DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 491 CE 003 656

TITLE	Proceedings: Cable Broadcasting in the Community. April 30-May 2, 1972.
INSTITUTION	Guelph Univ. (Ontario). Office of Continuing Education.
PUB DATE	Feb 73
NOTE	80p.; Proceedings of a two-day conference held at the University of Guelph, (April 30-May 2, 1972)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Audiovisual Communication; Broadcast Industry; Broadcast Television; *Cable Television; Commercial Television; Conference Reports; Educational Alternatives; *Educational Television; Foreign Countries
IDENTIFIERS	Canada

ABSTRACT

The proceedings contain transcripts of speeches, panel discussions, and plenary sessions dealing with various aspects of cable broadcasting. The speeches include: Community Television--Future Potential, John deMercado; Reaction to Dr. deMercado's speech, Diane Abbey Livingston; The Guelph Communications Project, William Foss; An Outline for the Plans Under Discussion for the Ryerson Open College, Margaret Norquay; Cable TV and Credit Courses, R. F. G. Campbell; The Political Dimension, Richard Gwyn; Ownership, Rights and Control of Cable Transmission, David Williams; and Getting and Keeping People Involved, Philip Lynd. The plenary sessions included: Community Programing--Costs and Sources of Support, with Douglas Waterston and Ted Jarmain; The Political Dimension, with Duane Tulloch and David Williams; Ownership, Rights and Control of Cable Transmission, with Glen Warlow and David Williams; and Citizen Involvement and Education in Cable TV, with Weldon Findlay and David Williams. Technical Aspects of Cable Broadcasting, were discussed by I. Switzer, J. D. Livingston and Ian Easterbrook. Senator Keith Davey's address Federal-Provincial Issues in Cable Broadcasting in the Community is also included. (JR)

Proceedings

Cable Broadcasting in the Community April 30-May 2

Proceedings of a two day conference held at the University of Guelph, April 30 - May 2, 1972.

Sponsored by: The Office of Continuing Education in conjunction with extension oriented faculty members of the School of Agricultural Economics and Extension Education, University of Guelph.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

These proceedings deal with a fascinating and rapidly changing aspect of communications in Canada, that of cable broadcasting. During the two day seminar held at the University of Guelph in the Spring of 1972, cable broadcasting was examined from a number of different points of view – citizen involvement in programming, legal aspects, financial considerations, program possibilities and technical developments and limitations. Senator Keith Davey summarized many of the seminar discussions in his address titled, "Federal-Provincial Issues in Cable Broadcasting in the Community."

The intent of the seminar was to bring together those with an interest in cable broadcasting in the community as well as to have them meet and discuss common concerns with some of the major stakeholders in the industry. The franl discussions that arose from this meeting and the id as generated in an informal way could nc ver be captured by a proceedings. Most of t ie formal presentations are included in this publication. Several were presented visually and could only be distributed using videotape. In other cases, the discussion was of such a nature that a printed proceedings would only lead to confusion. In other words, you would have had to participate in the seminar in order to get the true value of what went on. These proceedings then cover the formal presentations of the seminar and provide you with a reminder and possibly a further insight into major issues facing cable broadcasting in Canadian communities.

Several seminar participants have asked to have a second seminar dealing with the more applied aspects of citizen programming on cable. If you consider this important and needed, or if you have other ideas for future seminars dealing with cable broadcasting, then please feel free to contact me.

Several individuals made major contributions to the success of this seminar. My sincere thanks to the many resource people who presented papers, to the Extension Education faculty members in the School of Agricultural Economics and Extension Education and to the staff of the University Information Office.

I hope that these proceedings will provide a background for further discussions and decisions dealing with the important impact that cable broadcasting is having on Canadian communities.

Mark Waldron, Ph.D.
Director
Office of Continuing Education

University of Guelph
Cable Broadcasting in the Community
April 30 -- May 2, 1972

PROGRAM

This two day seminar will explore the present and potential uses of community cable broadcasting in Canada. The focus will be on the relationship of community cable systems to adult education and citizen involvement.

Sunday, April 30

Registration

Monday, May 1 — Introduction to Seminar

Chairman: Dr. Mark Waldron, Director
Office of Continuing Education
University of Guelph

Community Television — Future Potential
Dr. John deMercado, Director
Communications Systems Planning
Department of Communications
Ottawa, Canada

Reaction: Mrs. Diane Abbey Livingston
Project Consultant
OECA, Toronto

Case Studies in Community TV
Guelph Communications Project
Mr. William Foss
Guelph, Ontario

Education and Cable — Ryerson Open College
Mrs. Margaret Norquay
Ryerson Open College
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute
Toronto, Ontario

Spotlight on University of Guelph
Mr. D. L. Waterston
Director of Information
University of Guelph

Communications Into the Home
Mr. David Ferguson
Cable TV Limited
Montreal, Quebec

Papers and Group Discussions — Concurrent Sessions
Community Programming — Costs and Sources of Support
Mr. Ted Jarmain
Chairman of the Board
Canadian Cable Television Association
Jarmain Teleservices Limited
London, Ontario

Cable TV and Credit Courses
Dr. R.F.G. Campbell
Superintendent Programming —
University, College, Adult Section
OECA
Toronto, Ontario

The Political Dimension
Dr. Alan Thomas
Chairman, Department of Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto, Ontario

Mr. Richard Gwyn
Director General, Socio-Economic Planning
Department of Communications
Ottawa, Canada

Ownership, Rights and Control of Cable Transmission
Mr. David Williams
Executive Vice-President
Canadian Cable Systems
Toronto, Ontario

Citizen Involvement and Education in Cable TV
Mr. Philip Lind
Rogers Cable TV Limited
Toronto, Ontario

Plenary Sessions based on group discussions
Chairman: Mr. Douglas Waterston
Director of Information
University of Guelph

A. Citizen Involvement in Cable TV
B. Operating Aspects of Cable TV

Tuesday, May 2

Programming and Technical Aspects in Community Broadcasting
Chairman: Professor Duane Tulloch
School of Agricultural Economics
and Extension Education
University of Guelph

The Best of the Present in Programming – Wasteland or Not?

Mr. Udo Salewsky, General Manager
Grand River Cable System TV Limited
Kitchener, Ontario

Mr. Jake Milligan
Fergus-Elora Cable TV
Fergus, Ontario

Mr. Lorne McFadden
Jarmain Cable TV Limited
Brantford, Ontario

Getting and Keeping People Involved

Mr. Philip Lind
Rogers Cable TV Limited
Toronto, Ontario

Technical Aspects of Cable Broadcasting

Moderator: Mr. George S. Atkins
Agriculture and Resources
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
Toronto, Ontario

Panel Members:

Mr. I. Switzer
Chief Engineer
MacLean-Hunter Cable TV
Rexdale, Ontario

Mr. Bert Pilcher
Project Consultant
OECA
Toronto, Ontario

Mr. J. D. Livingston
RCA Corporate Staff
Consumer Information Systems
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec

Mr. Ian Easterbrook
Audio Visual Services
University of Guelph

Speaker: Senator Keith Davey
Federal-Provincial Issues
in Cable Broadcasting in the Community

Introduction to the Seminar
Chairman: Dr. Mark Waldron

Good morning ladies and gentlemen, I would like to welcome you to the University of Guelph. We want to keep this conference informal; we would like you to discuss among yourselves some of the questions, concerns and issues involved in cable broadcasting in the community. We want to give lots of opportunity for discussion because, while we have an agenda, I suspect that the hidden agenda is even more important than the one that will take place in the formal sessions.

We want to find out what is being done in cable broadcasting in the community; we want to find out what is being done well, we want to find out how to improve. We want to look at the future potential for cable broadcasting, especially as it relates to citizen participation and adult education and we want to learn how to use and how to make more use of this very powerful device, how it can become a more integral part of our community lives. We refer to "Canadian" in the program and while we do not have that many people involved in the formal program from outside the Province of Ontario, we refer to Canadian because we have people from all parts of Canada participating in this conference. Each of you, regardless of whether you are from Ontario or Quebec, the Maritimes or the West, should feel free to participate in the discussion and that way, give it the real Canadian content, a word that seems to plague this whole industry.

You probably wonder why the University of Guelph is involved in this sort of thing? The City of Guelph has, if not the first, among the first, cable system in the country which came into being even before television broadcasting started in Canada, back in 1952. The University is involved because for some years, there has been a program on the local cable system called "Spotlight on the University of Guelph". We have several courses in the area of communications and the entire area of cable broadcasting seems to come up so often in these courses. We have a program in Extension Education at the graduate level, giving the Masters degree, and in addition have several courses at the undergraduate level, we have an enthusiastic television section of the Audio Visual Services and generally, a great deal of interest in this whole field on this campus. The Guelph community has a great deal of citizen involvement, we'll be hearing more about it later in the Guelph Communications Project.

An ad hoc committee has planned this conference. Mr. Ian Easterbrook from the Audio Visual Services, in charge of the television production unit on this campus; Dr. Weldon Findlay from the Department of Extension Education, Professor Duane Tulloch from Extension Education. Professor Glen Warlow, who is Acting Chairman of Extension Education and Mr. Douglas Waterston who is Director of Information. Doug, will you stand? Doug will be presenting later some of his activity in using cable television here in Guelph. These people have been involved in working with me, developing the program and making contact with the speakers.

I have some program announcements before we get to the first speaker. Mr. David Ferguson of Cable TV in Montreal is unable to attend but he has sent me a statement and I will be contacting him this morning by phone to see if it is satisfactory for me to present this statement to you. Mr. Estey has been called to testify in Court and will not be able to be here this afternoon. He is being replaced by another person from the same company.

The noon lunch is wherever you can find it, there are several restaurants on campus. I would suggest one called Der Keller which is in Johnston Hall, near the Faculty Club.

We have a concert this evening for those of you who would like to attend. We managed to obtain some more tickets late last week when we saw it was quite popular. We have held nine of these tickets till today so if anybody would like to go to the concert this evening, we have these nine tickets and I would suggest that you pick them up at the coffee break. Those of you who are not going to the concert this evening, there is going to be, following the buffet dinner, an open bar in the Faculty Club. There is also a film festival that the students are presenting tonight. It starts at 7:00.

Tomorrow we will be meeting in Room 107, the Music Room in the Arts Building on the Mall. If you refer to the map, you will have no trouble in finding it. All the general sessions are going to be videotaped by Cable 8 television here in Guelph. The videotapes will be available for the cost of the tape for any of you who would like to have them to look at or to show them on your systems. In addition, audiotapes will be available and we will print proceedings.

Monday, May 1, 1972
Community Television – Future Potential
Dr. John deMercado

I approach the task that has been set me with some trepidation. I am not a particularly good representative of the community, and I have never produced a broadcast program. The theme of the meeting is however of special relevance and importance, it is very timely, and Dr. Waldron and his colleagues are to be commended for choosing it as a subject of this conference. It is always easy to speak about the future because only time can prove you wrong, and if you go sufficiently far ahead then hopefully death will come before being proven wrong.

This conference deals with adult education, citizen involvement and the role that various types of communication systems could play in enhancing these processes. Many possible systems and applications which will be investigated in the next few days by eminently qualified people and undoubtedly you will delve in depth into the possible uses of cable television systems, to provide support for educational, entertainment and various community services. I also see from the program that the important problems, access, liability, ownership and control are all on the agenda.

In my talk I will briefly explore the present communication systems that serve communities, then sketch a future scenario indicating some of the problems associated with the transition from the present to this ideal future.

Let me begin by saying that I don't really have too many answers but I have lots of questions and thoughts about the future and for what they're worth, I'll try and share them with you. There is no doubt in my mind that telecommunication systems are and will continue to be, the revolution that propels Canada into the post mechanical society of the twenty-first century. There have been lots of other revolutions before. Three thousand years ago, those of you who watched the television program "Chariots of the Gods", will recall the construction of temples and pyramids signifying the beginning of human clustering by means we don't even understand today. Five hundred years ago the printed book arrived on the scene, creating a revolution that caused a rebirth of learning, and all sorts of problems between churches and state. Things haven't been the same since. One hundred and fifty years ago, the industrial revolution began and Adam Smith wrote about the wealth of nations and its relation to and reliance on mechanical (industrial) power. Here for the first time we began to see how mechanical movement (horsepower) produced wealth. One hundred years ago the communications revolution began and man entered into new relationships with himself and his environment. The significance of this revolution will be far greater than any of the previous ones. The promises and challenges of this revolution are what the future potential of electronic communications is all about.

