in all the time, if it is ten hours a day, films which will be of American origination.—A. Have no such fear that we are going to bring in ten hours a day of films of American origin.

Q. How many hours?—A. We cannot say we are going to do blank number of shows. We do not know what the program potential is ten years from now.

Q. Perhaps I should not have said ten hours a day; I do not see how you could do it ten hours a day.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Carter was attempting to ask a question.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. Did I understand the witness to say that his station is a member of the C.A.B.?—A. That is right, sir.

Q. And this brief that you are submitting now is your own brief?—A. My own. Yes.

Q. It expresses a different opinion that the brief submitted by the C.A.B.—A. I do not know. I have not seen the C.A.B. brief. I had nothing to do with drawing it.

Q. The C.A.B. is not representing you then?—A. The C.A.B. presented a brief that was prepared by their manager and the board of directors which I have not seen and have not read. I do not know whether my brief differs from their brief or not.

Q. But you are a member of the C.A.B.?—A. Yes.

Q. They are making representations on behalf of all their other members except you. Is that right?—A. No. I did not say that at all. I said I have not seen their brief and do not know what is in it. You asked me if I wrote this myself and I did. No one helped me; this is my own argument.

Q. Did you know the C.A.B. were presenting a brief?—A. I knew they were submitting a brief but I have not seen it yet.

Mr. HANSELL: The C.A.B. do not present briefs concerning individual station problems?

The WITNESS: No.

By Hon. Mr. McCann:

Q. This is your own brief?—A. Yes.

Q. And while you are a member of the C.A.B. you are not as closely associated with them as you were at one time?—A. That is right. I am not on the board.

Q. And you have a perfect right to present a brief on your own individual station.—A. Yes. I think that is fair.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. This is not a minority brief?—A. No. I think the situation in Toronto is different from anywhere else in the country. There are lots of places in the country where applications have been made for television where no American signal gets in. Buffalo with their tower of increased power do put in a very sizeable signal to Toronto and much more than they did last September. It is a strong signal for the full 16 hour day that they broadcast now. The situation in Toronto is unique.

Mr. GOODE: It should be pointed out to Mr. Carter that this question was asked about this brief when we first called the briefs and the chairman in reply to my query regarding this individual brief placed the status of the brief on the record so it was quite understood we were going to receive this brief.

Mr. CARTER: I want to ask the witness this. I gathered from his brief he does not agree fully with the present government policy?

The WITNESS: Well, as far as it goes—

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the witness said that.

The WITNESS: I am suggesting that the hint that Dr. McCann was kind enough to throw out a few weeks ago he implemented probably a little faster than Dr. McCann intimated it would be.

Hon. Mr. MCCANN: He wants to impress us that it should be loosened up quicker than we have any idea of doing it.

Mr. GOODE: Dr. McCann, do not think he is alone in that either?

By Mr. Carter:

Q. You are asking that the establishment of private stations be done as quickly as possible—more private stations?—A. Yes.

Q. And your purpose in advocating that is to set up competition. Is that right?—A. That is correct.

Q. And you have in your mind competition with the C.B.C.?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. And you think that competition will improve C.B.C. programs?—A. Competition usually does, sir.

Q. From what I gathered you say now the C.B.C. already has competition from Buffalo?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you think that is not adequate?—A. It is tough, but we think we can make more competition when we get into it—give competition to Buffalo and C.B.C.

The CHAIRMAN: And any other private station which might be licensed in that area?

The WITNESS: That is right.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. I was just wondering how that could be done since you would either have to bring in, as Dr. McCann said, American programs or use sustaining programs from the C.B.C.—A. I do not think that is the whole story. I think we have enough ingenuity to find programs. I do not think that is our only source of programs.

Q. There would be a very small percentage of live programs?—A. That is going to be true in every station. The economics of the thing do not permit of programs where you are using musical groups. Musical groups are very expensive to produce and you cannot afford to produce a great many musical programs.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that true in the United States?

The WITNESS: They divide the cost of those expensive programs among a number of stations which will ultimately happen in Canada.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. The bulk of your programs will be what are termed "canned" programs?—A. Possibly a good many at the start anyway.

Q. Do you have in mind using Canadian or American programs?—A. Canadian, English and American; anything we can get. You scout around for programs.

Q. If they were Canadian programs they would be available to the C.B.C.?—A. That is so.

Q. How then would you have a better chance to improve television and compete with Buffalo than the C.B.C. has?—A. I would like to refer to our accomplishments on AM. We have done that successfully for a number of years and we think we can do it just as successfully on TV.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): With the Buffalo station there is competition plus because of the Columbia broadcasting system and you are affiliated with them?—A. Yes, I have been for 24 years.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I think there is one impression that may have gotten on the record in answer to one of Mr. Carter's questions that may not give a fair picture of what was intended. When you say that you would like to see this policy of the one station—of one channel per area—loosened up you only mean, do you not, in those areas where there is sufficient audience potential or viewing potential to warrant it?—A. I am only speaking for the Toronto area now. That is a very large market and I think it would support more than one television station.

Q. But you are not suggesting for the present that generally all over the country they should open up new channels in the same areas that have stations?—A. No, I am talking of the Toronto area alone. There is another very important factor, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that should be considered. TV stations now have been authorized, privately owned stations, in the smaller markets throughout Canada. The success of those stations will depend very largely on the establishment of commercial stations in the larger markets,

because that is where the advertising programs are developed which will keep these smaller stations alive, and without these stations developing that advertising busines I am afraid the smaller stations will find it difficult going.

Q. What type of signal would be coming into Toronto from Buffalo now? How would you characterize it, an A signal or a B signal?—A. In my home it is an A signal. Engineering-wise it is supposed to be a fringe signal, but from the reception point of view it is very good.

Hon. Mr. McCANN: Is there very much variability in it?

The WITNESS: I get a top notch signal from Buffalo now.

Mr. RILEY: What is the distance between Toronto and Buffalo?

The WITNESS: About 85 air miles, from my house.

The CHAIRMAN: We had evidence the other day that it was 60 miles.

Mr. FLEMING: Doctor Ouimet added to that, that with good equipment and good topography they get up to 85 miles, and he mentioned Buffalo to Toronto as a good example.

The WITNESS: I am five miles northeast of Toronto and Buffalo from my house is five degrees east of south—if you know what that means, I don't.

The CHAIRMAN: I might say that Mr. Sedgwick has been navigating the Georgian Bay for many years.

The WITNESS: On the same hit and miss theory, too.

Mr. RILEY: From the colour of his skin, he has been navigating further south than that.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. Now, then, having regard to this theory that they lay down areas on a map dividing the A signal from the B signal, or the fringe area, as you call it, and having regard to what your experience is with that Buffalo station, it may very well be that generally in television you will get an A signal away over on the fringe area. Is that not true?—A. I think that is true, and I think that was the reason behind the freeze in the United States for so long, because the engineering data—I am not an engineer, but I believe that the trouble in the United States was that the engineering data did not work out in practice. The signal travelled further than it was ever supposed to go; the TV signal was supposed to cut off at the horizon and the horizon was further than the engineers found it was, or they found ways and means of putting the stick up higher, and it was the result of that that created the freeze in the States, because the plan would have created a lot of interference between stations and they had to have a new deal.

Q. Have the TV engineers broadened out their areas as a result of that? —A. Yes, but they have cut down the number of availabilities per channel, that is the way I understand it, that is what the engineers tell me.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I don't think anyone can say that I am against the east getting any more television, but I must say, to be fair to you, that I am not too anxious to see the Toronto area, or anywhere else in the east, get television before the west. I am very interested in financing. How much would this station cost? —A. My estimate is, a capital cost of approximately $750,000.

Q. How would that money be raised?—A. We have most of it.

Q. You have it in the bank now?—A. Yes.

Q. What percentage of it have you got—is that a fair question?—A. Seventy-five per cent.

Q. Is that shareholders' money?—A. Shareholders' money. We have all the money that we require either in the bank or arranged for at our bankers.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. I am speaking of the competition between Buffalo and the existing C.B.C. TV station in Toronto. I take it that Buffalo is broadcasting all of the hours that the Toronto station is on the air.—A. That is correct.

Q. How many hours in a day have the Toronto listeners to listen to Buffalo instead of listening to the C.B.C. station there?—A. About eleven additional hours a day. I think Buffalo is on the air an average of sixteen hours a day and C.B.C. TV are on an average of five.

Q. So there are eleven hours a day that Toronto listeners can only tune in on the Buffalo station?—A. That is correct.

Q. Now, when a private station submits an application for a licence, do they have to indicate what hours of the day or how many hours they propose to broadcast?—A. Yes.

Q. They do?—A. Yes.

Q. So the position must be that where a private station in Toronto, if it were granted a licence, might be in greater competition than with the C.B.C. TV station. What I mean to say is that there might be only two or three hours that a private station would have the field free to itself. And other times it could be that both the Buffalo station and the Toronto private station might find themselves with few listeners in Toronto.—A. That might be if the C.B.C. maintained their present restricted rules.

Mr. BEAUDRY: Would it be your intention to broadcast at the time only that CBLT is silent so that you would have only one station to compete with, that of Buffalo, or do you think you would be rather inclined to go on the air at the time when both other stations would be on?

The WITNESS: Yes. The profitable periods, commercially, on TV would be in the evening, and no station can succeed if it passes up the evening periods.

By Mr. Riley:

Q. How far is Kitchener from Toronto?—A. Fifty-six miles, by air line.

Q. Well, if a TV licence was granted to the Kitchener area, that would constitute just as much competition to CBLT as your station. Is that correct?—A. I do not think so, sir. The topography is different. Buffalo signals come straight across the lake.

Mr. KNIGHT: Is that the station in which the Famous Players Corporation own half the stock?

Mr. RILEY: I don't think there is any station yet; there was an application before the Board of Governors for one.

Mr. FLEMING: It was rejected.

The WITNESS: That was an application.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): The London station's application was approved.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Sedgwick, there are two or three points that arise out of questions put to you. You mention that there are two VHF channels available. If you were assigned one of them would you be prepared still to face the competition which would be offered if the other channel was licensed to someone else?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. You have taken that into account in all your calculations?—A. Yes, sir. My brief never said a word about giving a licence to CFRB. My brief said we thought the policy should be to issue the available channels, and if there were two channels available they should both be issued.

Q. You are quite prepared to face all the financial risks involved in such an operation, even if the other channel were licensed to someone else at the same time?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, the point was raised about obtaining television in other parts of the country. Have you any thought of applying for a licence in any other area of this country, other than Toronto?—A. I am not.

Q. If you are granted a licence, or if these channels are opened up in Toronto is that going to have the effect of delaying television for any other part of this country?—A. I think it will have the effect of accelerating it, for the reasons I mentioned earlier, that the privately owned stations must live on commercial revenue and that commercial revenue is developed in the larger markets. This was the situation in AM radio and it is undoubtedly so in TV.

Q. The idea has prevailed wth some members that it is helping to speed up the development of the provision of television for other parts of the country by clamping down on the development of television in Toronto by any other station.—A. I would not agree with that point of view. Is that your viewpoint?

Q. It certainly is not my view, but it was the view expressed.—A. I would not agree with that, so that would not be my view.

Hon. Mr. McCANN: Mr. Chairman, why not proceed with the brief? This is not an application to this committee for a television licence.

The CHAIRMAN: The question has been brough up in the brief Dr. McCann and we have allowed a fairly wide discussion, and I do not see how we can very well limit it at the present time.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Dr. McCann in his remarks rather threw doubt upon the validity of the Elliott Haynes survey, and said he had never been satisfied it was dependable or that any of these surveys were dependable and said it had never been proven. May I ask you if, in your 27 years of experience, the reliability of these surveys has ever been disproved.—A. Generally no. There have been mistakes made, but they are carefully drawn, and I think that in surveys, if honestly approached and consistently made, the errors in one month are self-correcting. I think it is like reading a gas meter, and if it is wrong one month, and you go back the next month, it will correct itself. We believe Elliott Haynes do honestly approach their task, and have evolved a formula that is as close to being scientific as they can make it, and I think when they use a large enough sample, as they claim they do, and prove they do, I think the survey can be pretty well relied upon. As a matter of fact there are a lot of checks and balances, because there are three or four other survey organizations, and they make surveys, and we regularly check one survey against another, and we have established a survey at the moment by which we can check Elliott Haynes. It is the most generally used survey in Canada, and it is subscribed to by every radio station and practically every advertising agent, and most advertisers do accept it as their general guide to radio buying.

Hon. Mr. McCANN: May I suggest it is not a bit more reliable than the Gallop poll, and the Gallop poll in the last presidential election in the United States proved to be absolutely inaccurate.

The WITNESS: Well sir, I can give you my statement, that the Gallop poll also said that it is plus or minus 5 per cent accurate, and even in the presidential election, they claimed it was plus or minus 5 per cent.

Hon. Mr. MCCANN: The Elliott Haynes appraisal is not any more accurate than that.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Against the quite unsupported statement of Dr. McCann, do you extend your dependence on the overall accuracy of these surveys to the point where you take financial risks in your reliance on them?—A. Definitely, and so do all other advertising agencies, and for that matter the C.B.C. themselves pay for it, and I presume they think it is accurate.

Mr. FLEMING: Perhaps Dr. McCann may make a recommendation to discontinue it after the opinion he has expressed here.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Did you say that all advertising agencies accept this Elliott Haynes survey?—A. I do not know of any advertising agency that does not subscribe to it, and I know in these selling mediums they use them for selecting stations when putting on an advertising campaign. It is used by us, and if we see a program is reaching a state where the listening figures are going down, and it is sponsored by somebody, we have a difficulty keeping it, and we have to do a selling job to keep it on.

Q. Are your station advertising rates based on these surveys?—A. No.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Do you base rates at all on listening audience. In other words, would the Elliott Haynes survey have anything to do with the calculation of the rates?—A. No sir. Rates are based on potential audience.

Q. How do you know what the audience is if you do not get it from the survey?—A. The potential is the number of sets in your area.