In looking at the future it is impossible for reasons that will be readily appreciated to state apriori and with probability, the set of all the cost-benefits, and what they will mean to us in the community. That they will affect and shape our lives is certain and what is even more certain, is that we can't afford not to try and find out how and why. Many "wise" people have speculated on how communications systems will affect us and what opportunities they offer for the good life. In fact it is the "in thing" today to be a "communications social-psychologist." However, in my opinion, the useful efforts of this group can just about be equated to one gigantic zero.

This question of opportunities and how to make use of them reminds me of a story that I just read a few days ago in a circular that OISE puts out:

The story is about a travelling salesman named Neuf, from one of our eastern provinces. In the story, Neuf is driving in the west and his car breaks down late one evening near a farm. Unable to rectify the matter he is forced to consult with the farmer who is an elderly gentleman, married to a beautiful young woman called Marge. They find that the car can't be fixed and the farmer says "You are welcome to spend the evening with us, have supper and sleep but we only have one bed so you'll have to sleep with Marge and myself." No problem here for Neuf. They have supper which consists of a great big meal of pork and beans and Neuf has several servings; though not filled he says "Thank you very much for everything, I really can't eat any more." The rest of the beans are then stored in the refrigerator and they retire to bed. The old farmer and Neuf both fall asleep immediately and Marge lays awake between them contemplating how she is going to get in contact with Neuf. After about two hours, she hears a little noise coming from the chicken coop and

nudges her husband saying "Wake up, it sounds like someone is trying to steal the chickens; and while you're out there, milk the cows and get some fresh milk for breakfast." The old fellow gets up, doesn't know what time it is, and vanishes. She turns to Neuf saying "Wake up, here's your chance, take it but hurry before he gets back." At this Neuf gets up, runs downstairs and eats the rest of the beans in the refrigerator. The moral of this story, if there is one, is that opportunities offered by situations will undoubtedly be taken advantage of in different ways by different people.

Without anticipating government policy, I will try to look into the future, not only on the basis of what can be inferred from the present, but also what I believe that rational man in a society such as ours should come to expect from communications systems. There are pitfalls in forecasting only on the basis of what we have now. For example, in 1938 the National Academy of Engineering did a very famous study for senior Government leaders in the United States. This was a study to forecast future possibilities afforded by current trends in technology. In the study they missed such things as the computer, vitamins, communications satellites. In fact all the scenarios painted of the future turned out to be wrong. The reason was simply that anybody attempting to forecast in the 1930's based on what existed then, would not have been able to forecast moon landings, the digital computer, or anything like that. Hopefully, my forecasts will not be as bad.

The development of ideal future plans is absolutely predicated on the use of our two faculties; namely intellect to distinguish between the possible and the impossible, balanced by the use of reason to separate the sensible from the senseless. Thus an ideal future plan is one consisting of a choice of those possibilities that are sensible. Sensible in that they provide linkages between and contribute to health, wealth and leisure, both on an individual and collective basis within and between Canadian communities. The use of sophisticated communications systems offer, I believe, a rational approach for this sort of community planning. Within this planning framework, I believe, will be found the answers to the pressing questions of what are the best linkages between health, wealth and leisure, and how these are generated through the use of communication systems. Let me give you some examples of what I am talking about.

At the present time cable television systems or CATV systems as they are called, serve some 1,250,000 urban homes, out of a possible maximum of 4 million urban homes. This penetration has taken place over only about 20 years! In fact CATV systems now pass within 80% of all urban homes and in some cities like Vancouver 60% of the homes are now connected.

The capital cost of building a typical CATV system is, in my estimation, between $90 and $150 per subscriber, varying in this range primarily as a function of the amount of subscribers connected per mile to the system and the type of terrain on which the system is constructed. When you compare this with an average annual rate of return from subscription for each subscriber for about $60, with a system life of about 10 years, there is little wonder why the competition for CATV licenses is so fierce. Thus they do in fact generate wealth for their owners, leisure for their viewers, etc. CATV systems have shown that it is possible to provide numerous video channels into the home for a reasonable cost per channel. It is now obvious that these systems provide for the dissemination of far more programs than can be received from off the air broadcasting stations, and the problem now arises about what to do with these channels. Questions such as who can use them and for what, What should be the charge for the use and/or monitoring of these channels, are the subject of a great deal of contention and discussions at the present time. For example, for educational applications the CRTC requires that cable operators applying for a license, as a condition of the license, make one television channel available on the request of provincial authorities for educational application. Thus these systems provide a ready vehicle that people could use to engage in educational and community programming. In fact certain individuals and provinces are already working in these areas.

Perhaps the most dramatic use of television has been in the political dimension. In 1968 in the United States, about $200 million (according to the Sloan Foundation Report – "On the Cable") was spent on political advertising during the presidential elections. Of this total some 40% ($80 million) was spent on television advertising. This compares with only about $20 million spent on newspaper advertising for the same purpose during the same period. Little wonder then that it is a truism that whoever can buy the most television time has an excellent chance of being elected. In

this regard providing access to channels available to anyone wishing to use them; means that theoretically, more people could air their views and more people would have the opportunity to seek public office. In essence then, more people can interfere or otherwise manipulate political programming. To illustrate one possibility, suppose I'm making a political speech and my opponent who knows about it in advance decides that he would like to reduce my listening audience and accordingly rents a feature movie which he shows for free on another channel on the same network at the time I'm speaking. I wonder whether people would listen to my speech or watch the movie. This is a childish example but not all political actions have been or will be rational.

The whole area of system ownership and programming in the CATV field is the subject of much debate these days. For example, in the past, the CRTC has insisted that there be some partial ownership of the cable system hardware by the person who had the license to operate the system. However, recently in a new town – Erin Mills, near Toronto – the CRTC has apparently allowed,on an experimental basis,what I interpret to be a hardware-software split. In Erin Mills the system hardware will be owned by a common carrier, in this case Bell Telephone Company, who plan to build a new type of broadband system and provide lease back to various channels to the CATV licensee.

The Erin Mills system and a number of other systems like it, have the capability of providing a wide range of new services to the homes that they serve. These services include information services, weather, train reservations and so on. In fact numerous administrators, common carriers and private conglomerates are studying the market prospects for such new services.

In this connection pressing questions that must be resolved include –

- are there cost-benefits involved in integrating and sharing communication facilities in a common network? and if so
- should the provision of this one large network be left to common carriers?

The idea here is for single networks to serve as electronic highways for the country; over these highways the various classes of services duly licensed by the appropriate authorities would be provided to the home, office, etc. This notion is akin to the road system in the country, in that the builders and maintainers are not necessarily the same ones who will provide these new services. In general then the hardware-software split is in keeping with the modus operandi of the common carrier. Its successful implementation raises a number of intriguing questions about ownership and control and involves a fundamental evaluation of the roles existing and "new" common carriers. There have been many heated debates on the pros and cons of this concept. For example, in the Erin Mills case it has been argued that the CATV licencee could end up being simply a bill collector at the mercy of the telephone company. The counter argument to this is that the technical and operating procedures should remain in the hands of the experts. One interesting question that you might wish to think about is, what happens if Erin Mills is successful? That is, what happens to the future complexion of cable systems in this country?

Since we are on the subject of cable systems, let me try and give you a brief idea of the capital involved. There is about $125,000,000 invested in the capital costs of cable television systems in this country. The telephone companies on the other hand each year spend a billion dollars, roughly ten times this amount on the construction of new systems facilities. Telephone systems have been optimized for voice communications and can carry efficiently a host of other services. They provide, I feel, the greatest bargain at the lowest price available to the average Canadian. I can't think of too many other things in this country whose price in relation to income has actually gone down over the last 20 years. The common carriers have demonstrated their competence in engineering ultra reliable and efficient networks in the public interest and I look forward with interest to their continued activity in the video area.

There are those that argue, and I do not necessarily subscribe to this, that cable television systems are the next logical step in the transition from audio to video communications. This is simply because although CATV systems do disseminate video information, their "tree" topology severely restricts their potential for interactive video communication applications.

Turning to the general overriding question of how will the billions of dollars necessary to realize sophisticated video systems ever be found.

I feel strongly that we must find distributed rather than lumped economic concepts to pay for such sophisticated systems. For example, if we had to pay for a mile of super highway in front of

a house, especially if we were the only house for one mile, it would be an impossibility. Yet in a sense communication systems are priced in this way. If the costs of these systems are not distributed over other goods and services, I do not feel that we will have them, at least not for a long time.

Intimately related to this problem of costs is the question of whether or not Canada should utilize its scarce resources, namely people and money, to develop wide ranging video capabilities in the country.

As far as developing a single gigantic video network is concerned, there will always be the danger that inertia and inefficiences associated with large size will negate any cost benefits that would otherwise accrue from integration and sharing of facilities.

In the educational area there is a growing realization that video communications could play a major role in effectively enhancing the educational process in some cost-beneficial sort of way.

For example, Ontario operates its own UHF broadcasting station and has, I am told, an educational programming budget of the order of $11,000,000 for this year (1972) These expenditures are significant, however I feel they are important especially when we consider that the Statistics Canada projections are that there will be an increase in enrolment from the present 6.2 million to 6.5 million students over the next 10 years. At the same time, projected educational costs increased from $6.7 billion to $23 billion. Thus for a marginal increase in student enrolment, there will be a massive increase in costs. This suggests that before massive financial commitments are made to the new technology, we must resolve as soon as possible, two fundamental questions which I don't think have been satisfactorily answered at all as yet; namely—

- can communications technology be cost beneficial and enhance the educational process more efficiently and better than other conventional techniques;
- what are the best systems, and the techniques for using them in order to best serve the interests of educators, as determined by educators; and how do we choose and deploy systems?

There are no rules, no criteria for choosing the best systems. Engineers are enthusiastic about technology and tend to be good salesmen and I have seen all too many audio visual centres equipped with millions of dollars of fancy equipment which is really not being properly exploited. Nothing I feel produces more of a tendency towards disillusionment with technology than expensive black boxes that are not doing anything. Many people have in the past proceeded on the assumption that all communications technology will be good and should be used as soon as possible in educational applications. While I don't think we should ignore the possibility that there will be meaningful applications of this new technology in education, I wish to re-emphasize that the problem of how best to exploit it is still an unsolved one. Everything that has been done to date in this area underlines how little we know and how much remains to be done, and in general, the following "folk lore" theorem holds — "Most telecommunications systems and techniques will be very valuable in educational applications except most of the ones used thus far."

Cognizant of this, the Council of Ministers of Education sponsored last week at Mont Gabriel in Quebec a seminar on Communications Technology in support of Education. The seminar addressed the problem of what are the best technologies? How are these used and evaluated? Are there any cost benefits? The Deputy Minister of Communications made the point that I could not agree with more, namely that possibly the only way to find the answer to questions of this nature would be through the use of carefully planned and monitored experimental programs.

In this regard there have been a number of pilot programs that have illustrated how various levels of government and industry can work together in evaluating the role of communications technology in education. One such pilot program took place in Ottawa over the last two years and was called the Information Retrieval Television Project. With the collaboration of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and Bell Northern, research of a CATV type system was used to connect some 150 classrooms in 5 schools in Ottawa to a central library containing some 3,000 educational films. The teacher in a classroom then used the telephone to call the library and make a request for a certain program which would be played at a scheduled time through the CATV system to a television set in the classroom. I do not know where the project now stands, but I have heard some comments to the effect that it was all very nice but that it costs

too much money. In the more exotic area of using computer-communications in the educational process, the National Research Council of Canada has been running for a number of years, in collaboration with some provinces, such as Alberta, and Ontario, a computer aided learning pilot program. In this program a computer in Ottawa is programmed by educators who develop various courses on it. Large numbers of remotely located students can then take these courses directly interacting with the computer.

It is important to appreciate that the full potential of communication technologies cannot be realized through the use of very simple systems that are called upon to perform complicated tasks. The complexity of the system and its architecture must be related to the tasks to be performed. Simple systems do not perform complicated tasks and this is why we should not expect miracles from the use of broadcast systems in education. The Department of Communications,in collaboration with other Federal Government departments,has prepared a proposal for an educational communications research program involving collaboration between the federal and provincial governments. The object of this program would be to conduct experiments that would more fully evaluate the role of technology in education. The proposed program will, I expect, be examined by the Government shortly.

There have been numerous studies as I have said previously, dealing with special communication services to the home Too few of them have sought to determine the householder's preference, as expressed by the householder. For example, if education to the home via communications technology were provided, would mothers want their children home all day being educated? Similarly, if it were possible to work at home, would it be wise to have husbands working at home all day? Also would the housewife want to forego driving out in her car to shop? Right now most shopping can be done from the home, using a telephone, yet how many people actually shop this way?

There has been a great deal of interest in recent years in the concept of a cashless society. The idea is quite simple, and involves the replacement of actual cash by an electronic debit/credit system using a computer communications network. Japan is well ahead of Canada, in that most of their financial transactions take place in such a network and do not involve the transfer of actual cash. The Japanese plan to extend the automatic debiting and crediting of customer accounts in stores. Thus in time the conventional methods of paying bills by cheque will be replaced by one of direct account debiting by electronic means. This sort of cashless society could be a reality in ten years in Canada if a national commitment were made to it.

I believe that services such as remote shopping, electronic banking and computer aided learning etc., will cause the changes that will,in the long run, fundamentally alter our society and it is therefore important to determine the relationship between new services and associated changes.

In order to make the optimum choice of new services there should be pilot evaluation projects and programs, both in the laboratory and in the community involving sociologists, engineers, urban and economic planners. In addition to system design considerations these programs must determine if there are tangible dollar assets that would accrue from the provision of these new services and whether or not there would be any "benefits" in terms of social norms.

I think another real promise that telecommunications systems hold for Canadian communities, is related to the fact that all telecommunication is a substitute for travel. You usually call someone on the phone instead of going to see them. The question that should now be in your minds, is what has all this to do with urban planning? Let me now try and explain what the connection is that I am trying to make.

The modern city is largely a child of the automobile. In fact some forty years ago, there were many scenarios in glowing terms of what a great thing the automobile was going to be for mankind and life in the city. Beautiful pictures were painted of people living in the country and commuting to work, in a "relaxed" atmosphere in the car with a radio softly playing. These scenarios as we now know are not complete and the automobile has become in many respects a menace to the viability of the city. The point that I am making here is that the city's mechanical communications systems do not serve it well in all instances and we must look at what possibilities telecommunications systems and services offer for the planning of new environments that will be better than present ones.

Consider for example, a community in the Canadian north, here the conventional practices of urban planning involving building roads etc.,do not work well in an environment that has large

snow accumulations and sub-zero temperatures 80% of the year. Conventional urban planning of northern communities seems to me, to have lead so far, to less than desirable lifestyles, both for people that go to the north and for people that live there. Therefore, there is in my opinion, an urgent need to determine those attributes of telecommunications systems that urban planners and architects need to understand so that they can use them as dynamic variables in moulding and planning new environments. In this regard the Department of Communications has a program with the University of Toronto that has been running for about a year. This program is devoted to determining the experiments and simulations that need to be run to answer the questions that urban planners have about communications systems and services before they can use them to plan and mould new environments. The first phase of this program is now finished and the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Toronto and the Department of Communications are presently defining the set of possible simulation experiments that can be run in a new broadband simulation laboratory that we are constructing at Carleton University.

This laboratory will be devoted to performing simulation studies and experiments on the role of video communications in telemedicine, education, teleconferencing, new services, etc. Many people will be involved in exploring the social, technical, economic and psychological aspects of communications in these areas. Thus a multi-disciplinary approach will be followed and heavy emphasis placed on the sociological, psychological aspects of the experiments. The Carleton laboratory will, I believe, contribute significantly to a better understanding and use of video communications in the service of Canadians.

As I said at the beginning, I was let off the hook by saying something about the future, however, I've tried to describe system capabilities as they now exist and some of the things that are being done to expand them and why. I hope that you now have a "feel" for the relationship between communications systems and some of the areas such as education, urban planning, etc., where they might be utilized.

To summarize, we have three types of communications systems, that serve the community, namely telephone systems, that provide,in addition to voice communication,access to computer power; CATV distribution systems, and then computer communications networks which are now emerging.

In essence, on a national basis there is a growing realization that Canada must face the challenge of rationalizing the use and development of our computer systems, telephone systems and CATV systems. This challenge demands the successful resolution of such problems as how to best "couple" systems; how to generate new programming sources; how to ensure the provision of secure and useful data banks, etc.

There are those, including myself, who dream of the ultimate computer and the ultimate computer communications network that will link together everybody in this country providing them with unlimited computer power and information beyond their wildest dreams. This dream reminds me of a story of this ultimate computer arrangement.

A scientist, after many years of university, built the ultimate computer. This computer stored and could manipulate all knowledge, forecasting with 100% reliability. That is, it could respond to any question with 100% reliability.

The scientist took it to a marketing executive and said "I have the ultimate computer, we can stop here and now and take it easy for the rest of our lives. It will tell you anything you want to know." The executive was skeptical but he said "O.K. I'll ask it a question. I know my father has been dead and I'll ask the computer where he is now. So he typed in 'where is my father?' Some lights flashed and out came the answer: "Your father is fishing in Perth." He turned to the scientist and said "This is impossible, my father is dead. This is a stupid machine, take it away. I don't have any more time for this nonsense." "Just rephrase your question" said the scientist. "O.K. I'll phrase it another way." The executive then wrote:"where is my mother's husband?" The lights flashed and out came the answer: Your mother's husband is dead, and in case you are interested, your Dad just caught a fish."

That would truly be the ultimate computer and a network of thousands of them certainly boggles the mind, I wonder what would happen to the traditional role of women as purveyors of the latest gossip, perhaps this is the break that the Ms, or those in search of masculinity are waiting for. There are all sorts of intriguing possibilities here. It should keep the lawyers, marriage counsellors, legislators, technologists, not to mention sociologists, pre-occupied for

many, many years.

In all seriousness, the next 20 years in Canada will be critical for future generations but the beautiful thing about this future is that we can make it just about anything that we want it to be. However, once events are set in motion, they will be very hard, if not impossible, to reverse. What we do now with telecommunication technologies will create a legacy for our grandchildren and their grandchildren; and if there happens to be any of us left around, we can expect to be called to account for our actions in the next crucial two decades.

In summary then, I believe it is safe to say that telecommunications systems will be wealth generators, that will contribute significantly to the "good life." I don't think we know sufficiently well yet how to focus and guide accurately the flow of information by electronic means so that it will contribute effectively to the wealth generation process, and the "good life." But that it can and will do so, is certain and learning how is the challenge for the future.

Reaction:
Mrs. Diane Abbey Livingston

Dr. deMercado has certainly kept my mind dancing for the last thirty-five minutes. It seems to me that the most sensible reaction I can make to his address is to suggest that we halt the session, and that we all take a couple of hours to really think about what he has said, absorb the implications and consider alternatives.

This morning's session and conferences in general, represent to me what we consistently do when we set out to consider important issues. We divorce physical and technical realities from social and psychological realities. Technically, we can place chairs in a room, light the room and ensure that sounds can be heard. Physically, we can have human beings capable of hearing sit in that room. Then we can structure time so that it is filled by a few persons giving information to all the others who are seated in that room. These are the technical and physical realities.

Lets look at the social and psychological aspects of the situation I have described. I'm not sure how many bits of information we receive in a given space of time, and, I don't know what the relationship is between what we can receive and what we can process. I am certain that we cannot handle as much as we hear, or as much as we have heard this morning. We've ignored the psychological reality that we cannot concentrate attention or intelligently consider information for as long as our bodies can endure the seated position. The social reality we ignore is that we are not as effective learners or thinkers when we are passively listening as we are when we are actively involved in questioning, clarifying and challenging.

The result of over-concentration on physical and technical possibilities and little attention to psychological and social realities is a waste of time resources.

For me, the gap between social and technical, between physical and psychological relates to cable television and the possibilities outlined by Dr. deMercado. He painted the picture of people working, playing, shopping and learning without ever having to move from their homes. This, he said, is technically and physically possible. I did not hear him relate this to the jolt it would cause to our lifestyles and to the human relationships

that form the fabric of our lives. I did not hear any consideration given to the fact that we all operate with certain expectations of each other as friends, mothers, fathers, husbands and wives, and that these expectations structure our life space, our time and our activities. As insecure as our society is, we derive a certain amount of psychological stability from interaction with each other and from secure expectations for each other and for the way time and space are structured.

I am not saying that we should preserve our stability and security at all costs. I am not saying that living, working, playing and learning at home might not be great. (It might solve some of our pollution problems). What I am saying is this. I would like to hear those who know about technological developments express as much concern for the social and psychological implications of their gadgetry as they do for the design. I am saying that the development and implementation of new technology requires that designers and technicians calculate social costs as well as economic costs.

You and I must involve ourselves not as listeners but as active evaluators of their ideas and plans. We must demand facts on how much of our resources will go into a wired world and whether the cost will be less in social and monetary terms than the benefits we will supposedly derive. It seems to me that social development and technology warrant more than us simply hearing a few speeches and delegating serious consideration to cocktail party time.

In preparing for this conference, I read through some of the literature written about television in its early days. Many forecasted that through television, an informed public would act on political processes and on government to bring about a more just and equitable society. Television was heralded as a tool that would bring about intelligent participation in decision making, greater awareness and the "good" life.

The social reality doesn't reflect our technical prowess nor the realization of our hopes. In fact, statistics show that our situation with respect to poverty, mental illness, and family breakdown has not improved. The position of families on the lowest rung of the ladder has deteriorated since 1951. The middle class goodies, which through television, form packaged expectations for most of us, are available to less than 40% of Canada's population.

What has gone wrong? Is it that our technology has not been sophisticated enough? Or is it that we have been looking for technical solutions to human problems and are having to live with the inadequacy of technological answers? Are we at this conference about to feel that 28 channels, two way communication and computer hook-ups are going to significantly help? Are we again looking to the wrong areas for solutions?

Think of this. Even now, in the infancy of cable television, gaps exist between the technical possibilities and the social realities. The decisions made in the past few years limit the extent to which cable will be able to be used for improved communications. In the granting of cable licenses, communities have been fragmented. Municipalities will not be able to offer better services at lower costs because the areas they serve are being carved up by cable systems that are not interlinked. The cost of information retrieval via cable will waste untold resources and time because most of the cables which are being laid at present do not have two way capability.

And what about the idea of sophisticated systems for information retrieval? Will they help the average person? Dr. deMercado told an interesting story about a computer which distinguished between a young man's father and the same young man's mother's husband. The story brings home to me a skill which most of us lack. We don't know how to frame questions so that we get the information we are looking for. We are not hungry for information – we are over-saturated. We need to know how to ask and how to select. The priority should not be the creation of machinery that responds only to precise input, as do computer systems, but the creation of learning experiences that teach us how to ask questions, how to select information and how to link together relevant pieces of information. This must be attended to before we can ever hope to have meaningful returns from our technology.

Dr. deMercado touched on the area of community originated programming. I think that issues in this area deserve much consideration. What are they?

The CRTC endorses a channel reserved for local originated programs, and it smiles favourably on community participation in programming. We also hear the phrase "equal and open" access to these channels.

This is all very nice and it fits with our idea of

participatory democracy. Through reserved channels, the full range of views within a community can supposedly be expressed. The separate voices of minority groups and special interest groups will find an exposure they never had on broadcast television.

These are hopeful possibilities. But the crunch comes when we ask a few questions. Who decides what is put on the cable and who decides what merits prime time exposure? What ensures that special interest or minority groups have access to the channel? Cable operators, responsible for content, have the right to screen out programs done by the community. They also generally control scheduling. What ensures that irresponsible censorship does not masquerade as responsibility?

To what extent must a cable operation reflect the views of a community? To what extent is a cable operation responsible to the community it serves?