By the Chairman:

Q. Where did you get that information?—A. Elliott Haynes do provide it. There are a lot of sources. The radio manufacturing people and license fees of course did hint at it.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I am interested Mr. Chairman, and want to get back to this American production line of thought. Do you think, Mr. Sedgwick, there is too much emphasis placed by critics on the danger of American programs. What I would like to know—perhaps I should not ask this question of you, but of someone else—but I would like to konw what particular danger exists in American programs broadcast to Canadian listeners.—A. I do not see much, and certainly of the percentage we have carried over the last 24 years there certainly has not been any danger. There is no danger in some of the better ones, the Metropolitan opera, or the New York Philharmonic orchestra, or the new production of Hamlet which cost someone $175,000, and I certainly see nothing dangerous in that. May be other programs are not so desirable as that, but there are lots of programs produced in Canada that are not so good either.

Q. We hear a great deal of criticism of the broadcasting of American programs, and particularly now that TV is coming into its own, and I do not hear the same criticism in respect to motion pictures. I do not see where there is any difference. I think the listening or seeing public enjoy Hollywood productions perhaps more than any other.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Portneuf*): Speaking for my province, they are censored before they come before the public, and very severely.

Mr. HANSELL: All provinces censor their motion pictures, but I have heard more criticism of other productions, British productions, for instance, than American productions, that they are not as good as the Hollywood productions, although I do not know I altogether agree. I think some of the British film productions are top rate, but nevertheless I do not hear the same criticism in respect of American motion pictures as I hear in respect of radio and television.

Mr. RILEY: Is that because they can review films?

Mr. HANSELL: I do not think so. I think criticism does not come from the listener.

The WITNESS: I think that is true, sir.

Mr. HANSELL: In other words do you think that audiences are particularly fussy as to where a production originates.

The WITNESS: I think they are much more interested in how well they are being entertained.

Mr. HANSELL: That is my point. I listen on Sunday night, believe me I do, to Miss Brooks, followed by Amos and Andy, followed by Charlie McCarthy, followed by the Singing Stars, and I think we have a variety of programs on Sunday that cannot be beat anywhere. I listen to these, but I do not hear any listeners coming along and saying: "These are fine programs, too bad the first three were produced in Canada." I do not hear that, but as soon as we talk about television policy, we hold up our hands in holy horror as though some American film is going to be shown. Perhaps I have observed more than I have questioned, Mr. Chairman. Excuse me.

By Hon. Mr. McCann:

Q. Would you express an opinion with reference to commercial rates on television.—A. In what way sir.

Q. What I am anxious to find out is if we did have a competitive situation in Toronto, is there any likelihood of rates being reduced because of the competition, and if you did get down to the reduction of rates by reason of competition, are you going to get enough revenue to make your project commercially favourable.

Q. And another question I want to ask is this: There is some doubt in my mind whether or not the Canadian commercial public are prepared to pay the rates for television that are now being paid in the United States. We have a market with about one-tenth of the number of people here, and we have got competition in the United States with people there who have a great deal of money, and it means nothing to them that they have to pay higher rates. And anyone who goes into television in Canada says it costs you $3/4 million for capital expenditure and that probably you have got to be prepared to operate for 2, 3, 4, or 5 years with an even break or with losing money. Do you think the Canadian advertising public is prepared to assist that type of business?—A. I think so, sir.

Q. You say that you think so?—A. As to competition lowering the rates, I think the reverse would be true. The rates will enhance as more listeners are drawn to the Toronto stations, and as more radio stations are into the market. We are not nearly at the saturation point in the Toronto area. Where more sets are sold, the potential audience goes up and the rates go with it, and I think that rather than reduce rates, it will increase rates. That again has been the record with AM.

Q. But the rates are not comparable for the two?—A. I know all about that and I am prepared to take that chance.

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. You answered Mr. Fleming that the present method of audience measurement, or the accuracy of the method, had never been disproved. But has it not been seriously questioned?—A. I did not say it has never been disproved. I said it has not been seriously questioned. There have been mistakes and questions, but we have always got explanations, and when you get into the working figures I think, notwithstanding the complaints—and I have been the one who made them—I still think it is the only information whereby an honest appraisal can be made which is reasonably accurate, to measure the listening audience.

Q. Your answer was that it has not been seriously questioned. I am under the impression, rightly or wrongly, that last year at its annual meeting the ACA did express rather considerable doubt about it, but at any rate they continue having some belief in the present method. Are you aware of that subject?

A. Yes, I am. And there was a committee appointed to go into it and we ended up exactly where we were before and we are now carrying on with the Elliott-Haynes system. However, I am in favour of improving the system.

Q. I am simply speaking about method.

Mr. FLEMING: The witness should be allowed to answer the question.

Mr. BEAUDRY: I am sorry.

The WITNESS: I am not sold with the idea that this is the best way. I have argued for 2 or 3 years that I would rather have a less frequent survey and a much larger sample. But I do say that Elliott-Haynes can prove to me, and I think they can prove to your satisfaction as well, if given a chance, that their sample has reached a point of mathematical precision and that no matter how much larger the sample may be, the same percentages are arrived at. I would rather have a less frequent survey with a larger sample. They have attempted that and claimed that it produced the same results. I am not saying that these things are perfect. They are not supposed to be mathematically correct. They could go beyond the number of listeners, but they are interested in providing an accurate guide as to listener interest.

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. I agree with you to a certain extent, but I still have the thought that in a considerable number of minds, with respect to the subject of radio measurement, there is some doubt that these things are not as accurate as we sometimes contend they are. It is only incidental to the general discussion, but I do not think that we should use it as so definite a yardstick as sometimes we want to.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? If not, Mr. Sedgwick, I want to thank you for your presentation.

The WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen.

Mr. JOSEPH SEDGWICK: I have a word to say, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is only one word, it should only take a minute.

Mr. JOSEPH SEDGWICK: It is only a word, really.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now hear from Mr. Joseph Sedgwick, Q.C.

Joseph Sedgwick, Q.C., called.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am the brother of the last speaker, Mr. Harry Sedgwick. I am also a lawyer, and what I have to say is about a legal matter that I think might well interest this committee at this juncture. It arises from a comment that was made by Dr. McCann in the House on March 30, and I am looking at *Hansard* of that date at page 3393. I want to say at the outset that what I have to say is in no sense a criticism of what Dr. McCann said, and I am quite sure that what he did say was meant to be kindly to those interested in establshing television stations. In the view I take of the state of the Canadian Broadcasting Act it may not turn out to be as kindly as it was no doubt intentioned. The statement I draw to the attention of the committee is to be found at page 3393 of *Hansard* where Dr. McCann in discussing the ultimate objective of the C.B.C. was reported to have said: "For that reason licences granted for private stations in those provinces. . ."—he was talking about provinces where they may later go in— ". . . will contain a provision that before establishing a competing station, the C.B.C. will ascertain whether the area is likely to afford adequate financial support for two stations. If not, it may offer to purchase the private station at a fair and reasonable price rather than set up a new one."

Now, I repeat that this statement, I haven't the slightest doubt, was made to console those stations which may now be established and that later may be taken over by the C.B.C.; but the comment I want to make is that under the Canadian Broadcasting Act if the station is taken over by C.B.C. the corporation is limited by the statute to paying the depreciated physical value of the asset; and I would like to refer to section 11 and particularly subsections 4 and 5 which specifically provide—I am looking at section 4—where the minister has a right to cancel or refuse to renew licences and it says that compensation may be paid to the extent of—and these are the important words—"an amount not exceeding the depreciated value of the licensed radio equipment requisite for the efficient operation of the station together with a reasonable allowance to cover the cost of restoring the premises to a tenantable condition for ordinary purposes."

And the following subsection provides that "in determining the compensation. . ." —and that is in determining it by courts or by any method—" . . . no person shall be deemed to have any proprietary right in any channel heretofore or hereafter assigned, and no person shall be entitled to any compensation by reason of the cancellation of the assignment of a channel or by reason of the assignment of a new channel in substitution therefor."

That Act, of course, is now as it has been for seventeen years, and it may have been quite fair when we were considering AM stations that were then in operation. At the present tme, however, some seven TV licences have already been allotted, and I am creditably informed there are a number of other applications, and it is conceivable that at some time in the not too distant future the corporation may decide to take over some of these stations, and as I read the Act, in taking over those stations it will be limited to payment for the physical assets.

Now Dr. McCann made a very pertinent comment a moment or so ago when he said that those who embark on TV enterprises must contemplate two things: a considerable capital investment and an operating loss for a period which I hope will not be as long as the Doctor anticipates—he said four or five years; but at least I think we may say with some certainty that a station will be fortunate if it gets into black figures within two years.

Now, that, of course, has nothing to do with the physical assets. Let us suppose that a station with a large and competitive market should operate for two years and lose, as it could well lose, $300,000 or $400,000 or half a million dollars, and if at that juncture it should be taken over by the C.B.C., as I read the statute no compensation could be paid for the operating loss, but just the essential loss, and a loss that in all probability any station would make before the enterprise would stand on its own feet. I think there would be some initial loss in any event, and the suggestion that I should like to put to the committee, with great respect, is that section 11 (4) of the Broadcasting Act might be considered and that the committee might consider amending it in the light of this completely new situation, and while, as I have said to this committee before, I am not a drafter of statutes—it is a special art in the legal business and certainly is not my art—

The CHAIRMAN: I recall you gave me a draft at one time.

Mr. FLEMING: Doctor Ollivier is viewing this with a great deal of interest.

The WITNESS: I was one of the commissioners sitting on the Royal Commission on Revision of the Criminal Code, but I see that our work is somewhat criticized, so I don't pretend to be a draftsman. I suggest to the committee that they might consider that section, and the suggestion I put forward in all humility is that the words commencing with:

> an amount not exceeding the depreciated value of the licensed radio equipment requisite for the efficient operation of the station together with a reasonable allowance to cover the cost of restoring the premises to a tenantable condition for ordinary purposes.

that those words might be eliminated from the section and these words substituted: "a fair and reasonable value of the station expropriated." It would then permit the C.B.C. to pay to the owner of a station expropriated the fair and reasonable value, indeed the very thing that Doctor McCann has said they want to do, but, as I say, I think the statute as it now is might prevent them from paying it, and I suggest the statute might well be amended so as to permit the corporation to deal with an expropriated station, as Doctor McCann said, in a fair and reasonable way, a way they would want to deal with them. That is all, gentlemen. If there are any questions.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Why, then, under these circumstances, would we be receiving applications for private TV stations? You know, and every other applicant knows, what the broadcasting Act says, and yet we are still receiving applications for private TV licences, and I expect they will continue.—A. Mr. Goode, the point occurred to me, and may not have occurred to any other applicant, and you must remember we are incurable optimists in the radio business. We have been threatened with annihilation ever since the Aird Report in 1929, and like people who live on the side of a volcano, surprisingly, we survive, and I suppose the optimistic applicants feel they would survive in TV, also.

Q. Mr. Sedgwick, I am in favour of private TV, but I am still not naive enough to think that an application for a private TV station would come in to the government of Canada without that operator thinking, first of all, that he would make good money out of it. I am not fool enough to think that if you and your brother got a channel into Toronto, that that channel is not going to be worth ten times its value ten years from now, and I would suppose, and although I disagree with Doctor McCann on some points, I do agree with the statement he made at that time. Doctor McCann is a minister of the Crown and the air belongs to the people of Canada, and if I thought that the C.B.C. with cause, through the minister responsible to parliament,

thought that we should take over your station, even at a loss to you, it would not worry me a bit.—A. But it would worry me a lot, Mr. Goode, and it would worry my shareholders.

Hon. Mr. McCann: Mr. Sedgwick, whom I have known for many years, is very astute. Both he and his brother have appeared before radio committees for a great number of years. I have listened to them. As I say, they are very astute and the representations throughout the years which they have made to various committees have been very seriously considered, and I have always had great admiration for their opinions and their judgment. Mr. Sedgwick, the present witness, generally believes in the old fable or principle of taking time by the forelock. He is looking ahead a great many years. This is a condition which could not obtain within a number of years. Now that statement was very carefully prepared, and the first part of it was that we should ascertain whether or not that particular community could support two stations. Now, if by reason of yearly losses it became necessary, because of the fact that these losses and because of the fact that that station was not serving that community, and the C.B.C. determined that they would go into that community, they would first ascertain from that company whether they were able to carry on, whether or not they were sustaining losses, and if they chose to get out of the field, or if we proposed to get into that field in order to give that community better television service, we would take over their depreciated assets, and the point we want to make is the very point that is in the Broadcasting Act that they have not any vested right in the air channels of this country, and that they cannot, because of the thought that they have a vested right, think of that as an asset that is worth money, and as far as your losses are concerned, if it can be proven—this is my own personal opinion, not the opinion of the government—if it can be proven that through the years you have actually sustained a loss, then consideration could well be given as to whether or not in the purchase of that station, these losses would be taken into consideration.

The Witness: For my part I would be quite content to accept that assurance. Indeed when I first raised the matter in a letter to Mr. Dunton, I suggested to him it might be possible for you sir, as minister, to give some assurance such as the one you have given now.

Hon. Mr. McCann: I am not giving an assurance, I am giving a private personal opinion as a business man.

The Witness: I will take the comfortable thought that it is a measure of assurance, and I raise the question here so at least the committee may consider it. There is one thing I would like to make clear. Of course the air channels belong to the people, and must be used in the public interest, but it would I think frighten applicants for TV licences if they thought they might invest something like $3/4 million and lose the channel within a month or a year from now.

Hon. Mr. McCann: I have known you long enough Mr. Sedgwick, and I know you are following directly the same policy as you have followed for years. When we took over the CFRB you fought all the time for the propriety rights in that channel of the air on the basis that you should be paid money for that, and I fought tooth and nail against it, and when we took over your station and channel you were well compensated, not in money, but you got another good channel, and you have nothing to quarrel about over that.

Mr. Fleming: Who raised the point?

The Witness: I certainly do not intend to argue with you sir, but I do say this, and I think it only fair it should be said—not that I am the owner—

Hon. Mr. McCann: You are the advisor.

The WITNESS: I am a lawyer, but we had to take a very considerable risk, and be ready to spend $600,000 to go on that new channel. That was money which at that time we did not have, and we had to borrow, and have managed to work it out, but it was a great risk. Television is a great risk, and we did not know if this $¾ million we were willing to put into this new medium would ever come back. It is a chance we had to take.