I understand that a community group can present briefs on their situation to the CRTC, but, I cannot find ground rules about what data the CRTC will accept, or what criteria it will use to determine adequacy of service. It seems to me that in a monopolistic system, cable operators, and citizen groups would want to have guidelines which protect both parties and which act as the basis for their actions.

The whole area of control of cable might well be a red herring if supports are not given to community groups for the planning, implementation and publicizing of their television efforts. The CRTC says that the local originated program is not supposed to compete for mass audiences, but rather it is to be geared to special interest groups and therefore does not have to put on slick, polished presentations. I think that is naive; naive in the sense that cable will compete for our time on the same terms as other TV offerings, in terms of what we are accustomed to and what we expect. TV offerings may be superficial but nevertheless we are accustomed to slick looking, polished TV. There certainly are questions around the ability of no-cost community produced programs to draw audiences and sustain viewer interest.

At a broader level, I think we should consider the implications for network television of local community programming. Once we have local channels where we say that a range of community views can be exposed and special concerns be heard, does this absolve national broadcast systems from their responsibility to relate the concerns of one part of the country to those of another part of the country? Mass media must make people aware of the relationships between the north and the south, aware of the connectedness of Cabbagetown and Rosedale, and aware that Toronto and Halifax relate to each other on issues which are seemingly localized to only one area. How are we minimizing the risk of further fragmentation of the country and even less consciousness that we are all inextricably interlinked and interdependent? By creating these local channels, what precautions are being taken to ensure that we are not simply diffusing expression of discontent?

I would like to continue and talk about community television in terms of community development. I would like to pose questions to those who see VTR and local cable channels as methods for community organization. This is an area that deserves attention. But, mindful of what I said earlier about our capacity for listening to speakers, I will forgo the temptation to continue speaking.

I would like to share the image that keeps forming in my mind. I can see a summer conference where world authorities come to define and set policy on the elephant. The Englishman defines the animal in terms of its constitutional development. The Frenchman describes the elephant in terms of its sexual relationships, and our representative from Canada, with firm conviction talks about the animal in terms of Federal and Provincial relationships.

I feel that we, here, are interested in a kind of elephant. The local community channel is but a toe on the beast. I maintain that, if that toe has a hangnail, our animal will limp along wincing at every step instead of marching with full sense of purpose. If we hope to create, as television literature suggested in the early forties, a better life, then we have some pretty strong thinking to do. If we hope that the new technology will nurture democratic dialogue, will send more people to the polls to act more intelligently on political processes and on government systems, then we have to switch the focus of our attention. We must concentrate less on the technology itself and more on the kind of support systems we have to build around the technology.

The Guelph Communications Project
William Foss, Guelph LIP Project

Canadian television, the CBC keeps reminding us, is twenty years old this year. "Progress" means doing more with less (B. Fuller). Civilization is related to communication. Kenneth Clark makes constant reference to improving communication in his analysis of civilization. It is clear, then, that the technologies which communicate the most with the least effort are the most progressive. They also have the most profound effect on civilization. Computer and television networks are involved in almost every identifiable social phenomenon and technical breakthrough of the last quarter century. Computers and television are now so much a part of civilization that their impact is impossible to measure.

Considering the importance of television, it is disturbing to think that, until recently, very little was known of its "modus operendum". Television was felt by most to be a past time. "Entertainment" sections of the newspaper still contain the television listings and reviews, even though it is common knowledge that:

1. Some children may spend half of their waking hours before a television set.
2. Children in all the world's worst slums and ghettos have access to television, and
3. In North America the influence of television on children has been to increase their general knowledge and to launch a massive and universal demand for changes in social structure and wealth distribution. This factor, according to Pierre Berton, is the most played-down news in the history of journalism.

In January of this year, I formed a group to experiment with program and research the more recent phenomenon of "Cable TV" in the community of Guelph, Ontario. Guelph has no broadcast TV station, but is within good range of all three American and both Canadian networks. In addition, there are more independent and affiliated VHF and UHF stations available than the cable company can accomodate on their VHF capability. In Canada, cable operators, out of deference to the CRTC, hold available at least one VHF channel for local origination, consisting largely of a weather scan. This "wasted channel" is a bone of much contention. However, initially my group, Community Television Services, (CTS) was welcomed warmly to help fill some of that dead air time of Guelph Cable 8.

Canada is a huge country with sparse population. It is not surprising that, in such isolation, a sense of community and identification with a region has traditionally been a hallmark of Canadian life. The Canadian government is currently in a passion to discover what has occurred in these "communities" since the advent of mass communication. Cable TV isolates and identifies communities unlike broadcast TV which programs for whole regions, and often for whole cultures. The question CTS tried to answer was: "Do people still identify primarily with their community and if so, will they attempt to use mass media such as cable TV to strengthen this identity?" This is indeed a very large question, but may be attacked in the following way.

First we asked: "Are there any 'issues' which can be identified and telecast as local rather than regional or national concern?"

In answering this question, somewhat subjectively, we have broadcast about 50 hours of material to Guelph Cable TV subscribers. Most of the issues I and my colleagues considered important went far beyond the physical city boundaries. The region concerned was defined partly by the issue itself. For example, a hydro-electric transmission system from Pickering to Lake Erie passes within four miles of Guelph and is of "community" concern, but obviously also of concern to all the communities it affects. It is a regional issue, geographically defined by the issue itself. It is interesting to note that Cable TV operators are beginning to form networks and may in the future be in a better position to cope with regional issues. However, the one question of the rural, non-subscribing population, remains critical. In the foreseeable future, they will not be wired for cable TV even though most issues that affect the urban centres also affect them. Even the Provincial Government admits this and is switching to "regional" rather than municipal government. MacLean-Hunter Ltd. recently informally petitioned the CRTC to consider the possibility of broadcasting all "community" channels on low power UHF. All trends seem to indicate that the fabric of community life extends far beyond the convenient municipal boundaries into regions defined largely by issues which abound and are not necessarily of concern to other regions or

to the country as a whole.

An alternate attack on the question of community identity could pose the question: "If given the opportunity, do members of a community display interest in directing and generating their own programming for the local channel?" If they did, they would be displaying an interest in and identification with that community. If they did not, discounting the great Canadian apathy myth, the reverse would be true.

In the experience of CTS it was found almost invariably that groups already organized and conscious of themselves as leaders or communicators were anxious to use the free television exposure. These groups generally were disinterested in learning television operation or production techniques, tending rather to rely on the "experts". They seemed to feel Cable TV is extremely inadequate coverage but were thankful for even limited exposure. Examples of this type of group would be the Traffic Safety Committee and various amateur theatre groups. Individuals did not respond to the opportunity to broadcast and it can generally be concluded that members of the community feel that exposure only to the community and not to some larger group is meaningless or insignificant.

To lend support to my conclusion that the traditional community is disintegrating, I refer to the results of a survey of Guelph Cable TV subscribers by CTS. Here in Guelph, as everywhere, a very small percentage of subscribers view the local origination service. The majority of viewers watch American stations and the majority of those watch entertainment programming, presenting cultural archtypes. Surprisingly, an important minority showed up viewing and demanding hard-core educational material. Viewing trends by-pass completely the question of community. Programs which entertain or instruct or inform about the region, the country, the culture are in demand. Here is one of the first visible trends toward "global community".

An Outline of Plans Under Discussion for the Ryerson Open College

Mrs. Margaret Norquay, Ryerson Open College, Toronto

Ryerson has a long tradition of pioneering new developments in education. Its years of experience in technical and vocational education provided the prototype for Ontario's community colleges. Its extension department (which sends correspondence courses around half the world), and its educational radio station (one of four in Canada), have both pioneered in providing education at a distance. Ryerson Open College, which offered the only credit course to be given on radio in Canada last year, continued in this tradition.

Open College was established initially as a pilot experiment. The aim was to find out how radio, with some assistance from television, could be used effectively to teach a university-level course and to assess the potential market for such education.

Part-Time Off-Campus University-Level Education Is Not New

A dramatic development in university education in the last couple of years has been the announcement of a variety of plans to enable students to earn academic credits toward a degree, without having to live on a specific campus or attend classes there. Some have been initiated by such long-established institutions as the University of Syracuse or the Universities of South Florida and Oklahoma. These tend to use a combination of correspondence and independent study under a tutor, together with annual residential seminars and periodic examinations.

Other institutions offering off-campus study have been specially created and chartered independently, such as Britain's Open University. The latter uses a mix of radio, television, and correspondence, together with annual residential seminars.

Still other plans – like "University Without Walls" or Empire State College in New York – have been organized as consortia, or academic holding companies, designed to elicit the cooperation of a number of colleges and institutions within a given region. Students may take their studies in a variety of ways: through supervised internship in business, hospitals, museums, or other work-study exper-

iences. They may use educational films, cassettes, televised lectures, and correspondence.

The faculty of "University Without Walls" includes not only the qualified "academic" but talented citizens from the outside: artists, businessmen, engineers, scientists, and government officials.

The time limits in all these plans are relatively free. Credits can be acquired one at a time. Many students hold full-time jobs, and degrees may be obtained in three to eight or more years, depending on the academic capacities and circumstances of the individual student. These courses are not conceived as kind of "do-your-own-thing" education. The available literature concerning them indicates that they are carefully planned and supervised by competent and committed scholars. A summary of these plans is available in the Open College office for anyone interested.

These new developments appear well suited to provide for the wide variety of upgrading and retraining needed in a society subject to rapid social change and continuing explosions of knowledge.

Increased leisure, new conceptions of the roles of women, greater affluence, and technological change bring demands for changes in careers and lifestyles.

Trends in education seem to indicate that increasing numbers of people will move in and out of work and school, sometimes concentrating exclusively on one and sometimes on the other, and sometimes being involved in both at the same time. Continuing education for the citizen, as he remains and works "in the world" rather than apart from it, seems to be the new frontier.

Young people mature on average two years earlier than they did in 1920. The pervasiveness of the mass media, together with greater mobility and affluence, have contributed to a different psychological stance. Advances in photography, sound engineering, optics, communication, and transportation have completely revolutionized the process of learning. Our young are learning to learn in different ways. The average teenager knows much more than his parents did at the same age. To keep him segregated from the real world for seven to ten years beyond puberty is becoming increasingly untenable, as the unrest in schools and colleges continues to show.

Adults in the twentieth century all need retreading, regardless of previous educational attainment. The current trend is for increasing numbers of them to achieve this by re-entering the educational stream from the work force.

The old yardsticks of higher education: faculty-student ratios, years in residence, credit hours for courses, become obsolescent as new educational needs become more evident.

All the recent studies about post-secondary education in Ontario seem to support this assesment. These studies include the Bernard Trotter report on technology in university teaching, the report of the Committee of Presidents of Ontario Universities, "Towards the Year 2000"; and finally the draft report of the Wright Commission which was recently released. According to all of these studies, increasing numbers of people will be seeking higher education on a part-time basis, "studying as they work". The recent government decision to provide formula financing for part-time education reinforces this prediction and ensures the necessary financial support to meet the new demand.

What Is Ryerson Open College?

Ryerson Open College was established on a very modest scale in January 1971 with no budget of its own and one course, Introductory Sociology. Initially, it had a Management Committee consisting of the Dean of Arts, the Registrar of the Diploma in Arts Program, and the Director of the Media Centre. Later, this committee was augmented by adding the Vice President, and the Chairman of Radio and Television Arts.

Radio carried the burden of the teaching with two programs a week for 25 weeks, and 16 television programs interspersed throughout a six month period. Students completed 18 assignments of varying lengths, wrote two examinations, and attended two study weekends. Communication between students, tutors, and teacher was accomplished by telephone, correspondence, and an open line on the air following the broadcasts.

Radio programs were broadcast both afternoons and evenings on weekdays, and re-broadcast Sunday mornings. Eighty-three students enrolled, sixty-five of whom continued to work and send in assignments through the second term.

The admission to the "College" was completely open. It was based on the principle that if one

could do the work, one ought to be able to take the course, regardless of previous academic achievement.

It was called a credit course because students were graded and evaluated on the work done. In order to give the term further validity, an accredited Ryerson Teacher who had previous experience using the media was asked to conduct the course, using the prescribed texts and course outline approved by the Sociology section of the Social Science Department and Academic Council. It was therefore, the course described in the current calendar as Sociology 010.