Hon. Mr. McCANN: I just wish to say in conclusion that I am glad to have heard your point of view, and if further consideration is given to this matter, I will keep it in mind.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sedgwick, in the light of your remarks, you mentioned this committee might see fit to amend the Broadcasting Act. Of course you will realize that would not come within the terms of reference of this committee and Dr. McCann has stated that the committee will be very glad to give your representations on this legal matter our consideration. We thank you very much.

The WITNESS: Thank you sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, we have completed all the representations which we agreed to hear, and I think we have almost completed the work of the committee. There was a suggestion—not a request—but I think there were one or two suggestions during the course of our proceedings that we might hear some official from the Department of Transport. I think several members of the committee expressed a desire that Mr. Dunton might return next week. Is that the wish of the committee? First of all, is it your wish that we should hear a representative of the Department of Transport?

Mr. FLEMING: I think we should. We have always done so before and now it is particularly important in relation to these television channels and the issuance of licences for them. I think we ought to have an official and that he should bring to the committee, in order to save our time, because time is pretty short now, a statement of all the applications that have been filed and particulars of them, so that we can get at these things pretty quickly when he comes.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable to the committee?

Mr. GOODE: Is it not possible to have Mr. Dunton tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN: It would be impossible to hold a meeting tomorrow, Mr. Goode. Mr. Caton, I notice, has been following our proceedings very closely. He is here tonight and has heard the agreement reached by the committee. I imagine he would be able to have someone here from the Department of Transport, let us say, on Tuesday afternoon at 3.30. Is that agreeable?

Mr. GOODE: There are some who are leaving for the coast next week. Is it not possible for us to complete our work this week?

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot accommodate the wishes of the committee to those who wish to leave for the coast.

Mr. HANSELL: Is there any particular reason we cannot meet tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN: One reason, Mr. Hansell, is that both the chairman and the vice-chairman are going to be away.

Mr. GOODE: Yet you have said that the committee cannot accommodate those who wish to leave for the coast?

The CHAIRMAN: That is quite right. But may I point out that this committee has held seven meetings this week and I really think that we have done our duty in that respect.

Mr. FLEMING: Would it help Mr. Goode if we should meet on Monday afternoon?

Mr. GOODE: I am in the hands of the chairman, and he is responsible for knowing when we should meet, and I am not going to argue about it with him.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreeable that we meet on Tuesday next at 3.30 p.m., and hear someone from the Department of Transport, following which we shall hear from Mr. Dunton?

Agreed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Seventh Session—Twenty-first Parliament

1952-53

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. Robinson

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 11

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1953

FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1953

INCLUDING FOURTH REPORT TO THE HOUSE

and

1. List of documents filed with the Committee and appended to the fourth report.
2. List of witnesses.
3. List of appendices.

WITNESSES:

Mr. G. C. W. Browne, Controller of Telecommunications, Department of Transport; and Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1953

SPECIAL COMMITTEE
ON
BROADCASTING

Chairman: Mr. W. A. Robinson,

Vice-Chairman: Mr. Pierre Gauthier,
and Messrs.

Beaudry	Fleming	Knight
Boisvert	Fulton	MacLean (*Queens*)
Breton	Gauthier (*Sudbury*)	McCann
Carter	Goode	Richard (*Ottawa East*)
Courtemanche	Hansell	Riley
Decore	Henry	Smith (*Moose Mountain*)
Diefenbaker	Jones	Weaver
Dinsdale	Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*)	Whitman

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, May 5, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 4.00 o'clock p.m., this day. The Vice-Chairman, Mr. Pierre Gauthier, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Carter, Dindsdale, Fleming, Fulton, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Gauthier (*Sudbury*), Goode, Hansell, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Knight, Maclean (*Queens, P.E.I.*), Whitman, and Weaver.

In attendance: From the Department of Transport: Mr. G. C. W. Browne, Controller of Telecommunications, Mr. W. A. Caton, Chief Inspector of Radio; From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman, Board of Governors, Mr. J. A. Ouimet, General Manager, Mr. E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, G. R. Young, Director of Station Relations, Mr. R. E. Keddy, Secretary, Board of Governors, and Mr. J. A. Halbert, Assistant Secretary.

On a question of privilege, Mr. Boisvert asked that certain communications to Committee members, protesting the Brief of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association, be placed on the record.

Mr. Goode moved,—That communications from newspapers or organizations respecting the brief of the C.W.N.A. be placed on the record. (*See today's evidence*). Motion carried.

Agreed,—That a news release from Radio Station CJOR Vancouver, disassociating itself from the brief of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, be placed on the record. (*See Appendix "A" to this day's evidence*).

Mr. Browne was called.

The witness tabled a list of Broadcasting Stations in operation in Canada on April 1, 1953.

The witness presented a prepared statement, was questioned regarding the licensing of Broadcasting Stations, and retired.

Mr. Dunton was called, and submitted answers to questions asked at previous meetings by Mr. Fulton. (*See Appendices B, C and D to this day's evidence*).

The witness was further questioned and retired.

The examination of witnesses having been completed at 6.00 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

FRIDAY, May 8, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met *in camera* at 3.30 o'clock p.m. The Chairman, Mr. W. A. Robinson, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Carter, Dinsdale, Fleming, Fulton, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Hansell, Henry, Jones, Kirk (*Digby-Yarmouth*), Knight, Richard (*Ottawa East*), Riley, Robinson.

The Chairman presented a draft of the "Fourth Report to the House".

74601—1½

The Committee considered, and amended the above-mentioned report.

The Report as amended was adopted unanimously. (*For copy of Report see FOURTH REPORT to the House*).

The Chairman was instructed to submit the Report as amended to the House.

Members expressed their appreciation of the manner in which the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman conducted the meetings of the Committee.

The Chairman in turn thanked the Committee for its co-operation.

At 4.25 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned *sine die*.

E. W. INNES,
Clerk of the Committee.

REPORT TO THE HOUSE

SATURDAY, May 9, 1953.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting begs leave to present the following as its

FOURTH REPORT

1. Your Committee was appointed by resolution of the House of Commons on Friday, March 20, 1953, to consider the Annual Report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and to review the policies and aims of the Corporation and its regulations, revenues, expenditures and development.

2. In the course of its deliberations your Committee has held 19 meetings, including a visit to the Corporation's facilities in Toronto.

3. Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, outlined to your Committee the work of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and was examined thereon.

4. Submissions were presented by the following:
The Canadian Congress of Labour;
The Canadian Association of Broadcasters;
The Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association;
Radio Station CFRB, Toronto.

5. Written representations were received from various other persons and organizations.

6. Evidence was heard from Mr. G. C. W. Browne of the Department of Transport.

7. In accordance with an order of the House of Commons of April 22, 1953, your Committee gave consideration to Bill No. 340, An Act to Amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936, and agreed to report it without amendment, this having been the THIRD REPORT of your Committee and having been presented to the House on Wednesday, April 29, 1953.

8. Your Committee considered the annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the year 1951-52. It also examined C.B.C. officials regarding activities, policies, aims and development of the Corporation. It studied the revenues, expenditures and general finances of the Corporation for the year 1951-52, for the year 1952-53 as estimated, and as projected for 1953-54.

9. Your Committee was pleased to note evidence of general improvement in sound broadcasting programs during the past year. It is of the opinion that the Corporation should endeavour to maintain and still further improve and develop its sound broadcasting service. The extension of French language network service to Western Canada during the past year was a good development. The Committee noted with approval plans to improve coverage in several areas through the installation of more powerful transmitters. It recommends that the Corporation endeavour still further to provide for improved coverage in other outlying areas where national program service still cannot be heard adequately by listeners.

10. Your Committee considered the operations of the International Service. It also studied the estimates for the Service for the year 1953-54. It noted with approval the recent decision to add a Polish language service to the other European broadcasts. The Committee is of the opinion that the International Service is carrying out an important function particularly in view of the present international situation.

11. Your Committee was impressed by the developments in the television field since its last sittings in 1951. During the last 15 months, the C.B.C. has trained production staffs at two different centres and two stations have been put into operation. The meeting in Toronto brought home to the Committee the expense, organization, skill and equipment needed to produce live television programs. The complicated operation was carried on with evident efficiency by a staff which exhibited youth, vitality and good training.

Your Committee is convinced that television is going to play a very important part in Canadian life and that it must be developed in such a way so as to be of benefit to Canadians as individuals and to this nation as a whole. It should be a means of developing the human resources of Canada in talent, ideas and new abilities. While it should naturally make available to Canadians suitable programs from outside Canada, it must in our national interest have a basis of programs produced by Canadians for Canadians.

Your Committee is aware that production of adequate television programs in Canada is not easy from an economic point of view. It is also aware that the distribution nationally of such programs in this country is costly. It does believe that the twin objectives of adequate production of Canadian programs, and of nation-wide distribution of them to join the different parts of the country together and to serve the greatest possible number of Canadians, can best be met by the development as soon as possible of a national television system in which both the C.B.C. and privately owned stations play their part.

The Committee noted with approval plans for the development of C.B.C. production centres in Vancouver, Winnipeg, Halifax and Ottawa, as well as Toronto and Montreal, and for the development of a national program service serving both C.B.C. stations and the private stations to be established in other areas. The provision of the service of national programs to all private stations to be established should in itself assure at least a certain minimum Canadian content of programs on these stations, and should assist them in their operations. Through this form of "partnership" some national program service will be made available to many more Canadians through the privately owned stations, and at the same time privately owned stations will be assisted in their operations as well as having time for their own programming. In this way they will have a definite place in the national television system. The Committee trusts that both the C.B.C. and the private stations licensed will co-operate loyally in the challenging task of developing a nation-wide television service of which Canada can be proud.

12. The submissions made to your Committee, and which are noted above, produced the usual wide divergence of opinion on the important subjects of sound broadcasting and of television. Particular reference might perhaps be made to the submission of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters in view of the fact that the Committee devoted some time to a discussion of the views of the Association on the subject of regulation. The Committee detected a more reasonable approach to this subject than in former years in that the Association appeared to concede the necessity for regulation and co-ordination of broadcasting in Canada but suggested that such functions should be carried on by a "Separate Regulatory Body". The Committee was unable to study this subject with the care which it would appear to merit in the light of the continued interest which is expressed therein and which would be necessary in view of the concept of a national system with control vested in a single body responsible to Parliament, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

13. Any documents above referred to, as filed with the Clerk of the Committee, are tabled herewith.

14. A copy of the Committee's Minutes and Proceedings and Evidence is appended hereto.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

W. A. ROBINSON,
Chairman.

EVIDENCE

MAY 5, 1953.
3:30 p.m.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: We will come to order, gentlemen.

Mr. BOISVERT: On a question of privilege, I am aware that some protests were registered since our last meeting in relation to the brief presented by the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association. If I am in order and if the chairman knows about them I should like this committee to be informed of those protests.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I have here a telegram from the *Advocate* of Red Deer, Alberta, addressed to the chairman. I have also a letter from Mr. George Cadogan, Durham *Chronicle,* addressed to the Hon. Dr. McCann. And I have a letter from Mr. Allan King, Montreal and a letter from Mr. Loyal Davis, Toronto, 18, Ontario. Those are all documents of protest against the C.W.N.A. brief. I hope that the committee will allow the chairman to put them on the record or in the evidence.

Mr. GOODE: I so move.

Mr. KNIGHT: If we are going to have any discussion I think for the information of the committee we should hear the contents of some of these now. I have one here I would like to put on the record with your permission. I would like to read this telegram so that the members of the committee may know the contents of these telegrams. Merely putting them on the record would perhaps mean a week would pass before they were read.

Mr. GOODE: I wonder if this is the proper time to do it. I too wonder if we would encourage reaction to the C.C.L. brief if there would not be members of that organization who would be against it too. Would you assure me these letters and telegrams have not been asked for by some members of this committee? I am a little doubtful at this stage.

Mr. KNIGHT: I will assure Mr. Goode and the committee that this one was certainly not asked for.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: From what Mr. Robinson told me they were not asked for.

Mr. GOODE: I am going to object to this telegram being read.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): I do not think we can intelligently dispose of this matter whether it is in the record or not before knowing what the contents are.

Mr. HANSELL: I think Mr. Goode's point is well taken. I think we are perhaps creating a precedent and I fancy that these telegrams are based upon news reports rather than it being a case of the newspapers seeing the actual evidence or seeing the brief itself.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Meeting your point, Mr. Hansell, I must tell you those coming from the Durham *Chronicle* and the *Advocate* are certainly not coming from newspaper news reports because they saw a brief was presented in this committee and they sent telegrams of protests because they had not been consulted and they are part of the association. At least those two should be put on the record.

Mr. KNIGHT: This is as far as I know a telegram from one of the members of the organization and I should like permission to read it.

Mr. FLEMING: I suggest we have all these read into the record and if any member of any association differs from the presentation made in the name of his association to this committee I think that member of the association is perfectly entitled to inform the committee of that fact.

Is there a communication from Station CJOR, may I ask? I have what purports to be a press release from station CJOR in the west and I think that should go on the record.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Just the Durham *Chronicle* and *Advocate.*

Mr. FLEMING: I understand other members received the release too. That station divorced itself from the presentation made to us by the Canadian Association of Broadcasters in relation to television policy. I think this ought to go on the record too and I think it is only fair any member of an association we have heard should be permitted to give his views to the committee.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is the committee willing to put those letters and telegrams which come from the members of the association on the record?

Mr. GOODE: I wish it put on the record that I am against the reading of these documents.

Mr. HANSELL: The telegram should have been sent to the head of their organization.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I think it is proper to send it to the chairman of the Radio Broadcasting Committee since the brief has been directed to this committee.

Mr. FLEMING: We would all feel the same way if we were members of an association and did not agree with the views put forward by the association.

Mr. KNIGHT: Yes; and those put forward by an association that stated such views may not be those of all the members of the association and it is to back that up that I ask the committee to be permitted to put on the record this telegram which is along that line from a properly authenticated weekly newspaper in Canada.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are you agreed?