Students represented a variety of educational and vocational backgrounds. Some had only grade eight education, three had graduate degrees, but had never studied sociology. The median was about grade 11. Students included a pastry cook, a librarian, a parole officer, a child care worker, a newspaper reporter, an actress, several stenographers, nurses, some teachers, and some young people working on an assembly line in a factory.

A large proportion of them were shift workers who said that their irregular hours had denied them access to any other kind of higher education. A few were high school dropouts in their early twenties, trying to get back into the educational stream. Several were new Canadians, with good academic credentials from their countries of origin, who wanted to study in English to improve their vocabularies and to learn about their new country.

Most were people who had always wanted to further their education, but who had been given no previous opportunity to do so, either because they lacked the usual academic qualifications required for university entrance, or because their life situation, financial or otherwise, precluded them from studying full time.

All who completed the course said they would welcome more opportunity for study, provided it offered the same flexibility in hours.

Of the sixty-five who continued into the second term, thirty-three completed all the assignments and examinations and successfully passed the course.

Since the financial resources for the first year of Open College were "borrowed" from other Ryerson departments (particularly CJRT) the possibilities for continuing the program were contingent upon recognition from the Government of Ontario. This came in the form of a letter to the President from the office of the Minister of Education, dated July 21, 1971, saying that the experiment should be continued and formula financing would be available. This decision came too late to develop a new course for the year 1972. Consequently, it was decided to offer Sociology again in January 1972 and to begin preparing courses that could be offered in January 1973 or earlier if they could be managed. (Eight months to a year's lead time is needed for preparation.)

The registration for the 1972 course has more than doubled, reaching 190 students. The program has been uniformly well received. Reports have come in from sociology students at other educational institutions saying that they have been urged to listen to Open College. At least two teachers are known to be taping the programs to play back to their student seminars. Several students who successfully completed the Sociology course have been able to use this credit to gain admittance to a variety of degree programs at other universities. Two have been allowed to take second-level sociology studies, with the Open College course accepted as a suitable prerequisite. One student without grade 13 was admitted to the University of Waterloo on the basis of marks achieved in the Open College course. Both the Minister of University Affairs and the Minister of Education received letters from the general public last spring urging that this kind of education be continued. At least one of these letters came from a member of the sociology department in an outside university.

Administrative Structure of Open College

In keeping with the experimental nature of Open College, the structure has been kept relatively simple and small. The Director of Studies reports directly to the Vice-President, Academic. However, she is advised by a Management Committee consisting of the Acting Dean of Arts, the Chairman of Radio and Television Arts, and a member of the Social Science department who has had a great deal of experience in radio, television, and adult education.

In addition, there is an ad hoc Curriculum Committee to explore the possibilities for future courses, and to assess the contribution this kind of delivery system can make to the educational process. This committee consists of representatives from the Social Science and English departments, and four teachers from other programs in the Institute who were appointed because of their

particular interest and/or experience in the use of media for educational purposes.

Proposed Future Plans for Open College

1. To explore the "market" for part-time, university-level, off-campus education and to develop the curriculum to meet assessed needs.

Requests have come in from a variety of sources. Course preferences seem to lie in the realm of the Social Sciences – Sociology, Psychology, Economics, Political Science – with English and Canadian Studies coming a close second. However, consultations are being conducted with representatives of business, industry, and a variety of social and educational agencies and government departments, to find out what courses would be given support. Feedback from the community indicates that in order to gain wide acceptance the courses would eventually have to lead to a diploma or degree in Applied Arts. The administration of Open College intends all "credit" courses to be of sufficiently high academic quality to earn accreditation at other universities. To ensure this and to allay some of the skepticism regarding this form of education, the courses will be made more demanding than comparable day courses given in the Institute.

The Curriculum Committee will work towards a program of courses to be offered in the future. Some courses will be informal, others formal and for credit. The balance of each is to be determined. The formal course currently being offered for credit is parallel in content to the course 010 approved by Academic Council and taught by teachers in the Social Science department. It is, therefore, referred to as a credit course in the Open College brochure. Additional credit courses may similarly parallel those already established and approved. New courses will be developed in response to demands from the community. However, no new course will be offered for credit until it has gone through the regular channels and been given the approval of Academic Council.

It is expected that two credit courses will be developed during the spring and summer, ready for offering in January 1973. No firm decision has yet been made about the content of these courses, but it is expected that one will parallel a course already being offered at Ryerson and that the other will be newly developed in co-operation with the relevant department. It is hoped that information concerning these will be available for Academic Council in April.

2. To develop a variety of teaching approaches which will provide maximum flexibility for students.

Additional courses might be developed along the same lines as the pilot program, using a mix of radio, television, telephone, correspondence, and weekend teach-ins. It is important, however, to fit the medium to the particular course. Subjects with a highly visual component, such as urban geography, might have a higher ratio of television to radio than the reverse. Some courses might be taught through straight correspondence. It might be worth noting that Queen's University has for years provided university correspondence courses of sufficient quality to be given government financing. Some provision might also be made for independent study programs. This approach has been tried very successfully in other universities e.g. Syracuse, Oklahoma, and University of South Florida. Open College audio and video tapes could be packaged and made available in public libraries with listening or viewing carrels, or could be rented to individuals with appropriate home equipment. Already we have had several requests for such media materials from points around the province out of listening range of CJRT.

3. To make Open College materials readily available on request to Ryerson faculty or students for teaching and learning.

Open College already has available a small bank of materials dubbed from the broadcasts, and taped interviews with a variety of experts. These are being used increasingly by Ryerson staff. They are currently housed in the Open College office, but eventually will be transferred to the media or library resource centre.

4. To provide a continuous training program for Ryerson faculty who may be interested in learning how to use the media for teaching purposes.

A beginning has been made in the plan to offer teachers the experience of preparing two half-hour radio programs, as outlined in a memo sent to all members of faculty. The visit of Professor Beishon of the Open University (Great Britain) is another

step in this direction. A third will be taken this May when Open College offers a five-day course in Instructional Design to interested faculty members.

5. To develop cooperative working arrangements with other educational institutions.

A careful reading of the three reports mentioned previously, published by the Commission on Post-Secondary Education, indicates that the government is going to urge considerably more cooperation from educational institutions in accrediting each others' courses than has previously obtained. Open College is prepared to make its courses available to others who may request them, and to use suitable materials prepared by others. Open College intends to take a careful look at television and radio courses developed by other universities using audio and video tapes, in the hope that some might be suitable for its own use.

Ryerson has begun to establish a pattern of cooperation in another way through the informal non-credit courses broadcast over CJRT for the last three years under the rubric of "Radiostudy". Two years ago Ryerson employed a teacher on the staff at University of Toronto to do an informal course in Anthropology. Last year the Islamic Studies Department at the University of Toronto prepared a course on the Middle East which was carried on CJRT. This year a professor from Scarborough is employed to do a non-credit course in Political Science, and the former Dean of the Faculty of Music at the University of Toronto is teaching a course in the History of Opera. These courses currently have approximately two hundred registered students and, according to BBM reports, fifteen thousand listeners.

The policy would be to find the right teacher for a proposed course, irrespective of institutional affiliation. However, to present a course for credit, such a person would have to be approved by the appropriate Ryerson department or if none exists by a special committee of Academic Council. Open College would reserve the right to assess his competency in the use of the media.

Cooperative arrangements have developed with OECA, the Ontario Educational Communications Authority to experiment with television support. This year OECA secured time for Open College on Channels 19, 11, and 9. It is carrying the television component of the Sociology course at OECA expense.

6. To build in a research design to assess the effectiveness of the teaching.

Since the sociology course offered in 1971 was a pilot experiment, all possible material was retrieved. Copies were kept of all student assignments; cassette recordings were made of the feedback on these assignments given over the air, and of the telephone conversations during and after the Open Line. Copies were also kept of the examination papers written by the students and an elaborate questionnaire was administered to the students at the end of the year, asking them to evaluate the course.

The research department of OECA has gone through this material and has set up a research design to use this year. A questionnaire was administered to the students at the beginning of the first term, and will be administered again at the end of the second term to test any learning or change in perspective which may have occurred. A variety of other testing instruments is being devised.

It is intended that all credit courses in the near future shall have a research component built into them so that the adequacy of the teaching can be assessed.

Cable TV and Credit Courses
Dr. R.F.G. Campbell

I have been amazed with the breadth of experience that has come to this conference, young and old and I won't say which category that we fit in, with very broad experience, with some idea of both degree work and its constraints and its promises and its hopelessness and also the same of cable television. I have a page and a half of notes here and it begins with a question which I would like to throw to you. The question that I asked myself when suddenly I was asked to come and discuss this topic with you because Channel 19 is not a cable television outlet, although we do broadcast over cable in northern Ontario and I think open broadcast which in my opinion is not cable television, they're two separate entities, open broadcast and cable are two different things. I would like to ask you and just for a few minutes sound you out. Why in the world would you want to put a degree course on cable television anyway? I put it with that kind of emphasis. Have you any ideas?

A. I think the main reason is to reach people who cannot get to the university.

Dr. Campbell: So, easy access for more people.

A. We have only one station in Kingston and it would be very difficult to get the number of times on that particular local station for a degree course. Therefore the other way is to do it via cable which we still do not have and it will be coming in shortly.

Dr. Campbell. So, cable versus open broadcasting, if you will accept that as a term.

A. I guess we did it to find out if people in fact respond to it. Our credit course was designed for the Metro audience, ideally, but our signal within Metro Toronto is so weak that we decided to expand beyond Metro Toronto and see if there would be interest in other communities.

Dr. Campbell. So, as an experiment. I'm not going to react to any of these – just to get your ideas.

A. Why not have it on cable TV? If you believe in mass education then it is some kind of ultimate virtue.

Dr. Campbell. Then you believe in mass education.

A. I didn't say I believe in it but the Province of Ontario, up to now anyway, seems to look at it that way.

Dr. Campbell: So, for the degree in itself then. You wouldn't want to push that a little further in the area of rights – people's right.

The degree itself. I don't want to push you into things you're not saying.

A. I think that everyone should have a choice and there must be some place education can be put on, perhaps cable or the open broadcasting system but I feel that there should be enough channels so that they do have this choice, choice of programming, against a hockey game for instance. I think there should be multiple choice.

A. I would like to elaborate on that if I may. Generally as far as private broadcasters are concerned, there is only limited time in the day in which they would carry anything classified as educational. Private broadcasting becomes more costly every year, consequently the logical progression would be to cable where you could reach people more easily.

Dr. Campbell: This is both choice and cost now.

A. Cable or how about UHF channel such as Channel 19? I think in a lot of respects your UHF channels have a lot more going for them than cable. For instance the thing that limits cable is that you have to have lines and they are very expensive.

A. Well UHF channels require a great degree of hardware, a lot of which isn't out yet.

A. Well yes, but it would seem to me that you could reach more people by UHF than you could by cable because of the geographical setup of people in the outlying areas around the city. You're obviously not going to run a cable for somebody's house that's twenty miles down concession road no. 15 or something. So because of where they live, they're cut off.

Dr. Campbell: All right, let's leave it as choice and cost and cable versus open and we'll come back to this. Are there any other reasons? I don't know, to be quite honest with you, that you've given me much of a reason yet.

A. I think there is an idealistic reason – a degree course made available to as many people as possible, getting something out of their tax dollar because a lot of people don't, individually, get anything out of their tax dollar. This way they could if it's on cable, if it's on broadcasting stations, if it's on as many broadcasting and/or media type channels, the better.

Dr. Campbell: This is getting back to what I said a while ago – the right of a person because of his tax dollar really, is what you're saying.