Mr. GOODE: I do not agree. If everybody who came before this committee had the same right then you would receive no objection from me. But that is not the case. I have nothing for or against the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association. I did not agree with some parts of their brief when they brought it here and I said so, but I see no reason why we should allow a half dozen people to submit to this committee their own personal views when we are not allowing or accepting any from anybody else. I would like to go to some of the members of the C.C.L. and see if they agree with the brief presented by the C.C.L., but they have not the right to come here and may not have the money to pay for the telegram.

Mr. HANSELL: The precedent is rather a dangerous one for this reason. Supposing you put these in and then supposing tomorrow you get 100 telegrams from those who do agree with it, are you going to put those in too?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: If the committee agrees.

Mr. KNIGHT: The organization has already sent in what purports to be a majority report, a majority report that expresses the views on one side of a question, and this is, shall I say, a minority opinion which should have a proper chance of representation.

Mr. GOODE: I know the gentleman that presented the brief to this committee said he did not represent all the views of the association and he answered many questions on the matter. There is no doubt in my mind that he did not represent all the people in his association and said so. Now we are going to put these communications on the record. What if these had

come tomorrow after we have had our last meeting? What about someone else who may want to present something to this committee after it has completed its sessions. Are you going to let them come in then?

Mr. KNIGHT: I think it is well recognized when this committee meets. This committee has been meeting and anybody who has had any representations to make has had an opportunity to make them, and is not going to make them ten days from now, but is going to send them now when the committee is in session.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready to make its decision? Those in favour of these communications being put on the record.

Mr. GOODE: I do not think it is necessary to vote. At least I am not going to vote on it.

Mr. KNIGHT: Why oppose it if you do not want to vote?

Mr. GOODE: My views are on the record.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Those in favour of putting these documents in the record, please signify.

I declare the motion carried.

Mr. FLEMING: That includes the one I mentioned, the one I received from Station CJOR?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Yes. (See Appendix "A").

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Vice-Chairman, that's the first time I have been on the winning side of this committee since we elected the chairman and the vice-chairman.

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Chairman, should I proceed to read this telegram now? I might finish up this one and have it on the record here.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: It is the same telegram we all received. I have a similar one here addressed to the Chairman. Do you want to put it in as an appendix?

Mr. KNIGHT: I asked permission to put in this one and I would like to stay with that provision.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, then.

Mr. KNIGHT: This is a telegram from Red Deer, Alberta, from the Red Deer *Advocate*, published in Red Deer, Alberta:

> Vicious and unwarranted attack on C.B.C. by C.W.N.A. Directors does not express weekly news paper view.
>
> We believe C.B.C. doing excellent job under extraordinarily difficult conditions. We and others deeply regret action of C.W.N.A. Directors.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, before we go any further, I understand that the editor of that newspaper was a former C.C.F. candidate. Is that true?

Mr. KNIGHT: I never heard of it. I do not even know the man's name, or anything about him.

Mr. HANSELL: I can answer Mr. Goode's question if you want it answered, Mr. Chairman. Yes, he was a former C.C.F. candidate.

Mr. KNIGHT: Former? What is he now?

Mr GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): Like all other ex-C.C.F. candidates.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Browne of the Department of Transport is with us today and he will be our first witness.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Chairman, have you any other telegrams to be read now?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: The other telegrams are exactly the same as Mr. Knight's telegram.

Mr. JONES: Well, some of the others must be different.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: There is just one other. They are on the record. You will be able to read them on the record, where it will be printed as an appendix.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): Mr. Chairman, would you object to reading that letter you have in your hand?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I have no objection, no. This is a letter from The Durham Chronicle, Durham, Ontario, and dated May 1, 1953:

> Hon. Mr. McCann,
> Revenue Minister,
> Ottawa, Canada.
> Dear Mr. McCann:
>
> This is a note to say that as a member of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers' Association I do not wish to have my name associated with the brief on the C.B.C. as presented to the parliamentary Radio Committee.
>
> I might add that all I know of the brief was what I read in a newspaper this morning. The subject was not discussed at the last annual convention and certainly the members were not consulted.
>
> As far as I know, no member of C.W.N.A. (with the exception of those on the executive) has seen a copy of the brief.
>
> At the 1952 convention at St. Andrews by the Sea, the C.B.C. kindly sent a choral group from Halifax to entertain the C.W.N.A. members. While I do not have a copy of the proceedings, I am sure the C.B.C. was thanked by the C.W.N.A.
>
> And I have always understood members of C.W.N.A. were on friendly terms with the C.B.C. Neighborly News commentators.
>
> I expect there will be some discussion on this at the next C.W.N.A. convention to be held in Saskatoon.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> GEORGE CADOGAN,
> *The Durham Chronicle.*
>
> P.S.—This letter is addressed to you because I noted your name used in the report.

Mr. FLEMING: Does that mean that the C.B.C. has entertained the directors of the C.W.N.A. for the last time?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: The letter says: "At the 1952 convention at St. Andrews by the Sea, the C.B.C. kindly sent a choral group from Halifax to entertain the C.W.N.A. members."

Gentlemen, now we will proceed with Mr. Browne, and hear his statement.

Mr. G. C. W. Browne, Controller of Telecommunications, Department of Transport, called:

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Browne, I think Mr. Fleming asked that you to be here.

Mr. FLEMING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I suggested Mr. Browne should prepare a statement for us concerning the applications for television channels which have been received by the Department of Transport and describing what action has been taken on them, going back to the beginning.

The WITNESS: I have followed the proceedings of the previous meetings of the committee and, based on remarks contained in those proceedings, I have prepared this statement. It is not a very long one and perhaps I should read it, with your permission.

Mr. FLEMING: We won't have the opportunity, Mr. Browne, of asking you the time-honoured question about the collection of the $2.50 licence fee this time.

The WITNESS: I did not prepare any statement on that.

Mr. FLEMING: That is a closed book.

The WITNESS: But I have a total figure for the revenue to date, from last year's licence fee collections in case the committee should be interested. The books are not closed yet. The returns are still coming in as of the 31st March, and our books will not be closed, I would think, for another month or so. I have a total figure which is sufficiently close, though, as to what may be expected to be received.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Browne. You may now proceed.

The WITNESS: At the committees on radio broadcasting from year to year we have submitted lists of broadcasting stations, applications for broadcasting station licences, changes in operations of stations, etc., which constitute a continuous record of broadcasting development in Canada. Such information was given to the special committee on radio broadcasting of 1951, and the lists were printed as appendix IV on page 375, No. 8 of the minutes of proceedings, and as appendix I to No. 9 of the minutes of proceedings, page 443; the latter list dealing specifically with applications received for television broadcasting station licences and the disposition thereof.

The document that I am now tabling gives lists of Canadian broadcasting stations as of April 1, 1953, together with appendices indicating changes which have taken place since November 13, 1951, and up to April 30, 1953. This document includes information pertaining to television stations licensed and on the air, as well as a list of those authorized to establish television stations.

In my evidence before the 1951 committee, page 345, I outlined the policy, in effect at that time, to withhold the issuance of all classes of broadcasting station licences because of shortages of vital materials. This policy came into effect on February 7, 1951, and was continued until lifted by a release of January 2, 1953. During this period enquiries and application forms were received from prospective licensees, advising of their intention to seek a licence. However, in each case they were informed that the department was not then prepared to accept applications because of the critical material shortage. The names of all those concerned were recorded, and early in January, 1953, application forms were sent to over 60 prospective applicants for television broadcasting station licenses representing some 35 different areas.

Since the lifting of the restrictions, 81 applications for sound broadcasting stations and 72 for television broadcasting stations have been sent out in answer to requests. While some advice has been received from a number of those who were sent forms, only 15 complete applications for television broadcasting station licences, and 7 complete applications for sound broadcasting station licences have been received in the department, to date.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. To date? Does that include today, because I have information that one was received today. Is that correct?—A. I have no record of an application having been received today.

Q. Or yesterday?—A. I do not recall an application yesterday.

Q. My information was that one was received from my own city either today or yesterday on behalf of a newspaper there.—A. That is form?

Q. The Sifton press people in Saskatoon—for the *Star-Phoenix*.—A. That was received last week.

Q. It is included in this number?—A. It is included.

Of this number, 8 applications for television licences were sent to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and were dealt with at the March-1953 meeting of the board of governors. There were also 44 "sound" broadcasting applications sent to the board at the same time. The remaining complete applications (7 TV and 3 sound) have been sent by the department to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for consideration of recommendations at the forthcoming meeting of the board.

At this juncture, I wish to point out that an application for a private commercial broadcasting station includes a fully completed basic application form, and associated with this form are certain appendices with respect to the financial capabilities of the applicant, personnel connected with the enterprise, and a technical brief prepared by a radio engineering consultant with respect to the selection of a frequency, power, etc. While such technical briefs are received from time to time direct from the radio engineering consultants, these briefs do not, in themselves, constitute an application and cannot be dealt with until all of the official forms are received complete.

I now turn to the matter of licensing policy in respect to television, and would refer to my evidence before the special committee on radio broadcasting of the 1950 session of the House of Commons.

In No. 9 of the minutes of proceedings, pages 416 to 419, will be found quotations from recommendations of the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation which had received the approval of the Minister of Transport. From that time we move forward to the announcement of the Minister of National Revenue in the House of Commons on December 8, 1952—"The government will now be ready to receive applications for licences for private stations to serve areas not now served or to be served by the publicly owned facilities already announced"; and that "No two stations will be licensed at the present time to serve the same area"; and, further "It is desirable to have one station in as many areas as possible before there are two in any one area."

Pursuant to this announcement and to the statement that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation would establish stations, in addition to Montreal and Toronto, in Vancouver, Ottawa, Winnipeg and Halifax, our engineers, in consultation with those of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, carried out a study of possible locations of stations using the six C.B.C. assignments as a framework and using as a basis for possible coverage maximum power and effective antenna height of 500 feet above average terrain, unless exceptions were necessary. It was, however, definitely understood that maximum power was not necessarily mandatory and that the plan would be subject to re-valuation to achieve the objective of serving as many Canadians as possible. Another condition of this basic plan was that in order to conform with government policy and to cover as wide a population area as possible without overlapping the first-class or "A" coverage of a television broadcasting station should not overlap and that the secondary or "B" coverage overlap be reduced to a minimum.

A meeting of the professional engineering consultants was held on February 9, 1953, and the plan was explained in detail, in order to facilitate in every way possible the preparation of applications for TV licences to come before the C.B.C. No applications, however, were to be accepted for stations to be established in the areas to be served by stations of the C.B.C. Reference in this connection has been made in the committee to the Hamilton area, and I wish to review this situation briefly at this point. When an assignment in the Hamilton area was being considered, a television station was already in opera-

tion in Toronto. In addition, a station was proposed for London, Ontario, which, because of its central location, would require a somewhat circular pattern to render the best possible service under the single coverage plan. The district between the service areas of the Toronto and proposed London stations would not have been covered, and in order to get the best possible service out of a single television assignment in that area, a directional antenna was indicated if the station were to be located relatively close to Hamilton.

Completed applications for other centres within this area would, however, have been considered if they had been received at that time, and, as a matter of fact, it is my understanding that certain prospective applicants in the area made representations to the March meeting of the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in this respect.

Back in 1947, when our continuing study of the television problem had reached the point where possibilities of frequency assignments for Canadian stations in cities close to the border were under consideration, and when the United States were going ahead with their initial post-war plans, we approached the Federal Communications Commission in the United States with the object of co-ordinating assignments along the border, in order to prevent interference and to ensure that Canada would have a fair share of the frequency spectrum. Initial correspondence resulted in a meeting held in February, 1948, in Washington. The purpose of this meeting was the drafting of an allocation plan for the assignment of V.H.F. television channels along the Canada-United States border. This first provisional plan was predicated on the best technical information available at that time, but the engineers who conducted the technical negotiations were not altogether satisfied with the geographical separations between stations sharing the same channels as provided for in the plan. The Federal Communications Commission agreed to investigate these technical aspects at greater length and initiated a series of television hearings. In the meantime, the draft plan served to establish Canada's position with regard to future television allocations.

In June 1949, a further meeting was held in Washington to discuss television channel allocations and the original draft plan was reviewed in the light of current technical knowledge. Consideration was given at that time to the allocation of ultra-high frequencies to augment the very limited number of very high frequency television channels. Although this meeting produced a revised plan, it was generally felt that this plan was merely an interim document subject to review when the status of the art had been better established.

Further studies were carried out, and in March 1951 a meeting was held in Ottawa, and a plan drafted for both V.H.F. and U.H.F. which appeared to be consistent with the best technical information available.

Another meeting was held in Chicago—March 31, and April 1, 1952—for the purpose of correlating the conclusions reached by the Federal Communications Commission as a result of their findings with the requirements of Canada for television service.

It should be noted that this plan was not a complete allocation scheme for Canada, but only covered the area within 250 miles of the United States border. It did, however, form the nucleus of a more complete plan which it has since become possible to develop in accordance with government policy. An important aspect of this agreement was the assurance it afforded that future Canadian assignments would be fully protected and there would be no encroachment of United States stations on the Canadian services areas under the plan. The formal agreement was consummated by exchange of notes through the diplomatic channels and became effective June 23, 1952.

It has been noted that the geographical separations in Canada between stations on the same and adjacent channels are somewaht greater than the

corresponding separations in the United States. The reason for these differences is the fact that Canadian metropolitan centres are generally much farther apart and consequently many of the rural areas will obtain only fringe service, and it was felt that by keeping inter-station interference to an absolute minimum this fringe service could be made much more useful. Furthermore, it was felt to be doubtful if, due to the much smaller population, Canadian economics could stand the strain of establishing and operating the large number of TV stations contemplated in the United States planning for that country. It, therefore, appeared logical to arrange for the maximum possible exploitation of each Canadian assignment by keeping the geographical separations as wide as possible.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Browne. Are there any questions? Mr. Hansell?

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. On page 1, in the second paragraph it reads:

The document that I am now tabling gives lists of Canadian Broadcasting Stations as of April 1, 1953, together with appendices indicating changes which have taken place since November 13, 1951, and up to April 30, 1953. This document includes information pertaining to television stations licensed and on the air, as well as a list of those authorized to establish television stations.

I cannot find such a list in the brief.—A. Which list?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: What list do you want?

Mr. HANSELL: The list which is referred to here, the list of those who are authorized to establish television stations.