A. I don't suppose it could be called a right.
Dr. Campbell: What would you call it then, just a return for his investment?
A. Maybe that because it seems to me cable operators are always talking about a return for their investment.
Dr. Campbell: All right, return for tax dollar.
Q. Why would he not want it, is what I would like to know.
Dr. Campbell: Well the answer most broadcasters would give you is because it costs money and loses revenue and audience.
A. Well that's a natural assumption I think. I don't know whether it's true, whether it's factual that it loses an audience. It hasn't been on enought, often enough on enough cable systems to be judged as being totally unsuccessful.
Q. Well, Dr. Campbell, why does OECA for example, pay private broadcasters to carry programs which OECA puts out? If there were such a great demand for it, such a marvellous thing, surely the private broadcasters would leap at the opportunity to carry it but no.
Dr. Campbell: That's a policy which they've had right from the beginning which I believe in too, if you pay for your own time, you choose the time and you have control over that time. So that's a policy of OECA. Under normal circumstances they purchase from the CBC or CTV or independent CHCH.
Q. Do they purchase at the going commercial rate?
Dr. Campbell: Yes. Going commercial rate in the sense that we use a lot of it and we get a reduced rate for the amount we use which would be the same as a commercial advertiser.
Q. But you are primarily carrying OECA broadcasting.
Dr. Campbell: That's right – the same broadcasting that we have on Channel 19. It may be in the morning, it may be in the afternoon and in some instances, it may be in the evening, in one or two instances.

Well now, we've started in this way, I've lead you down the garden path really, you might know that about a broadcaster because I don't think that's the first question that we ought to ask ourselves – why use cable television? I think it's starting at the wrong point and I wanted to begin in this way and I know this wasn't intended by the main speaker this morning but to me superficially, if I was to drop in on that speech this morning, that's the main fault that I would offer with it – that it started with the assumption that you have the hardware there and you jolly well better use it. We have the technical means then let's use it.

From there I want to take you down two paths to give you an idea why I think the question we began with is starting at the wrong point. I believe that cable television is just one of the many media we have available to us and just because it exists doesn't mean that's the reason we should use it. To try and condense my thinking in this area I think that all kinds of media must be used. You know we worship this – we've said the systems approach, the multi-media approach. Face to face communication still has a function and I can say that, no longer being a faculty member of the University of Guelph and being accused of saying it for political reasons, I actually believe the lecture can do things and if pressed, tell you what I think those are. I think books and printed material can do things that face to face oral communication cannot accomplish. I believe that radio has a place. Open television, commercial television and videotape have unique characteristics available for learning. I consider a discussion group a medium of instruction which has its tasks that it can perform. I believe that correspondence study has its function in terms of printed materials going out and students writing back. Peer group study is another available learning medium. The examination is still a strong learning medium. Assignments fit into the same category. Independent study with programmed learning and computer-assisted instruction are also learning media. So then, what I'm asking you to consider is that all these media, I believe, have their strengths and their weaknesses that can be exploited for the purposes of the learner. So to say that cable television is something that's there and we've got to use it because it's jolly well there I think is wrong. I think the question is, what can a visual approach by television, videotape or cable television do that can lead to the strengthening of the subject matter that you have to teach? I also left out such important things as workshops and labs. Those of you who are scientists would clobber me for that. I think then, that a course ought to be designed, if you'll pardon the jargon, to include all these media if they are appropriate to the concepts that the professor has to get across. There are other constraints but that's the first thing and we could talk a long time and if you want to go a little further into this, there is a book by

Gagne, "The Conditions of Learning," and it's an attempt to take concepts of learning and break them down into a hierarchy of eight steps from the signal response learning as the least on the ladder, up to problem solving as the highest. He has tried to match along with these eight areas of learning, the media that have to be used to exploit these concepts for the benefit of the learner. When I was in the States I spent a lot of time working in this area. There have been actual followups where people have tried to apply this theory practically into learning situations in universities.

What can the visual do that audio can't do? Can the student acquire the concept more efficiently by the use of a visual component? Why use a visual? We could get into great discussion on that. What can these various media do? What can a discussion group do? Do you have a discussion group just because that's the custom or because fifteen years ago the students complained that they didn't like lectures so you all got into groups of twenty? So these are the circumstances we find ourselves in and I go with our main speaker this morning when he gets a little worried as to the rationale and when he can answer on behalf of himself and his colleagues and other people, as we do. My department is purely one that has the technical things, I don't care about the human aspects. We don't care what happens to the Eskimos or what happens there but we point out to you that we've got a satellite and so, we point out to you that we've got cable TV and I'm saying, let's not use it in that way.

The basis of what I'm going to say today besides my own personal study and my own interest in this area and having taught a course in educational technology, is the course that we have on air now on Channel 19 and on some cable companies, by the way in northern Ontario – Communications Arts 100 which we did with Waterloo. We have a Waterloo spy here today to correct me if I ever say anything that's out of line and he assures me that's why he is here today. This is a multi-media course. We failed in some instances because of very human things that happened, because of time, because of expense, because of personalities involved and we can talk a lot about these kinds of things but we started out with the idea that we were going to use television as it should be used. It has thirty half-hour colour tapes, videotapes. It has a textbook. There are twelve audio tapes. There are seven assignments and examinations. There are discussion groups in communities like Oshawa, Orillia, Toronto. There is a "hands-on workshop" where OECA took its mobile studio out and people actually tried to put into practice what they had been studying. It's called the "new literacy." I think we've tried to use the various media in the appropriate way. I said I can tell you where I think we failed and where the strength and the weaknesses are but out of this experience has come three or four areas of constraint that I'd like to offer to you and when I get finished with these then we'll open it up to discussion.

The first constraint is the subject matter itself. If you're discussing a biology course for arts students, the feeling amongst a number of biologists that I have worked with is that you don't need any labs. They're not going to go into it that deep so you can drop the lab. So, the subject matter itself, the kinds of units of instruction are important. Is it a problem solving course? Is it an information gathering course? Can that subject matter get across without the exchange? That's another important thing. If you look at our series, Communication Arts 100, that stupid puppet, that's his task as time goes on. Gordon has taught this course for three years at the University of Waterloo, over that three year period he knows where the questions that the students usually ask come up and what those questions are and the puppet tries to provide that. Would it have been better to have a nice blonde girl? Wouldn't it be nice to have a clean-cut male student instead of a non-person? So we thought we'd try and get away from that and have a stupid puppet instead. Can that material be presented without the necessity of exchange for that part of the course? That's an important thing. You'll notice that the professor suddenly has a clearer purpose of what he is trying to achieve in terms of the subject matter. You've noticed this when he has to sit down and discuss this and he's got to figure out what he's going to put on the boob tube or he's going to have in his book and things like this, perhaps the subject matter, the content itself, takes on a different shape than he used before. So, the subject matter is one of the constraints that we have to wrestle with and I think that we should spend more time doing this than we have in the past. Just turn the fellow on, put him in the studio, make sure he has good lights, make sure that you have editing responsibilities to get his oh's and ah's out but don't worry too much about his subject matter at all. I know I'm overstating it but this very often is what happens.

The second constraint or component besides subject matter itself, is the target audience for whom the learning experience is designed. So, we have the subject matter itself and we have the target audience. In the series CA 100, it was primarily the mature student that I was interested in. There were some other constraints thrown in there, like money and could we recruit enough mature students in a short while to justify this. So it's nice to have your on-campus students take the same course and Donald Gordon has seen, as those of us who are adult educators have seen, that the mature student is more with it than the on-campus student to the point where Donald Gordon was using the mature students as testimonials for the stupid students on the campus and saying "come in and tell the campus students why this course is relevant to you as a mature student." They were saying "this course is not relevant." Gordon was falling for this and saying "oh, dear, it's not relevant and yet I have the latest filmclips in there, I have the latest techniques for television, and they're standing there and telling me it's not relevant." It's the mature students who were saying "how wonderful, at last a professor who can really reach out into the community and be relevant." What are the media preferences of the student? The on-campus students — would they accept television and radio?

Motivation of the learner is another thing I talked on. When I visited the Open University, their comment was "Mickey Mouse, sir, could deliver the lectures. It wouldn't make any difference." Those people are so hungry for the learning. Talking heads you can criticize all you want but the fact remains that's the only way those people are going to get the information. They'll get it because they're so hungry for it. Are Canadian audiences so hungry for the information and will they set aside what they know is real slick commercial television and accept the soldier standing there? The Open University has done some wonderful things but on a small scale, most of their things are discussions and talking heads delivering of information, as far as their video portion is concerned and they make no bones about that. I really had my feet pulled out from under me. I went and viewed some of their programs for a day and a half and then went armed to talk to one of their instructional technologists to pull it all apart and he sat there and said "yes, yes, yes", but he said "do you know, we have close to 25,000 students who haven't had the opportunity to go to university and they don't care how that information comes?" What about the motivation of the student himself? Another aspect, how do adults learn? We got into this a little bit before. Do they learn in the sequential way of going through Canadian history, the way that we have in the past, studying it from the beginning to the end. Is that the way adults learn? I guess there's still a lot of conversation on this but the pat answer that I like to give is that they learn according to the need that they have. We got into a discussion of this at lunch time. If you have a cottage in northern Ontario and the Health Department tells you're polluting the lakes because you haven't got the right kind of septic tank there, you don't want a history of soils and engineering going back to the 1800's; you want some hard core information on a problem that you have and to solve it. This is why I think that adult teachers have it all over teaching anywhere else because they have the opportunity to meet the needs of the audience. We, at Channel 19, spend time and money trying to gauge what the needs are of the people of Ontario and trying to meet them. We've done studies, we have advisory committees, we've had people on the telephone and everything else. Is a degree course in the normal sequence of things meeting anybody's need? So these are some of the things we talked about in connection with the target audience itself.

The third thing, besides subject matter itself, the target audience, the third constraint is the teacher himself and what he can do, what his capabilities are with the media. Donald Gordon has had quite a bit of experience with the print medium, he worked as a reporter; he has done a lot of work on television. He knew what he was doing when he walked into this thing. I tried degree courses with other professors at other universities and the professor, in one instance was brought by his Dean to the meeting and that poor fellow was actually shaking; he hardly ever watched television let alone get on television. He didn't know whether you did it with a camera upside down or whether there was a microphone or whether you yelled loudly and he was just so nervous that there was no way that that poor chap was going to be of any use to anybody, himself included. So, what about the teacher himself? What about the exposure of the teacher himself? We've been a very private, closed group and for a

professor to suddenly open himself to the criticism, that's not communication, that's not a university course. So you ask yourself about the confidence that the professor has and what you can do to help him. How about the business of academic freedom? Can Channel 19 tell Donald Gordon that he cannot criticize the established press in Ontario? This is very funny to Donald Gordon and I because we have a very good relationship but it so happened that he was, in my opinion, unjustly criticizing the established press of Ontario and favouring the underground press who were doing the same things as the established press and I was able to get that across to him. Another concern is the professor's discipline over the student. He has this in the classroom. If you go to sleep, he can jolly well try and do something about it, but in a TV course he loses the equivalent of thirty half-hours of contact with the student for the purpose of disciplining him. Another aspect apparently lost on TV is the exchange between student and professor.

Fourthly, the relationships between the teaching institution, the cable company, the learner. The teaching institution becomes up tight about what is happening. It's image is being projected. The cable company or the broadcaster wants to know what right he has of copyright of the material, what right he has in connection with the Broadcast Act. Who owns the copyright? Does Gordon still own the information there? Does Channel 19 own the tapes, the physical tapes? Does Waterloo own the learning system? These are all questions that we have to face.

The sixth constraint is cost and here you get into this. If you're going to use television extensively, it's going to cost and if you're going to use it on two inch tape for commercial broadcast purposes, that's going to cost a lot indeed and are you going to broadcast it on cable hookup? One little part of North Toronto – are you going to spend a lot of money to put on a course for a 15 square block area of North Toronto? As I understand it, cable has as one of its chief attributes, that it is for the local community, so why should we take something that's expensive and put it on for a very local area? This kind of thing requires a mass audience.

So then, I think we are getting into the final characteristic which is the cable itself. Community emphasis, not mass. One advantage of course, repeats are welcome. You watch Metro cable in Toronto and the advertisements just go around that drum, hour after the hour, telling you when various organizations are going to be on. Repeats are possible. We repeated Communication Arts, one original broadcast and two repeats but how does cable television make its programs known and whose responsibility is that? Is that the university's, the cable companies? How can the potential learner learn that this is available? Through the university and its brochure, I guess. Another advantage is that really this is an inexpensive thing for the user himself, the user in terms of the learner. I don't think you would have to add very much to the fees in order to have a cable television program go out – in the normal sense of cable television. Another advantage I see is the possible introduction of local experts. Now, what would I do, very briefly. I would use cable as part of a learning system if I really wanted to do a course well. I would have to have a mass audience to meet the expenses, both the university expenses and the broadcast expenses. What could you do? Well, you could bicycle it around from one area to another or make enough dubs to go around. You could do that and you could broadcast it over the local cable but I think it's different, cable is different and I would broadcast it because I'm with Channel 19 I guess, on open broadcast. How would I use cable? I would use cable to bring in the local experts to sit around and talk about the content of the course. The local weekly newspaper or daily, Guelph Mercury, the TV man from the station in Kitchener. Bring them down and let them talk about some of the concepts that Gordon has been talking about perhaps in the abstract. Let people phone in because you could let that go for two or three hours if the interest was there by the telephone ringing. So you could use it as a discussion medium that people could use and yet not have to come on campus but I still believe they ought to come on the campus or have the professor go out to them for some part of it. I believe they ought to have audio cassettes. I guess this is my main thesis I would have, I would choose the medium to best suit that concept, the professor, the audience, the costs and then I would use these media in a mix and I would use cable television in the way that I think it was designed to be used – for the local community.

The Political Dimension
Mr. Richard J. Gwyn

Now you are going to hear from the socio-economic side and I think you'll notice some differences. Duane and I were having a hurried sort of sideline discussion, a coaching session, a moment ago and we agreed that the political aspects of cable television can be divided broadly into two parts: the first concerns regulation, the formal institutional process and the second involves the using of politics in a much broader context, whereby, if cable television in its local production, the community programming, reaches significant proportions in terms of (a) quantity and (b) of quality, that is whether people actually watch it or not, then this will have a number of political affects. I'm not sure what is the best way of proceeding but I propose to make some comments about both of these and then I think we should have a general discussion.

Let me talk first of all about the broad political issues which are only starting, I think, to surface now because there has been so far so little local or community programming on cable television. The only two large scale projects that I know of, which does not mean that there are not others – in fact there are three projects but only two have really achieved a peak. One of these is Groupe Normandin in the Chicoutimi region of Quebec. Another is, or rather was, the Town Talk project in Thunder Bay. Town Talk no longer exists, though at one time it was very strong. A third substantive program is Metro Media in Vancouver. It should be worthwhile to try to figure out why some projects have succeeded and some haven't.

When I use the phrase substantive, I mean substantive in terms of the amount of programming being done – as opposed to what Bill Foss was describing this morning which I found fascinating, but the only point here is that Foss has been operating for about three months, and this is not substantive in terms of its impact yet upon the community, though it would seem that there is clearly some potential there.

The political implications of community cablecasting can be, maybe, I believe, quite profound. We all know the cliche that information is power. Until recently, all this powerful information was distributed, in terms of the media, one way. It was packaged for distribution by professional journalists, a very well-defined elite who perpetrated their own views across the public at large. The means of production and the means of distribution were (a) very expensive and (b) very complex and difficult to use. Hence the audience substantively was passive.

About three years ago everybody woke up to cable television. The result was an immense amount of rhetoric talked about cable television and about its potentialities to substantively change the political structure, the social structure. I think there was an over emphasis built upon a recognition of the simple fact that cable television meant cheap distribution, available distribution. Nevertheless when you look at VTR and the whole half-inch scene, it's quite clear that technology is now cheap and it is easy to use. There are spare distribution channels; the UHF spectrum is being opened up and the FM spectrum for radio is now available in the sense that there is sufficient demand for people to use it, that the audience is building up because people, I think it is about 50% of the Canadian public, now have FM receivers. So a change has taken place on the supply side towards individualized media and you've also got a change as critical on the demand side. You've got now a substantive body of people who ***know how*** to produce programs, in a technical sense, and who ***want to*** originate programming. Which makes one of those rare conjunctures of supply and demand. The unknown fact in the equation is whether the public demand for this type of community programming exists. I'd like to come back to that but I would like to say this, that if that demand in the general public, that is if they want to see community programming exist, then this development is going to have substantive political effects.

What you're going to get first of all, I think, is the first emergence of media opposition at the municipal level. Traditionally in Canada, for practical purposes, all our newspapers and media outside the very large cities and by which I mean the capital cities, the provincial capitals and particularly the federal capital, have engaged in no critical comment whatever on the municipal scene. the mayor and the whole local establishment in all the communities across Canada have been subjected to absolutely minimal criticism or accounting, and often to none at all. If cable

television develops its potential, you're going to get the media beginning to be a very important element in the local political scene. I think this can produce all kinds of unexpected spinoffs. For a start you'll find that more municipal counsellors and mayors will teach themselves to become adept at handling the media. It is now commonplace for national political leaders and important regional political leaders to rise to the top, largely as a function of their ability to handle the media, to manipulate the media. This capability, till now, has not been necessary at the local level. I think you are going to get more charismatic type politicians at the local level.

The second development is of course that apart from just the introduction of media into the local level and the changing of the political structure in terms of formal representative politics, the development of community cablecasting means that a number of groups who up to now often have had difficulty in expressing their demands except by resorting to theatre, by which I mean demonstrations, should be able to do it in a much more effective way and through much more organized channels. This means that welfare rights groups, citizens groups, and so on should be able to get their message across within, though they would I think hate to admit it, within an established structure – the established structure being the CATV channel. The third thing that is going to happen, I believe, is that the public in smaller communities is going to be presented with an ever-widening range of choices because it will be possible for a great variety of opinions to be expressed through cable television and if those choices are offered to people, some of them are going to take them. This phenomenon will work the other way from what I was saying a moment ago, namely that welfare rights groups and so on will tend to work within the established structure because they will be able to get their message across. The public in small communities, because offered a larger choice of messages, will raise its expectations – a development of profound political implications.

So far as regulation is concerned, it's my own judgment to use that overworked phrase 'rearward mirror', that a lot of this talk about federal-provincial conflict in regulation is out of date. I think we are moving instead to a phase of no regulation. We have never regulated print; it's never been thought necessary to regulate print. It's been thought highly undesirable to regulate print. Broadcasting has been regulated because of scarcity and that is one of the prime justifications for regulating anything, that the supply of a particular product is scarce. That scarcity is on its way to disappearing. We have all read about the potential 40 channel and more cable television systems. Hard on their heels are going to come video cassettes – probably about five years away. They're delayed because of compatibility problems. One of these people, I think the race is between Philips and RCA, is going to knock the others out and that will become our standard video cassette system in about five years time. There's no way you can reguiate video cassettes. We've opened up the UHF spectrum now. You've got room for about another 40 channels there. In broadcasting I have already mentioned the FM band.

At the same time, if there is probably no need for regulation in the long term, there is clearly need for it in the short term. The short term issue is that the Canadian television industry is having to absorb two very powerful forces simultaneously. One is audience fragmentation brought about by cable. The second force and related directly to the first, is the massive inroads of American programming. Here you've got a classic Canadian dilemma. Thanks to the fact that Canadians like to watch American programs, we have the most heavily cabled country in the world. Thanks to the fact that we are the most heavily cabled country in the world, we are producing more cable local programming than any other country in the world. Far more than the United States. Proportionately, they are only one-third ours in terms of cable penetration but even then, our production of local cable programming is far higher than the United States.

Earlier this morning I was talking to a cable operator from Toronto, attending the conference, and we discussed Channel 79, the UHF channel in Toronto, that is going to be carried, has to be carried by, all the Toronto cable companies. The point she was making was that for Channel 79, the most desirable spot on the channel to the cable companies would be Channel 3 which is in between Channels 2 and 4 which are both American. There you've got a new local community broadcasting station, 79, which if it wants to survive has to attract a big enough audience, and the one way Channel 79 is going to be able to do that, in her reckoning, is to get in between the two Americans

because once you're there, when people start to flip, they flip from 2 to 4 and will have to at least stop for a second at Channel 3. And maybe some of them will stay. The worst position for Channel 79 would be at the top 'Canadian' end of the spectrum, around about 11,12,13. What is annoying, irritating, is that this Canadian community channel is most likely to survive or do well if it rides piggy-back on the Americans. This, however, is a fact of life.

It is quite clear that at the present time, the Canadian broadcasting system has to somehow absorb these two enormous forces of fragmentation and of American programming. In my judgment, therefore, it is critical that for at least the next five years cable television be regarded as part of the Canadian broadcasting system because if it is not, we are not going to have a Canadian broadcasting system. Looking over the longer term, my forecast is no regulation, that we will run out of political justification for the regulation of television, any more, than as I say, there are justifications for regulation of print or for that matter, of people talking.

Obviously there will continue to be certain minimum boundaries such as obscenity, plagiarism, copyright and so on but intense, continuing, regulation will prove to be unnecessary. What you can always regulate, in my judgment, is the cable distribution system itself which has all the characteristics of a public utility. In other words, it is a protected monopoly. It is the sole supplier. Cable systems once they reach maturity, which is about three to four years and 70% penetration (at the moment many are in a difficult phase during which their capital costs are very high), most of them will be very profitable institutions.

If CATV systems are regulated as a utility, it becomes possible to divorce from the cable operator the responsibility for determining the programming he carries. I would argue that we have placed a very unfair burden on cable operators asking them to decide between competing would-be users of their cable systems. The problem of making those kinds of choices is going to become acute. At the moment it's a minimal one because so few groups want to cablecast, although there are problems of censorship, as we heard this morning. In my own judgment, censorship is not a general problem as yet. The fact is more that the cable operators are concerned that many of the programs offered to them are of poor quality than that these programs might offend political interests or in any other way cause embarassment. It is unfair, in my judgment, to ask cable operators to make these kinds of decisions once the demand builds up. If they were operated as a utility and regulated as a utility – which means rate of return regulation as is the case with telephone companies – then CATV operators would have no further need to have any control over the programming content they carry. Instead they would simply provide a physical distribution system. I should mention that there is one instance of this hardware/software split, in New York where cable operators are required to operate two 'public access' channels. That was a very imaginative decision on the part of the regulatory authority in New York – although it hasn't worked out too well in practice since very little use indeed has been made of those public access channels.

This leads to the last point I would like to make. As I said earlier, cable television, when it first arrived, invoked a tremendous flood of rhetoric about 'citizens' access', and various phrases like 'wired city'. We're all a little bit sadder and wiser now and less idealistic. Not less idealistic perhaps but less naive. My own judgment is that cable television does provide an important means for distribution in cities or communities that are (a) relatively homogeneous, (b) have a distinct sense of identity and (c) that have poor alternative media or poor traditional media, by which I mean local television, radio, newspapers. The one exception is Metro Media in Vancouver. Almost all the other success stories or promising stories of community cablecasting have taken place in isolated communities with a strong sense of identity and with no local media at all. It's much harder to find examples in large cities. Metro Media, as I said, is one but much more typical is the Moose Jaw project; Thunder Bay which began very strongly but then collapsed for political reasons, and Trois-Rivieres which is developing at this time. So that the future for community cablecasting is going to fulfill itself largely in smaller towns and villages. In the large cities the competition provided by commercial television for the attention of the audience is simply too great. I may be wrong about the urban scene, I would like to think I am, but I doubt it.

Ownership, Rights and Control of Cable Transmission

Mr. David Williams, Exec. Vice Pres. Canadian Cable Systems

Ownership of Cable

The right of ownership to a cable TV operation is dependent on two things:

- Meeting the regulations relative to Canadian Ownership – Order-In-Council PC 2229-69.
- What other broadcasting interests you hold and the extent to which they conflict with a proposed cable TV venture.

Order-In-Council PC 2229-69

In brief, this says that after September 1st, 1970, licenses may not be issued either to persons who are not Canadian citizens, nor to "ineligible corporations", nor to governments other than the Federal Government. The Order then defines an "Eligible Canadian Corporation" as follows:

(a) Incorporated Federally or Provincially
(b) of which the Chairman, or other presiding officer, and each of the directors or other similar officers are Canadian citizens, and
(c) of which 80% of the shares are beneficially owned by Canadian citizens or by corporations that are not controlled directly or indirectly by subjects of another country other than Canada.

Where in the opinion of the Commission, notwithstanding these requirements, it believes the corporation is effectively controlled either by way of shares or debt, it shall be deemed to be ineligible.