The WITNESS: After the yellow spacing sheet, Mr. Hansell, I think you will find it.

Mr. HANSELL: On what page?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: It is an appendix.

The WITNESS: It is appendix No. 6.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Appendix 6, after page 42.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. I have it now. May I ask if these are licences which have already been granted?—A. They are licences that have been authorized by order in council but the actual licences have not yet been granted because it is necessary to complete further technical details in connection with the applications.

Q. Could you tell me whether any applications have been made for television stations in Alberta?—A. Yes, Mr. Hansell, I believe I have that information. There have been applications received from Alberta to be considered at the next meeting of the Board of Governors of the C.B.C. as follows: There is one from Calgary Television Limited, which is an amalgamation of stations CFAC, CFCN, and CKXL, for the purposes of this television enterprise.

Q. Do I understand that if an application is granted, the station will be operated jointly by these 3 stations?—A. That is correct. The company will be formed in the name of Calgary Television Limited.

Then there is an application from Edmonton Television Limited, with which are associated the present stations CJCA, and HM Sibbald.

There is also an application from Edmonton, from Sunwapta Broadcasting Company Limited, which I believe is station CFRN.

Mr. KNIGHT: Will that list be on the record, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HANSELL: It is on the record now.

Mr. KNIGHT: I mean the list.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is it agreeable that the whole list be put on the record?

Mr. FLEMING: You mean the total list?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: No, the list which Mr. Browne has of station applications.

Mr. FLEMING: Oh yes. We certainly should have that. I was hoping it would be in the brief, but it is not in the brief.

The WITNESS: No.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Could it be put in the record?

The WITNESS: I might explain that I can put it in the record, yes, but I would like to make it clear that if I put this in the record, it is a list of complete applications for new broadcasting station licences received in the department since the lifting of the freeze.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. There are more applications to date, are there?—A. If I may interrupt, this list includes the applications already approved by order in council upon recommendation of the board at its last meeting.

Q. In addition to this list, there are applications which have been made but which have not yet reached the stage where the Department of Transport can pass them on to the Board of Governors of the C.B.C.?—A. Not in this list, no.

Q. But there are, outside of that list?—A. There are other applications in process of development, so to speak. There are applications in which engineering briefs have been received but no formal application as to the particulars of the applicants' financial background and so on, and vice versa.

Q. That is, from Alberta, that you are now talking about?—A. From Alberta.

Mr. FLEMING: Why not read the list, if you have it?

Mr. HANSELL: I do not want a list of those that have not been passed on because it might prejudice cases a little bit.

Mr. FLEMING: How could it prejudice them, if they have been completed as far as the Department of Transport is concerned?

Mr. HANSELL: I mean the ones that are not yet completed.

Mr. FLEMING: Oh, I beg your pardon.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not want you to read the names.

The WITNESS: I can file this list.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I would like to have the list read of those that are completed.—A. The list of applications completed?

Q. Yes.—A. I would be glad to read it, if it is all right to do so, Mr. Chairman.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Very well. It is agreed.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not think I have received an answer yet to my other question. Are there applications?

Th WITNESS: To save time, shall I read you the list of stations already authorized by order in council?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: It is agreed, or do you want the whole list to be put in?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Is it different from that shown in the table?—A. I was going to leave this out.

Q. Appendix No. 6 lists only applications, according to the title.—A. That is a suggestion of my own. It is in that category.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: It is agreed. Please go ahead.

The WITNESS: Lower St. Lawrence Radio Incorporated, CJBR, Rimouski, P.Q.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Can you indicate which are English-speaking and which are French-speaking, or is that part of the information which you require in connection with an application? That Rimouski one, I take it, would be French-speaking? —A. I am not sure whether it is a requirement of the C.B.C. form of application.

Mr. DUNTON: We would find out before making a recommendation regarding it.

Mr. FLEMING: I would think that the Rimouski one would be a French language station. Do you happen to have that information?

The WITNESS: Not without looking at the applications. I do not think that the indication of whether it is English speaking or French speaking is a requirement which has to be put in.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Please proceed, Mr. Browne.

The WITNESS: Central Ontario Television Limited, Kitchener. Trans-Canada Communications Limited—I have a note which says CKCK Regina. Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix,* Saskatoon. Calgary Television Limited, Calgary; Edmonton Television Limited, Edmonton. William Rea Jr., Edmonton. Sunwapta Broadcasting Company Limited, Edmonton. That completes the television applications. I have some for sound broadcasting. I do not know whether you want to include those.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I would like to discuss this television licence business for a moment. I would like to know something, Mr. Browne, about British Columbia. We have evidence before this committee that a completed application has been in your hands for some years from station CKNW, New Westminster. What is the status of that application at the moment?—A. My recollection of that is that there was an application. I do not know whether it was a complete application some years ago. I recall that there was an application. There was a further inquiry about the application from New Westminster and I believe that the applicant was informed that in view of the established government policy of today that the application could not be considered further from New Westminster.

Q. May I ask you this: It says on page 1 of your brief near the end of the third paragraph: "The names of all those concerned were recorded and early in January, 1953, application forms were sent to over 60 prospective applicants for television broadcasting station licences representing some 35 different areas." Were any applications sent to British Columbia?—A. There were nine.

Q. Would you mind telling me who those nine were?—A. G. G. Moore, Dawson Creek Radio Station; CJDC, Dawson Creek, B.C. Limited; Kamloops Sentinel; News Publishing Company Limited, Nelson, B.C.; CKOK Limited Penticton, B.C.; William Rae Junior, CKNW, location being given as Vancouver Island; The Interior Broadcasters Limited, CJIB Vernon; S. P. Cromie, Vice president, Vancouver Sun, Victoria; and David M. Armstrong, CKDA, Victoria.

Q. I am going down your brief and I am not going to take very long. On page 2 it talks about, in the second paragraph, the "financial capabilities of the applicant, personnel connected with the enterprise, and a technical brief

prepared by a radio engineering consultant with respect to the selection of a frequency, power, etc." Have you ever had an application from British Columbia with all those particulars attached?—A. According to my records, Mr. Goode, the answer would have to be "no".

Q. And then on page 3 in the second paragraph: "A meeting of the professional engineering consultants was held on February 9, 1953, and the plan was explained in detail". Who are these engineering consultants and are there any from British Columbia?—A. These radio engineering consultants are professional radio engineers who specialize, among other things, in the preparation of briefs which are required in connection with these applications to satisfy the department, and are approved by the department as to their engineering capabilities.

Q. Are they civil servants?—A. No.

Q. How many of them are there? What I am interested in more than anything else is is there an engineer from British Columbia in the group?—A. There is not.

Q. Can you tell me why?—A. I presume, we have had no applications from the engineering fraternity or profession to work for the department in this capacity.

Q. It seems strange to me—I must not make a statement—that if you are taking the advice of a panel of professional engineers and television consultants —that a very important province like British Columbia has not a member on the panel.—A. We have not a panel as such.

Q. Have you any information about the power of United States stations close to the border? Does the United States Power Commission or whoever is in charge of this on the other side have to notify Canadian authorities in regard to change in power?—A. Yes. They inform us. If you are speaking of the television agreement, the agreement requires that we notify each other of all assignments.

Q. Have you any information regarding Seattle or Portland, Oregon, with respect to an increase in power to one of their television stations?—A. We would probably have that in our records.

Q. Have you anyone here who could tell you whether there was a notification of an increase in power?—A. We can have it looked up.

Q. Let me say this: We have knowledge in British Columbia that one of the stations, either Seattle or Portland, will increase power considerably in the next few months. If that is true what would be the effect of television over channels 2, 6 and 10 in British Columbia? Maybe I can pin point that further. If CBC televises as they have assured me they are going to do this fall in British Columbia, should Seattle or Portland increase their power four times would that have any effect on the C.B.C. channel in Vancouver?—A. It should not. The agreement provides for maximum power. There are three categories. VHF is split into two parts; one half of VHF is one maximum power, the upper half of VHF has a higher maximum; and the whole of the VHF band has a still higher maximum. It is predicated on maximum power on any of those channels.

Q. Station KING Seattle, I think, is on channel 5. What effect would that have on channel 6 operating on the lower mainland of British Columbia under lower power?—A. The same conditions would apply; that there is a certain minimum separation for adjacent channels which I think is 60 miles and the maximum power may be used in each case also.

Q. You know that Seattle is being received rather well in Vancouver at certain times?—A. Yes, I have seen it.

Q. Evidence has been given to this committee that should increased power be given the Seattle station—a large increase in power which I think has been

authorized—that it would affect channel 6 in Victoria. That is the evidence which came to us by a person who is supposed to be an expert.—A. I can only say the treaty was predicated on the use of maximum power in every case.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Is it not a matter of the International Convention? The American border stations—if we want to call them that—are only allowed to increase their power by reason of the International Agreement that has been signed?—A. Do you mean the Bilateral Television Agreement or the broader international agreement?

Q. I do not know the difference between the agreements, but they could not go outside of any agreement they have reached with Canada?—A. Oh, no.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I am very interested in this licence proposition. If I read the information correctly a completed application has to come to the Transport Department and then is sent on to C.B.C. It that right?—A. Yes. The Canadian Broadcasting Act requires that.

Q. When it comes to the Department of Transport what happens to it there is you either approve or disapprove?—A. It is examined by the engineers and other officials and checked to determine whether it is complete in every particular.

Q. Has the department power to say this licence will not be considered any further?

Q. Have you the power to do that? Has that ever been done?—A. No, it has never been done. That is why I am hesitating in answering your questions.

Q. But you have the power to do it?—A. I imagine so. I imagine that the minister could say under the Act, "I am not prepared to deal with this application", but it has never occurred.

Q. You are not quite sure of that, Mr. Browne?—A. We have refused licences for other classes of stations, point-to-point communications, because there were existing wire facilities in a given area, and the granting of point-to-point licences would duplicate the wire facilities. In that case we refused licences.

Q. Then it would be fair to say that actually the C.B.C. has the granting or disapproval of private television licences. That would be a fair statement?—A. No, the C.B.C. has the power to recommend to the minister.

Q. But if the C.B.C. did not recommend it to the minister, the minister would not grant it, and if the C.B.C. did recommend it, it is most likely the minister would grant it.—A. I do not know what the minister would do if the C.B.C. did not recommend it, because we never had a case of that kind at all.

Q. Do you have the power to recommend to the C.B.C. what they should do with an application for a private television licence?—A. The statute says that the minister shall, before dealing with any application for a new station, refer the said application to the C.B.C. for a recommendation.

Q. That just proves what I said, that the C.B.C. has the final say as to whether a private television licence will be granted or not.—A. No, I think the government has the fnal say, because if the C.B.C. does recommend to the minister the granting of the licence, then the minister must take it up with the cabinet and the licence is finally granted by the Governor in Council, which has the final authority.

Q. Have you ever known of the C.B.C. approving a licence that the minister disapproved of?—A. I would not like to answer that question without checking the record.

Q. But I think it can be agreed that the C.B.C. will grant applications for private licences or will disapprove of them, and the minister will go along with that decision.

Mr. HANSELL: Do I understand the function of the Department of Transport in respect to licensing television and radio is that they see that all the forms involved in the application meet the requirements of the law, and after having seen to that, then you pass the application over to the Board of Governors for their recommendations, as to whether it should be granted or not, and they will recommend one way or the other, and then the government by order in council will accept or reject the recommendation of the Board of Governors. That is about the process?

The WITNESS: That is substantially correct.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Mr. JONES: You do not pass on the capitalization of the company? You have nothing to do with that, as to whether they are financially able to carry out the project?

The WITNESS: The financial officers of the department satisfy themselves as to the soundness of the proposal.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. I would like to ask the witness, Mr. Chairman, what is the minimum distance between television stations on the same band in the United States? We had the opinion expressed that it was greater in Canada than in the United States.—A. There is a scale of distances, if I may put it that way. When the freeze to which I referred—not the freeze in Canada on account of the material shortages, but the freeze which was establisehd in the early days of television on account of the discovery that the separations which the United States had decided on for their stations was inadequate—when the freeze was put on in the United States, there were 108 stations in operation, most of them in the east, and the United States, we feel, from our experience and discussions with them, would have been very glad to increase that separation in the east, but they just were not able to do it. The stations were in operation and it would have cost a termendous amount to realign the whole set-up, and for that reason, and I believe for that reason only, they had to stick to their 170 miles, but in the west their separations are greater, they are of the order of 190 miles, and in the south, where there are still fewer stations, they were able to separate them by 220 miles, and the 220-mile figure is the one we have aimed at, approximately 220 miles. In fact, we have laid down greater separations where it is possible to do it in planning the Canadian scheme.

Q. That leads to another question which I really had in mind. What is the position when there are two applications for licences on the same frequency, one on each side of the border? Supposing there is, shall we say, a station on a certain channel which is perhaps 70 miles from the border, and a Canadian makes an application for a station on the same band that is, well, for the sake of argument, 190 miles from the American station. How does that work out?—A. We have adopted the 220-mile separation as far as possible in trans-border allocations—distances, I should say.

Q. And the United States go along with that, too, do they, or is it the other way round?—A. The agreement provides for a separation of approximately 220 miles between the allocations in both countries.

Q. There is no danger of an American station being set up 190 miles from the Canadian one on the same band?—A. No, and there is no provision under the treaty requiring the stations on each side to be established within a certain time limit. The protection is there for potential stations as well as existing ones.

Q. Now, one more question, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Browne, you have to grant licences, I presume, and approve all these transmitter stations operating on microwave relays?—A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Is there any congestion in the available bands as between these microwave relays that are used primarily for television transmission and which are used primarily for other purposes?—A. No, there is no conflict there because the microwave system which will be used for television will accommodate, in addition, several channels for other purposes, telephone and telegraph. In fact, some of the networks are carrying hundreds of telephone conversations simultaneously with television.

Mr. DINSDALE: With regard to the applications for TV stations, I can see that the C.B.C. is following up the policy now of making it possible to extend TV service to the less populated communities. Now, in that regard, what communities such as the one I represent, Brandon, with a relatively small population, have applied for TV privileges? What facilities will be available by way of programming should permission be granted to CKX, Brandon, to operate a TV station? Is it possible to comment on that?

The WITNESS: I believe that is a question for the C.B.C., Mr. Chairman.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dunton will answer later.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Coming back to a question that perhaps Mr. Browne can answer. There would be no impediment placed in the way of an application such as that because of lack of immediate programming facilities? Your viewpoint would be one strictly of technical factors, and financial ability?—A. That is correct.

Q. But you would not take into consideration the problem of development?—A. No, that does not come within our purview.

Q. Can we go back to the question of applications for broadcasting?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I think you can.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Sometime ago the station CKDM—that is its call sign—applied for a power increase. I am wondering if that was granted. At the time of the application, there was a hold up due to material shortages. I have not been in touch with the problem recently, but I was wondering what the present situation is with regard to an application for power increases.—A. We can have that looked up in the record.

Q. It is still listed in the book, I notice, as 250 watts.—A. I can tell you this Mr. Dinsdale, that we did notify everybody after the freeze was lifted. Everybody who had any applications outstanding for licences for a new station or for an increase in power, were notified that the freeze had been lifted, and that an application was then in order, and we have not heard from that station since, according to the best information I have at the moment.

Q. Just one more question Mr. Browne. The other day one of the witnesses appearing before the committee referred to the problem of colour compatibilities as having held up the establishment of TV policy. I always understood it was a material shortage that was the cause of the delay. Would you say that colour compatibility entered into the difficulties?—A. I think it did

to a large extent, because a system which was incompatible was approved some years ago, and it involved a mechanical device which would have been very cumbersome, and it was not very popular at the time, and I think it died a natural death about the same time as the freeze was set down in both countries.

Q. The basic difficulty was material shortages?—A. It was, yes.

Mr. HANSELL: I was just going to say Mr. Chairman, that I believe Mr. Dinsdale's conception of that is incorrect. My understanding is that that evidence which was submitted then was not to the effect that the colour television was held up, but rather that the government's decision in broadening the scope of licensing was held up because they were not certain of the effects of colour television on future policy.

Mr. DINSDALE: Yes, that was my understanding too.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. On page one of your statement, at the bottom of the page you say "since the lifting of the restrictions". What date have you in mind?—A. I believe it was made about the new year—about the turn of the year.

Q. Are you referring now to the lifting of the restrictions on materials, or restrictions dictated by government policy with respect to licensing TV stations?—A. I think they were practically simultaneous.

Q. Which one did you have in mind?—A. I had in mind here restrictions on materials.

Q. I see. Now, would you tell me what is the status of the incomplete applications with respect to the areas that are to be served by the stations which the C.B.C. has built or is building, that is Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa, Halifax, Winnipeg and Vancouver.—A. We have advised applicants in these areas that we are not in a position to deal with applications from these areas at the present time in view of government policy.

Q. I take it then applications that you have for private stations in those areas are broadly speaking applications on the files of the department, and have been there in some form or another for a long time.—A. Yes. These are the only ones we have. We have not accepted any recent ones.

Q. Can you tell me then what they are doing in these six areas? Let us begin with Montreal.—A. I have not information readily available, but I can have a statement prepared on that.

Q. Can you answer no questions about it at all?—A. I did not come prepared, because I did not think we would be dealing with ones back in the file. In any case, the engineering briefs which were prepared at that time would be obsolescent now.

Q. I appreciate that, but I wanted to know what is the position of these various applications on your departmental records. Some of them have been held back for a number of years.—A. Yes.

Q. And no doubt at various stages, so that the technical requirements differ with respect to the information required to be furnished by applicants. I would like to have the information covering all applications, at whatever stage they may be, or however incomplete, according to your present standards, on file in any respect from any of these six areas.—A. I am afraid we will have to prepare a statement on that, because we will have to refer to the dormant files.

Q. Are you in a position to tell me if there are any with respect to the Ottawa area.—A. I cannot say from memory.

Q. You do know there were such applications with respect to the Montreal area?—A. I recall there were one or two from the Montreal and the Toronto areas, and I think it was the recommendation of the board at that time that they get together in a joint effort, in which case—

Q. I think that was a question that goes back some years.—A. Yes.

Q. That was a variation of policy that took the name of co-operative policy at that time, was it not, and it did not produce much fruit. But, if you are not in a position to answer with respect to any of the other areas we will have to leave it until we have the statement, and that will include the Vancouver area which will cover an application from New Westminster which has been pending for a number of years.—A. Yes, if it were completed at that time, which I do not recall.

Q. So that there will not be any misunderstanding, my understanding is that a lot of these applications would not necessarily be regarded as complete according to present standards.—A. No.

Q. Even if completed at that time, they would still have to have the technical brief brought up-to-date.—A. Yes, standards have been altered, and in many cases there have been changes in the frequencies which were available for these areas.

Q. Can you prepare such a statement Mr. Browne, please.?—A. We will do that.

By Mr. MacLean:

Q. From the information you have, can you say if—there are two private licences already granted, one in Sydney and one in Saint John, N.B.—there are any other incomplete or complete applications in from the four Atlantic provinces, and if so, I would like to have an idea of the number of provinces including Newfoundland and the Maritimes.—A. There is one incomplete application for Prince Edward Island, one from New Brunswick, and one incomplete from Nova Scotia.

Q. What about Newfoundland?—A. There is none from Newfoundland.

Q. There are no licences granted in Newfoundland yet?—A. No.

Q. To either private operators or to the C.B.C.?—A. No.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are we through with the questioning, gentlemen? If so, we thank you, Mr. Browne, for your co-operation and we shall now ask Mr. Dunton to come forward.

Mr. FLEMING: How long will it take you, Mr. Browne, to prepare that statement I asked for?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Sudbury*): Until August.

Mr. FLEMING: August 10, I think.

The WITNESS: I shall try to have it some time tomorrow, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, if this should be our last meeting, I understand that that list will go in as part of today's proceedings of this committee?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

Agreed.

The WITNESS: The statement is as follows:

LISTS OF PERSONS, COMPANIES, ETC , IN CORRESPONDENCE WITH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT REGARDING ESTABLISHMENT OF TELEVISION BROADCASTING STATIONS IN THE AREAS OF HALIFAX, MONTREAL, OTTAWA TORONTO, WINNIPEG AND VANCOUVER, DECEMBER 7, 1951 TO DATE (NOTE: This information is supplementary to the list published as Appendix 1 to the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence No 9 of the Special Committee on Radio Broadcasting 1951)

Date and Nature of Incoming Correspondence	Name of Correspondent	Action by Department
21. 9.51 Engineering Brief for T.V.	CKOY Limited, Ottawa, Ont.	Applicant advised 16.2.53 Department not now in a position to consider television applications from Ottawa.
5.10.51 Letter of enquiry *re* television.	La Compagnie de Radio-diffusion CKCH de Hull Ltee, Hull, Que.	Applicant advised 18.2.53. Department not now in a position to consider television applications from Hull.
28.12.51 Letter of enquiry *re* television.	H. May, Weston, Ont.....	Applicant advised 20.2.53. Department not now in a position to consider television applications from Toronto.
(1) 2. 9.52 Letter of enquiry *re* television.	Famous Players Canadian Corporation Ltd., Toronto, Ont.	Applicant advised 7.3.53. Department not now in a position to consider television applications from Toronto.
31.10.52 Engineering Brief for T.V.	Broadcasting Station CKY Ltd., Winnipeg, Man.	Applicant advised 18.2.53. Department not now in a position to consider television applications from Winnipeg.
(2) 26.11.52 Letter of enquiry *re* television.	The Winnipeg Tribune, Winnipeg, Man.	Applicant advised 18.2.53. Department not now in a position to consider television applications from Winnipeg.
(3) 8.12.52 Engineering Brief for T.V.	Chronicle Company Limited, Halifax, N.S.	Applicant advised 20.2.53. Department not now in a position to consider television applications from Halifax.
(4) 29.12.52 Letter of enquiry *re* television.	Rogers Radio Broadcasting Co. Ltd., Toronto, Ont.	Applicant advised 7.2.53. Department not now in a position to consider television applications from Toronto.
30.12.52 Letter of enquiry *re* television.	Standard Broadcasting Co. Ltd., Nanaimo, B.C.	Applicant advised 18.2.53. Department not now in a position to consider television applications from Nanaimo.
(5) 26. 1.53 Letter of enquiry *re* television.	Toronto Broadcasting Co. Ltd., Toronto, Ont.	Applicant advised 6.2.53. Department not now in a position to consider television applications from Toronto.
(6) 30. 3.53 Enquiry regarding transfer of previous television brief for use on Vancouver Island.	International Broadcasting Company Limited, New Westminster, B.C.	13.4.53 Application forms sent to company for completion.

(1) 31.10.46 This company applied for temporary TV licence for demonstration purposes, which was denied in accordance with policy recommended by C.B.C.

(2) 14.4.44 This company applied by letter for a TV licence—no channel designated, which was denied in accordance with policy recommended by C.B.C.

(3) 19.12.44 This company applied by letter for a TV licence—no channel designated, which was denied in accordance with policy recommended by C.B.C.

(4) 14.9.48 This company applied for a TV licence—Channel 10. Application deferred by C.B.C.

(5) 15.3.45 This company applied by letter for a TV licence—no channel designated, which was denied in accordance with policy recommended by C.B.C. 26.4.48 applied for a TV licence—Channel 8, application deferred by the C.B.C. 30.10.50 applied for a TV licence—Channel 8, application not considered by the C.B.C.

(6) 2.11.45 This company applied by letter for a TV licence—no channel designated, which was denied in accordance with policy recommended by C.B.C. 13.9.48 applied for TV licence—Channel 8. 23.8.50 applied for TV licence—Channel 10. 30.8.50 submitted engineering brief for Channel 6, and advised they wished to be considered for any one of the three channels applied for. These applications were not considered by the C.B.C. 19.3.53 company advised C.B.C. they wished to apply for TV licence for Vancouver Island.

NOTE.—The engineering briefs submitted in support of these applications do not meet existing engineering standards, with the exception of the brief from Halifax, and in any event the applications may not be considered at present in view of the Government Policy that no privately owned television broadcasting stations may be established in areas now being served or to be served by stations of the C.B.C. If and when the Government Policy permits, the applicants may again submit complete applications to the Department for television station licences.

Telecommunications Division,
Ottawa, Ontario.
May 8, 1953.

By Mr. Jones:

Q. Have you anything to do with the booster stations?—A. You mean the C.B.C. booster stations?

Q. Yes.—A. We issue licences for them.

Q. Around the Kootenay valley and the Arrowhead lakes there has been trouble for many years. Have you any plans to remedy the situation there?—A. Those would be plans of the C.B.C.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Before the officials of the Department of Transport retire, I would like to ask a few general questions. I received information, Mr. Browne, that the travelling inspection cars in Manitoba operate entirely out of Winnipeg. Do you know what their schedule is, or if they follow any routine plan of inspection? I keep getting complaints in that area about radio interference, and the suggestion has been made that they might be decentralized and put in areas other than Winnipeg.—A. We have that matter under active consideration, Mr. Chairman. We recently appointed a new district superintendent who will have his headquarters at Winnipeg. The former man has retired. As a matter of fact, we will be having the new man come to Ottawa very shortly and we will go into the whole question and see if we cannot do a better job in that province.

Q. Now, one further question on this problem up at Churchill with respect to radio reception. I received information that it is due to electrical interference from the townsite and that the matter is in hand, and that it is largely a suppressor problem.—A. It is very largely a suppressor problem. Our chief difficulty came from fluorescent lights, heating pads, and electric razors. We would send somebody up there and he would clean everything up. Then the next day somebody would go down to Winnipeg and bring back another group of fluorescent lights and instal them without suppressors and we would have to start all over again. Churchill is rather isolated and we cannot make very frequent visits there, but we have arranged with the man in charge of one of our radio stations there to take hold of the situation. I think he has made a deal with a local service man to stock suppressors and he will make an effort to reduce the general noise level in that area.

Q. There is no regulation which makes it necessary for an electrician to instal suppressors along with news equipment?—A. There are existing regulations but they are rather difficult to enforce at the present time. We are reviewing the whole situation and now that we have the section dealing with interference in the Radio Act—we have taken it out of the Broadcasting Act and put it in the Radio Act—we are making a review of our interference regulations to put some more teeth into them, so to speak.

Q. Where does Churchill receive its radio from? Where is the transmitting station?—A. I believe there is a local army station. That is about the only broadcasting there is in Churchill.

Q. And it carries the C.B.C. programs?—A. Yes.

Q. How many inspectors have you in British Columbia?—A. We have permanent offices in Vancouver and Victoria.

Q. And how many men?—A. We would have about 4 on our staff doing that class of work between the 3 offices.

Q. There is one man in the interior, I understand, and this man cannot do his work because he has too big an area.—A. He has quite a large area to cover, but I think he will be getting around when travel conditions start to improve.

Q. I have heard that he only gets around once in 2 years.—A. It is difficult to get an increase in staff at the present time due to the departmental ceiling.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. What is the policy of the Department of Transport with respect to licensing of sound broadcasting stations in the same area where there are already such stations?—A. Our policy is to refer the applications, in the same way as we do the televisions applications, to the C.B.C. for recommendation. There is no specific policy regarding the number of stations.

Q. That is the point I wanted to bring out. You say there is no policy against licensing two or more stations in the same area?—A. There is no government policy which restricts the number of stations, of which I am aware.

Q. In other words, it is not the policy to foster a local monopoly in sound broadcasting?—A. There is no government policy, as I have said, akin to that which at the present time applies in the case of television.

Q. The two policies are quite different.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are we through? Have you found the trouble in Donnacona?

The WITNESS: I cannot answer your question at the moment, sir.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I shall wait until you get the information.

The WITNESS: We will make a report on it, sir.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Browne. I now call on Mr. Dunton, the Chairman of the C.B.C., who is ready to answer questions.

Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, called:

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Have you any statement to make before answering any questions, Mr. Dunton?

The WITNESS: No. We have some information requested chiefly by Mr. Fulton I think. Perhaps we could file it with you.

Mr. GOODE: Put it on the record.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Order.

The WITNESS: Mr. Fulton asked for a breakdown by types of television programs, and there has been prepared a statistical summary of television programs from December 6 to December 31. We have copies of it with us for filing.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Very well. Agreed.

(See Appendix "B".)

The WITNESS: And also a list of the gross live talent costs of a number of programs which Mr. Fulton asked for.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Very well. Agreed.

(See Appendix "D".)

The WITNESS: And finally a return for Mr. Fulton on the programs coming in directly over the Buffalo-Toronto link and the revenues to the corporation therefrom. (See Appendix "C".)

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Very well. Agreed.

Mr. GOODE: Are we ready for the questioning?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Just wait a minute, Mr. Goode, if you please. Now, Mr. Dunton is ready for the questions.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. First, I offer you my regular question, Mr. Dunton, regarding C.B.C. television in Vancouver. What are the latest developments?—A. The Mount Seymour site has been definitely decided upon by the corporation, and the whole project will be proceeded with as quickly as possible.

Q. Is the equipment all ordered?—A. The main equipment is all arranged for.

Q. Are you now confident that you will give us television in the fall?—A. Yes.

Q. You are. I am very pleased to hear it. I have a couple more questions and then I am through. There has been a statement made at the coast regarding the Coronation being carried by television over station KVOS, Bellingham. Is that right?—A. Our people have been holding discussions with the Bellingham station. I am not sure at the moment just where they stand.

Q. Do you know how many hours that broadcast will take?—A. No. It will be a fairly tricky technical thing depending on the amount of kinescope they can use.

Q. Is it right or wrong that British Columbia is going to see the coronation through KVOS Bellingham?

Mr. E. L. BUSHNELL (*Assistant General Manager, C.B.C.*): There is a slight technical problem. We have been prepared to cooperate with station KVOS so that those who have receivers in the Vancouver area could see the coronation. However, we have to adopt British standards and whether station KVOS has the proper projector to use the type of film we will have has not been assured. But we have made the offer and if the station owner can provide the proper projection equipment probably the film will be there the next day or certainly the day after.

Mr. GOODE: With regard to this equipment you will have to have, you will have to have it for C.B.C. Vancouver anyway.

Mr. BUSHNELL: I should ask Mr. Ouimet to explain this to you.

Mr. A. OUIMET: No. The Vancouver station, the C.B.C. station, may not necessarily have that equipment. This may be a one-time occasion that we would have to record a broadcast on equipment for a different system. It is the British system.

Mr. GOODE: Do you not intend to use British films?

Mr. OUIMET: Yes. But it will not be done in the same way as on this occasion.

Mr. GOODE: You mean to tell me there is a doubt that British Columbia will see the televising of the coronation because of some small technical difficulty?

Mr. OUIMET: It is not in our hands, but in the hands of this station KVOS.

Mr. GOODE: What do you think the likelihood is? Do you think they will be able to complete their installation so that they can put that program over?

Mr. OUIMET: If I had known this question was going to be asked I would have checked.

Mr. GOODE: You should know I would ask any questions concerning British Columbia.

Mr. BUSHNELL: The position is this, that the manager and owner of that station has been advised of this technical difficulty and he has not yet replied to our engineers what he proposes to do.

Mr. GOODE: If this program goes over KVOS how much is it going to cost the C.B.C.?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Well, actually in addition to what we are already spending it would cost very little. It will mean an extra print being made of our film.

Mr. GOODE: You mean the station is not going to charge you anything for the time.

Mr. BUSHNELL: We are not going to charge them anything for the film.

Mr. GOODE: This program is going to take some hours.

Mr. BUSHNELL: That depends entirely upon the operator of the station.

Mr. GOODE: How long have you arranged for the broadcast over the network?

The WITNESS: We hope to have it for the full length of the transmission in Britain.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. How long is that?—A. About seven hours.

Q. If Bellingham is going to show seven hours of the coronation at a considerable cost, then the CBC would be expected to pay the station in Bellingham some amount of money?—A. No. I do not think so. I think the station would be extremely grateful to us for getting the kinescope for them.

Q. He is going to get some new type of equipment to take care of this film and show it on television for seven, or six, or five hours?—A. We do not know what length.

Q. Are you going to allow the station to cut the film? If you have seven hours to show the Canadian people the coronation are you going to allow him to cut it in half?

Mr. BUSHNELL: He will do as he likes when he gets it.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Are you going to take a seven hour program and allow some private operator to cut it in half?—A. This is a station in the United States. We have no jurisdiction. We were advised he was interested in getting the film and we hope it will be of benefit to the United States and some people in British Columbia.

Mr. BUSHNELL: We have assurance he will carry it in full, but what he will do with it when he gets it we do not know.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Do you mean that if this Bellingham station lives up to its assurance and broadcasts for seven hours it is not going to charge the C.B.C.?

Q. We do not expect to pay anything.

Q. Is there any likelihood you might pay something?—A. No.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Can you give any information with respect to the use of American television programs either by Montreal or Toronto stations?—A. I think I gave that verbally to the committee, but I think I can find it again. A survey done fairly recently showed CBFT Montreal, Canadian 18¼ hours, United States 12½ hours; that is about 60 per cent Canadian, CBLT, Canadian 25 hours, United States 15¾ hours; I think that is a little over 60 per cent Canadian.

Q. Is that a fairly accurate reflection of the position today?—A. That is about the way it has been running; rather over 60 per cent Canadian counting all United States material either by film or other means.

Q. Have you put on record the particulars of that agreement you have with the Bell Telephone Company in connection with the micro-wave relay between Buffalo and Toronto?—A. Yes. Mr. Ouimet outlined that fully.

Q. I must have been absent at the time and did not hear it. Is it on the committee record?—A. Yes.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fleming, it is five-thirty. Do you think we can finish tonight?

Mr. FLEMING: I have only one or two other matters.

Mr. KNIGHT: I have a question or two—perhaps five minutes.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. What about Rediffusion Incorporated in Montreal? I raised that question on sound broadcasting and it was suggested it be left for discussion on television. There has been some litigation over this question, I believe, but I understand there is some protest made about some arrangements you had with Rediffusion Incorporated. Would you tell us about that?—A. I can say Rediuffsion is, we understand, picking up our television programs from the air and distributing them by cable to its subscribers.

Q. Are those radio or television programs?—A. Television programs. We had a general arrangement with them covering sound and also respecting television under which they could, under certain conditions, take certain programs subject to a third party agreement and so on, but that agreement is simply not applying in television and they are just picking them off the air and distributing them to their subscribers.

Q. Have you no agreement with them?—A. We have this earlier agreement which covers sound operations but it does not cover what they are doing at the present time.

Q. Have you acquiesced in any way in what they are doing now or taken any steps to prevent it?—A. No, there is a case before the Exchequer Court.

Q. Is that a case brought by you?—A. No.

Q. Who are the parties to that litigation, do you know?—A. I think it is Canadian Admiral.

Q. What interest has the C.B.C. in this matter? I gather you have not asserted any interest in it to the point of taking action against Rediffusion Incorporated?—A. No.

Q. Is it the view of the board that the C.B.C. has no interest in their activities? They are taking your programs and, in some form or other, transmitting them to their subscribers?—A. We could have, very much, but we first want to wait and see how this court case comes out.

Q. You are watching that, and that is the reason you are taking no steps at the moment?—A. At the moment, yes. I cannot say what steps we could or would not take after that. We are watching the situation.

Q. Well, I take it, then, that you are satisfied that so far as their retransmission—if that is the correct term—of your sound programs to their subscribers is concerned, you have no reason to object to that?—A. No, we have not, because under that arrangement they are carrying a number of our programs, and we are, under the old arrangement, guaranteed that we get the licence fee from them, so we see no reason to object. I might say that the board has a number of question marks in its mind about this whole matter of community antennas or wired systems which would pick up television programs from the air and redistribute them. This is a question not only in connection with Rediffusion but also many other similar projects in the whole country.

Q. If that practice became widely extended it could very considerably affect the revenue you are going to derive from the exise taxes?—A. I think the Excise Tax Act covers that situation. I think if you will read the clause you will find that it definitely covers such sets.

Q. Are those sets as expensive as those used in normal private reception?—A. In the case of Rediffusion they are different, but they are probably not very much better. I understand some of the other systems are thinking of using ordinary sets, or just expecting people to use their ordinary sets and have a cable connection to those sets.

Q. But so far it is only a Montreal problem?—A. Yes, but there are news reports of community antennas in other parts of the country—in Vancouver, for instance.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I might say for Mr. Fleming's information that they are already arranging for a station in Vancouver. Is that not right, Mr. Dunton?—A. I do not know.

Q. I can tell you that they have bought the location.—A. I have heard of it.

Mr. JONES: Could there be something in the Copyright Act to cover the situation where your own programs are used in that way?

The WITNESS: There may be something covering a broadcaster's right to what he puts on the air, but it is not very clearly determined, and perhaps parliament at some future time would think of giving the broadcaster more definite protection than he has now.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions?

By Mr. Knight:

Q. As a supporter of the C.B.C., I have been rather worried and uneasy about this story in the Canadian Congress of Labour brief about personnel relations. I think it would be as well to air it here. I take it that the C.B.C. has some answer to these allegations and I thought I might ask Mr. Dunton a few questions on it. I suppose I could give Mr. Dunton that opportunity by asking him a general question: What is the relationship as between management and personnel, and particularly in regard to this matter of union certification, and I suppose I might ask him if that situation was created, or came into existence, due to the coming of television and the consequent expansion of the number of employees?—A. If I could answer in a general way, I think Mr. Knight, that the relationship in general between the employees and our management has been good—has been for some time and, as far as we know, still is. That does not say, of course, that there are not differences of opinion at different times, but I would say from our knowledge that it has been good.

Q. For instance, I heard some suggestion that there was a sort of breakdown—I do not know how to describe it in elementary labour relations practice, but that there has been some question that overtime pay was a matter of concern to the employees, some overtime pay that was due to them, I think as early as December, and which they had not yet received in March.—A. I would like to know just what the charge is. I might explain that the C.B.C. as a general rule has not previously paid overtime, it just did not operate that way, but a number of our employees at different times have, I think, because of keenness, not because of the needs of the corporation, actually worked more than a set number of hours. With the coming of television that created a terrific demand on the staff. I think you might have gotten some idea of that from the Toronto trip.

Q. I wanted to say that I personally was impressed with the apparently very happy and interested attitude of the staff that I saw in Toronto. Now, whether that is the part of the staff to which my information relates, I do not know.—A. I wonder if I could go on and explain a little more about the overtime. In those early weeks of television, there were enormously heavy demands on a number of people who did have to work long hours in getting the operation under way, and not getting extra compensation for it. I did not think there were any specific complaints. If there are any specific complaints we could look into them, and I would be glad to know about any.

Q. There is one specific thing, and that is the matter of the letter that was read—I think it was read in the C.C.L. brief.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: It was put on the record.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Yes, it was put on the record, and it would appear there was a good deal of friction, and, I might even say, opposition, according to the brief, by the management of the C.B.C. to certification on the part of these people who wanted to form themselves into a union.—A. I do not see where you can take that from Mr. Knight—about opposition.

Q. I can come to it, but it is not up to me to prove opposition. I am asking you if there was such opposition, to your knowledge, by the management as against certification.—A. No.

Q. In your opinion there was not?—A. No.

Q. My own impression of yourself was that you would not be opposed to certification.—A. Mind you, management took all steps considered proper in connection with certification.

Q. Is it not true this certification was slow—may I say that somehow it seemed to take a long time from the time preliminary negotiations started until it finished, and I think it was some 9 months.—A. I think it is only proper for the management of any organization appearing before a board to see that all the proper procedure is gone through, and there is proper support, and the labour relations board has a chance to consider all sides fully.

Q. Let me come to the specific thing on which I base my question in regard to opposition on the part of management, and I refer to the letter of Mr. Manson and Mr. Ouimet a day or two before a vote on certification was taken when this letter was circulated. Do you admit—I do not like to use that word, I am not badgering you—but there was such a letter.—A. Yes.

Q. And there was such a letter sent?—A. Yes.

Q. Would that be sent with your approval, or did you have nothing to do with it?—A. As I said before the corporation acts as a corporation, and not as an individual, and we all share the responsibilities.

Q. Would it be a fair question to ask you what you think of the letter yourself?—A. I do not think it is a fair question. It was sent as part of the procedure, and there it is.

Q. It would not represent the C.B.C. policy, as suggested, as an attempt to influence the workers against certification or joining a union?—A. That is one interpretation of the letter, but if you take the brief, that is the only thing that is mentioned about labour relations, for Mr. MacDonald went on to say that he did not know anything about relations with the union for the past several months. There is no reference to anything other than the letter, and the one thing mentioned is the letter which stands by itself.

Q. I was terribly worried that a Crown corporation as such would take the attitude, if the assertion of these people is true, that the corporation would take an attitude against certification in this day and age, just because it is a Crown corporation.—A. But no attitude was taken against certification.

Q. I am coming to the letter, and I will be there in a minute, and I hope to show by the letter that there was some such attitude. Has to your knowledge a threat, for example, ever been used by the C.B.C. on the basis of its status as a Crown corporation working for the government which is all powerful, which implied, if these boys were not good, certification could be revoked by, for instance, an order in council, or some such method?—A. As far as I know, certainly not.

Q. I am going to ask you if you recognize one or two things about this letter, and if you recognize the letter from one or two portions of it. I will read one or two clauses I have before me in the letter which is purported to have been issued by the general manager and the assistant general manager, and their signatures are reproduced so that no doubt—

Mr. GOODE: Was this letter in the C.C.L. brief?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Yes—that is the letter?

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Yes. I don't know to what employee it was addressed. I do not know who took the precaution to cut his name and address out, and I will not suggest why he did that. You asserted Mr. Dunton that you see nothing wrong with this letter.—A. I do not think I said that Mr. Knight.

Q. And that it did not bring any pressure to bear on these workers. It says here for example, clause 13, addressed to these workers on the eve of certification, or on the eve of making a decision with regard to certification, and it says this:—"Are you prepared to give up any or all of your personal rights in matter of your employment to a trade union." Now, Mr. Dunton, you would not suggest that that was not a leading question would you?

Mr. GOODE: Maybe it was one of these sanctimonious questions they talked about.

The WITNESS: That is a question.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. And then clause number 9 in the letter: "What voice will you have in the affairs of National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians, particularly in forming its policy on both a local and international scale?" Do you think that is rather a leading question?—A. It is a question. I would not admit is is necessarily a leading question.

Q. I would point out that there are no leading questions on the other side of the argument. They are all against certification, and to my mind its purpose was to persuade these workers against joining a union. All right, I will not go on with that.

Would you say this is a proper question to put to employees of a Crown corporation: "Are you prepared to strike against the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation if called upon to do so by National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians? What is the history of National Association of Broadcast Engineers and Technicians as far as striking is concerned?" I am asking you if, in your opinion, each one of these questions, or almost all of them, are not leading questions designed to put, I might say, almost fear into the hearts of the employees, suggesting that they had better have nothing to do with certification. There is no man more interested in this C.B.C. than I am, and you know it. My only purpose in bringing this up is that I am concerned about the success of the corporation, and about anything being done which would hurt the corporation as such. So there is my case. I suggest to you

that you do not want to answer this question. I know that. But I ask you if that is not an improper letter—with all due respect to your general manager and to his assistants—to put before a group of employees before a ballot was taken on that subject?

Mr. GOODE: I do not think that Mr. Knight should say to Mr. Dunton that he did not want to answer the question.

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Dunton already has said that he did not think it was fair to ask him that question.

Mr. GOODE: That is not my experience with Mr. Dunton.

Mr. KNIGHT: Well, Mr. Dunton knows me better than you do.

Mr. GOODE: That could be.

By Mr. Hansell:

Q. Do you not think that the management of the corporation has the right to protect the corporation in their labour relations against disruptors?—A. I would not phrase it in that way, just as I would not agree with some of the things Mr. Knight has said. Our management thought it was right to do what they thought proper for the management of a corporation having regard to proper labour relations and in the public interest. That is what the corporation and the board tried to do. Here was one item in a long series of discussions. And in any event, here it is, brought forward. It is here before you to interpret.

Q. Personally I do not see anything wrong with the letter. I am not connected with a corporation, but if I were going to employ a person, I would like to know his attitude on these same things.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Were these people not already in your employ, to whom this letter was addressed?—A. Yes, certainly.

Q. Do you think it was fair to say:

> Some employees may have been subjected to great pressure by their fellow employees or trade union representatives, but that is passed and the time is now at hand for you to express your wish with the freedom that is accorded you by the democratic process of a secret ballot?

The suggestion is that you should not surrender your freedom and the best way to surrender your freedom is to certify yourselves into a union. What was the result of the whole thing in the matter of the vote taken?—A. You know there was a large majority in favour of certification.

Q. Please give me the figures, for the record?—A. Eighty-five per cent of the men voted for certification.

Q. Would it be correct to say that in favour of certification there were 338, as against 74 spoiled ballots, and against certification, four votes?—A. I believe that is right.

By Mr. Jones:

Q. Am I correct in this report of what the C.B.C. intends to do to improve conditions in the upper Arrow lakes and the Kootenay valley; Now that they have dropped the project of putting up their own station in the interior, they will consider applications from Trail or Nelson to increase their power in order to give the coverage?—A. In the first place, repeater stations are going in at Grand Forks and Greenwood, and if possible there will be repeater stations north and south of the Okanagan. The Trail and Nelson stations are always free to make applications to increase their power.

Mr. BOISVERT: Do you know where the head office of NABET is?

The WITNESS: I understand it is in the United States.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Is there any policy of supplying programs to the smaller stations?—A. We hope so. We have made public the fact that we will have as our objective to supply them with a national service for as many as 10½ hours a week. But right at the beginning we do not know, and perhaps we will be able to increase it.

Q. At a nominal charge, or at no charge at all?—A. It will be free, but we will not pay them for carrying the service. If there are any commercial programs included in it, as we hope there will be, they will get a commercial return from them.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I thank Mr. Dunton and his officials of the C.B.C. for their co-operation. The next meeting will be at the call of the chair.

APPENDIX "A"

CJOR LIMITED

Commercial Radio Broadcasting C.B.C. Dominion Network

846 Howe Street, Vancouver 1, B.C.

APRIL 29, 1953.

Immediate News Release

Mr. George C. Chandler, President of CJOR Ltd. Vancouver, B.C., who has been a director of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, took issue with that organization's submission today to the Parliamentary Radio Committee at Ottawa. He stated that: "Our Station cannot, in all conscience, join with the C.A.B. in either congratulating or commending the Government of Canada upon its present television policy. The very fact that the C.A.B. has chosen to give such congratulations is a damning indication of the strong control over publication by radio and TV that the government now holds, inasmuch as it can be assumed that the 50 private stations with TV applications either before the C.B.C. or in preparation, so recognize this element of government control that they have prevailed upon their own trade association to "butter up" the government at this time."

Government policy on Television, while it makes vague references to permitting future expansion of private operators into the field, remains sternly monopolistic, and distasteful to Canadians.

This is not merely an academic argument. Government policy has discriminated against Canadian TV set owners, against Canadian talent, and against Canadian business—by delaying the development of Canadian TV at least six or seven years behind that of the United States. Then—when Canadian TV was launched—it was done with millions of dollars of the people's tax money and provided in two major cities only, with those two stations being government owned and operated.

The Government Television policy as presently constituted does not give Canadians a choice of programs. The "single program" principle adopted for TV by the Canadian Government has removed freedom of choice for Canadian TV set owners. It has been thought out so carefully that when private operation was permitted in the city of Hamilton, it was so permitted only on the basis that the Hamilton station would transmit a directional signal that could not be seen in Toronto. Toronto set owners thus continue to have NO free-

dom of choice in the field of Canadian TV programs, although they are able to view U.S. programs at will. In the border areas where Canadian viewers can compare U.S. and Government programs, U.S. television conclusively wins the majority of Canadian viewers.

Government Television policy in Canada has set two monopolies in operation—the government—C.B.C. monopoly, at present operating in the major cities of the nation where the greatest population can be reached, and private monopoly in other places, where highly competitive radio station operators have been forced to combine to exploit a government granted monopoly of a Television area. The private licences granted for TV in Canada have been granted with the amazing provision of a government option to buy at a future date—if the government feels the need to further its C.B.C. monopoly of TV. This government option is as subtle as a mailed fist because applications for private TV must be supported by a detailed list of equipment whose only purpose can be to ascertain that the equipment of the proposed station is complementary to the C.B.C. ultimate proprietorship aims.

Government Television policy in Canada has forced international acceptance of a monopolistic use of TV channels. It has been decided that in the highly populated area of Central Canada, TV stations on the same channel shall be separated by a far greater distance than those required by engineering standards—in other words, that by design Canada has decided not to make the most efficient use of the available channels, in order to keep at a minimum the number of TV stations that can be licensed.

Therefore, we at CJOR cannot join with the C.A.B. in commending government policy in Television. We restate our position that government policy remains monopolistic, has caused long delays, refuses Canadians a choice of programs, hurts business by restricting the number of stations, deliberately lowers the efficiency possible in the use of available TV channels, and in many border areas of Canada has driven Canadians to rely upon American TV service.

In addition we must resubmit our contention, as stated frequently on previous occasions, that in the field of *radio* regulation, the only regulation necessary to Canadian radio is already contained in the laws of the land, plus the international treaties governing allocation of frequencies. As a form of publication, radio needs recognition as an equal to all other forms of publication, whose regulation lies solely in law and not in regulations promulgated by any government board.

In the interests of the Canadian people, it is the duty of radio and TV broadcasters to continue to resist monopolies in their own field, and to point out that present regulatory methods are not in line with Canadian principles of freedom and responsibility.

APPENDIX "B"

Return for Mr. Fulton

Statistical Summary of Television Program Operations from Inauguration Sept. 6-8—December 31, 1952

Classification	*Total Hours*	*Percentage*
Musical Programs:		
Opera	4:35	0·6
Symphony or Classical	17:20	2·1
Choral	:15	0·03
Ballet	5:20	0·6
Light	22:50	2·8
Variety	50:25	6·09
Amateur	8:00	0·97
Total	108:45	13·19
Spoken Word Programs:		
Drama	227:30	27:5
Documentary	75:20	9·1
Interview and Talks	47:15	5·7
Panel Discussions	23:00	2·8
Quiz	20:50	2·5
Educational	:50	0·1
News	15:10	1·8
Newsreel	29:45	3·5
Sports	109:00	13·2
Sports Resumes-Talks	20:25	2·5
Women's	24:15	2·9
Children's	100:20	12·1
Religious	4:30	0·6
Special Events	16:20	2·0
News Commentary	4:05	0·5
Total	718:35	86·8
Grand Total	827:20	99·99

APPENDIX "C"

Return for Mr. Fulton

At the meeting of the Committee on Friday, April 24th, Mr. Fulton inquired, and it was agreed that the information should be provided as a return, for a tabulation showing the revenue for a sample week on commercial programs imported to Canada over the microwave link joining Buffalo, N.Y., to Toronto.

During the sample week analyzed there were four programs relayed over the microwave link from Buffalo, N.Y., to Toronto and broadcast by CBLT. These were the "Jackie Gleason Show", one hour, a twenty minute portion sponsored by Schick, Inc., and a second twenty minutes sponsored by Bristol Myers Co.; "Studio One", one hour, sponsored by Canadian Westinghouse Company; "Aldrich Family", half-hour, sponsored by General Foods; "Goodyear Playhouse", one hour, sponsored by Goodyear Rubber Company. These programs yield a revenue to the Corporation of $1,508.70 a week.

APPENDIX "D"

Return for Mr. Fulton

SUSTAINING TELEVISION PRODUCTIONS

Week March 29 - April 4

Program	Duration	Type	Gross Live Talent Cost
	hrs. min.		$ cts.
Palm Sunday Service	1 : 00	Religion	
CBC News Magazine	0 : 30	News Events	50 00
Pépinot et Capucine	0 : 30	Children's	440 00
Sunday at Eight	1 : 00	Drama and Feature	150 00
Jeanne et les Juges	1 : 30	Drama and Feature	1,958 00
This Week	0 : 30	News Commentaries	200 00
Stump the Experts	0 : 30	Quiz	300 00
Let's See	1 : 30	Children's	277 00
Tabloid	3 : 00	News Resume	705 00
Pays et Merveilles	0 : 30	Documentary	60 00
Big Revue	1 : 00	Variety	3,588 10
Ed's Place	0 : 30	Children's	170 00
Le Grenier aux Images	0 : 30	Children's	185 00
Sunshine Sketches	0 : 30	Drama and Feature	783 15
Your Income Tax	0 : 15	Talks Informative	60 00
Cue for Music	0 : 30	Light	683 00
Divertissement	0 : 30	Opera Concert Music	100 00
Fighting Words	0 : 30	Talks Informative	275 00
Amateur Boxing	1 : 00	Sports Events	200 00
Conférences de Presse	0 : 30	Talks Informative	155 00
After Hours	0 : 30	Variety	200 00
Life of Mary	0 : 30	News Events	50 00
Rêve et Réalité	0 : 30	Women's	345 00
Varsity Story	0 : 30	Educational	50 00
Telestory Time	0 : 15	Children's	194 00
Les peintres de la Passion	0 : 30	Religious Paintings	100 00
Sporting Corner	0 : 15	Sports Resume	50 00
Le nez de Cléopâtre	0 : 30	Quiz	435 00
CBC Theatre	1 : 30	Drama and Feature	2,527 00
Tic Tac Toc	0 : 30	Children's	100 00
Hans in the Kitchen	0 : 30	Talks Informative	50 00
Space Command	0 : 30	Drama and Feature	517 00
Café des Artistes	0 : 30	Variety	2,651 97

APPENDIX "E"

List of Papers and Documents Filed with Special Committee on Broadcasting

From The C.B.C.

A. Existing C.B.C. regulations for Broadcasting Stations.
B. Proposed regulations for Broadcasting Stations.
C. Statistical Summary of Network Program Operations.
D. Capital Report Speakers 1952-53 to date.
E. Breakdown of C.B.C.-I.S. Estimates.
F. Tentative Statement of Income and Expenditures 1952-53.
G. Memo *re* Section 22 (3) of The Canadian Broadcasting Act.

From Other Sources

H. Newspaper advertisement tabled by Mr. T. Goode, M.P.
I. Policy Statements of Canadian and Ontario Chambers of Commerce.
J. Brief—Canadian Congress of Labour.

K. Brief—and its Appendices—of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters.

L. Brief from Donald Fergusson, Hudson Heights, Quebec—tabled by Mr. Fleming, M.P.

M. Brief—Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association.

N. Brief—Radio Station CFRB, Toronto.

O. List of Canadian Broadcasting Stations in Operation—submitted by Department of Transport.

P. Answers to questions asked of the C.C.L. by Mr. Beaudry.

APPENDIX "F"

WITNESSES

1. Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
2. Mr. Kenneth Taylor, Deputy Minister of Finance.
3. Mr. H. J. Kealey, Assistant Secretary of Excise, Department of National Revenue.
4. Mr. Donald MacDonald, Secretary Treasurer, Canadian Congress of Labour.
5. Dr. E. A. Forsey, Director of Research, C.C.L.
6. Mr. T. J. Allard, General Manager, Canadian Association of Broadcasters.
7. Mr. W. H. Cranston, Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association.
8. Mr. Harry Sedgwick, representing CFRB, Toronto.
9. Mr. Joseph Sedgwick, Q.C.
10. Mr. G. C. W. Browne, Controller of Telecommunications, Department of Transport.

APPENDIX "G"

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Memorandum on Section 22 (3) of The Canadian Broadcasting Act. (*See Appendix "A" page 166*).
2. Brief of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters and its Appendices A, B, and C. (*See Appendix "I" page 311*).
3. News release from Radio Station CJOR, Vancouver. (*See Appendix "A" page 477*).
4. Answers to questions asked previously by Mr. Fulton. (*See Appendix "B", "C", and "D" pages 479-480*).
5. List of documents filed with the Committee and appended to the fourth report. (*See Appendix "E", page 480*).
6. List of Witnesses. (*See Appendix "F", page 481*).
7. List of Appendices. (*See Appendix "G", page 481*).

BIBLIOTHEQUE DU PARLEMENT
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
3 2354 00507 347 6