Canadian Ownership

In order to avoid proof of citizenship, which is easier for new Canadians than for many of the rest of us, the regulation allows to be deemed as Canadians all individuals whose address is in Canada and who hold 1% or less of the total number of issued shares of the corporation.

In reality, public corporations have the most difficulty in proving Canadian ownership due to the number of shareholders and the lack of knowledge of just who are shareholders. Some of the public companies in this area require a certificate from each purchaser of a share before the registration of that share is allowed. Other companies only require this when large blocks of shares are dealt with. All public companies in broadcasting have introduced into their bylaws the Constrained Share section of the Canada Corporations Act of 1971 which permits them to refuse the registration of a transfer if it places the company in a position where more than 20% of the shares are held by ineligible shareholders.

The practice that has developed is for an officer of the company to analyze the share register and recap the individual shareholders with less than 1% of the outstanding shares, and to take certificates from as many of the larger corporate shareholders and other shareholders that they are not controlled by aliens and to present that to the CRTC when requested.

The Second aspect of ownership of cable television depends on being able to comply with certain policies of the CRTC as to who may or may not own a CATV system. This is a grey area but it is generally recognized that the owner of a TV station cannot own a CATV system in the same community nor vice versa, and in fact, may not even be able to own CATV in one community and TV in another. Similarly, newspapers holding TV or CATV licenses are rare, but some do exist. There seems not to be such a restriction on radio and CATV, but radio and TV are generally thought to be not available to the same owner in one community. There are exceptions to each rule, e.g. London, Ontario.

The most desirable qualities to have to obtain a license for CATV, are to be an individual, be rich, and be artistically talented. Unfortunately, these qualities are seldom found together.

Control of Cable Television might be interpreted in another sense, and this deserves to be commented on. The view of the CRTC is that a CATV operator should not only provide good clear signals of the regular TV channels, but he should also programme a "local community channel" and finally, that he should make his facilities available to local community groups in order that they speak to the community.

This latter area may be examined from two sides – the legal right of individuals or groups in the community to have access to the community cable channel – and the practical way this is occurring.

On the practical side, many cable TV companies

regularly invite a wide range of community groups to use the cable to address the community. They instruct them in the way to make use of the facility and on the general need for preparation of their material before they come to the studios. Regrettably, many such groups find it "just too much trouble" and are not interested in carrying out their plans.

A few groups do become quite proficient and make regular use of the community facilities to address the community on matters in which they are concerned.

A comparison may be made between cable TV and other media. To telephone a radio station talk show is comparatively easy — to write a letter to the editor of the newspaper is a little more trouble, but to prepare a programme to be seen and heard on cable TV requires both effort and that one's ideas have some general interest to those being addressed.

I think it is safe to say that most cable TV companies seek programmes of interest to their community, and are concerned only that the laws of libel and slander be not broken, and that a programme be in good taste. The cable operators would also be concerned that the laws of copyright be respected.

No matter how well he is insured, or what protection he seeks from the producers of a community programme, the operator is still in a position to be the recipient of a lawsuit and to be held accountable by the CRTC in the event that a programme libels or slanders someone or infringes a copyright.

The legal aspects of the right of individuals or groups to demand access to use the cable are less clear, and so not being a lawyer, I will leave this as a matter between lawyers and their clients.

However, Peter Grant has comments on this matter which I will read:

Comments
1. CATV should complement not compete with commercial TV.
2. Control of content a sensitive issue — but the station is ultimately responsible.
3. If two groups have $150,000 each, and apply for license, a community group would have a better chance than MacLean-Hunter

Question
1. Should the programmer and the carrier be separated to increase discussion of alternative issues?

Perhaps you may have questions on these matters by which we may further discuss them.

Peter Grant, who is a lawyer quite interested in these matters, has comments on this matter which I will read from a booklet which has come into my possession but is not yet published, I don't believe. It is dated February '71 but I am not aware that it is widespread:

Canadian Communication Law Papers, Faculty of Law, University of Toronto. Firstly, in the chapter marked Access to Cable Television Systems, he has indicated "The approach of the Canadian Radio Television Commission prompted by the rapid expansion of cable services and the unique opportunities for access afforded by cable systems inasmuch as they make additional channels available for use, the CRTC has come to see the cable's role in the following terms and they quote, and this is a May '69 policy statement and there are two or three of these that I'm going to quote you because they are progressive: "CATV can assist in the development of a community identity through locally produced programs; they can participate in the enrichment of the community's cultural life through the distribution of Canadian produced films, educational information and other films of particular interest produced for public showing but not normally available in that area. CATV local programming should complement, rather than compete with programming already available to the community through television."

Then, at a later time the theme was picked up and emphasized in a subsequent public announcement on April 1970 which quotes "The Commission pointed out in its announcement of May 13, '69 that CATV local programming should complement rather than compete with programming already available to the community." It placed particular emphasis on the opportunity for CATV licensees to enrich community life by fostering communication among individuals and community groups. "In the development of programs of interest to communities, it is hoped that the CATV programmers will be motivated by innovation rather than imitation. Local programs should be based on access and freedom from the restraint of program schedules which are often less flexible than the conventional broadcasting."

In the most recent statement which I think was in July of 1971, one little paragraph stands out. Again they have said "The Commission maintains its view that cable television systems should be

encouraged to provide access to a channel for community expression and information." They go on then to speak about locally programmed channels – "This Commission has consistently emphasized the opportunity available to cable television system licensees to enrich community life by fostering communication among individuals and community groups. It has also encouraged cable television systems to provide programs which are substantially different from those available from off-air sources. Local programming often achieves its greatest effectiveness when production techniques and facilities are kept simple and inexpensive. The Commission recognizes the responsibility of cable television system licensee for the services provided through a locally programmed channel and believes that a diversity of local programming best reflects community needs and interests." In respect to community programming they said "This is a process which involves direct citizen participation in program planning and production. The means which are employed to best further the use of a channel for the local citizenry and establish fair access of facility production can be as varied as necessary to satisfy a local need."

Then we go back and carry on with Mr. Grant. The text here goes on "At present the Commission will not except under exceptional circumstances or for experimental purposes, license CATV undertakings which carry commercials other than those receiving the programming, broadcast by broadcasting stations. Cablecasters then are left in the situation of having imposed on them the duty of programming community events financed out of subscription revenues which the CRTC has frozen and without the aid of ad revenue. As there is not a built-in incentive to public access inasmuch as the understandably economically minded cablecaster may be induced to draw upon resources offered freely by groups seeking access. This analysis appears to be in line with the CRTC policy. The CRTC feels most definitely the cable systems have an important role to play in their community and is anxious to encourage local programming whether these be programs actually produced by the cable company or by groups within the community." We could touch upon a lot more of that but I'm trying to pick out the points I think highlight the problem then we can discuss them. The question of responsibility for content. If the problem confronting a meaningful access which has already been canvassed, finds solutions along the lines suggested and they have discussed it pro and con, the efforts will go for nought if the prodigious obstacle presented by responsibility for content cannot be removed. The problem and perhaps the best solution was articulated by Ed Jarmain, Vice-President of Jarmain Teleservices Limited, London, in the Globe and Mail in September, 1969 as follows: "The whole concept of participatory cablecasting may founder on the question of responsibility. If the cable company becomes pre-occupied with this question, it may be driven to exercise very tight control over its facilities and accessibility may be lost. Censorship may masquerade under the guise of responsibility. Possibly the CRTC can relieve some of the pressure by licensing some of the groups who regularly produce some of the programs for cablecasting. This solution has apparently found favour with MacLean-Hunter. Mr. Frier of MacLean-Hunter, after acknowledging his company's willingness to originate programs as part of the price of its license, remarked as follows: "However how open the access gets to a channel depends on who, in the end, is responsible for the program content. Our company, for example, is now beginning to feel that maybe we shouldn't be owner of the cable license and controller of the program content as well; that maybe another group should be licensed as being responsible for the program content." Well, logically speaking as it is, this solution has not been taken up. Perhaps the reason is fear on the part of the CRTC that some percentage of the group who will be seeking access has exhibitionist propensities which are manifested in the form of slander, obscenity or bad taste. In answer to that one can only say it is by no means certain the idiot fringe will constitute an inordinate proportion of those who would make use of access. The second objection is that a programmer is not likely to be as good a judgment debtor as the cable operator whose physical plant may be subject to execution but this is presently the case outside the media where a personal slander is not guaranteed a substantial judgment debtor. Does the fact that slander occurred in the context of cable justify greater precautions in favour of the potentially slandered? Even if the argument could be made out that slander on the media is more damaging than slander from the pulpit or some other less wide-ranging platform, this consideration is surely outweighed by the benefits accruing from the diversity of opinion that was the result of public

access unhampered by the licensee. Two other approaches to the responsibility problem might be noted. The first is that taken by Town Talk in Thunder Bay. Simply get a community group representing those people who want access and buy a cable company. That goes on then to quote "Suppose we buy Lakehead Vidium," said David Hughes, Town Talk spokesman and driving force, the housewife, shaggy-haired researcher, labour representative, school trustee, high school principal and life insurance man do not think he's serious. Buy it? Such a huge thing? But Hughes is serious. He has told some Town Talk people, not all, that Lakehead Vidium can be bought for about a million and a half dollars. He has approached ten respected Thunder Bay citizens and offered them jobs as directors of a new, accessible, community-controlled cable company. Town Talk will appear at the CRTC hearings, outline its arguments against MacLean-Hunter's application, retire for a drink of water, return and announce 'gotcha'. They are prepared to buy the cable company. If they can't arrange financing by the hearings, they will argue that Thunder Bay can do it alone, they don't need MacLean-Hunter. As you probably know, that was not successful. MacLean-Hunter do own Thunder Bay at this point in time.

A final approach is to ignore the whole question. As a closed circuit, private subscription system, a good constitutional case could be made out that the CRTC has no jurisdiction whatever over content, that with all the financing hanging in the balance, cable operators are not going to open their studios to the public on as tenuous a basis as the possible inapplicability of the federal content regulations. The CRTC has provided a wider spectrum of permissiveness on the media and therefore a greater inducement to cable operators to relinquish control to community groups by indicating that it will not move on a licensee unless it has been previously convicted of a criminal offence. This attitude may encourage a great deal of flexibility on the part of cablecasters. Rogers Cable, a large one in Toronto, lets panel discussions go on live with no built-in delay but even the most flexible cable operators will not give any group carte blanche over programming. I think that that touches quite a bit on the matters of access and they have a brief conclusion here which I will read to you and then we can have questions: "In Canada today, the right of access to the existing communications media by the public, is closer to a privilege than a right. Communication is both the right to hear and the right to be heard. Legislatively the problem of giving affect to these rights is the problem of defining the amplitude of each right. A major question today is whether the disenfranchised public might include the largest part of society and not only the poor, the underprivileged and the extreme. It might be appropriate in the light of the previous sections of this study to attempt to bring them together in the context of an examination of the censorship devices which are available and in use by the communications industry. It will be demonstrated here then the forcible right of access by any private or public is limited in Canada because it is tightly controlled in the public sector by the CRTC and in the private sector by a small number of individuals in whom ownership of the communications media is concentrated." I think perhaps that should have said very often the management group of the quite large public companies, for many of these are quite large public companies today who are operating cable.

Plenary sessions based on group discussions
Chairman: Mr. Douglas Waterston

Mr. Waterston: It is obvious that the discussion groups this afternoon were very successful. From the conversations out in the hall, a lot of points were raised which people are very keen on following through.

The purpose of this particular session is to synopsize what went on at each group session and provide an opportunity of questioning the resource person of sessions you couldn't attend. The resource person for Ownership Rights and Control of Cable Television Transmission had to leave and the session chairman, Professor Warlow of the University, will stand in for him. We will take each session in the order which it appeared in the program, rather than deal with them jointly in a formal panel discussion. We have about an hour and fifteen minutes so that means an average of fifteen minutes devoted to each group. Please direct your question to the resource person and I'll act as referee on whose turn it is.

Our first group was Community Programming – Costs and Sources of Support. The resource person of that discussion was Ted Jarmain, Chairman of the Board of Canadian Cable Television Association and I was session chairman. A very wide ranging discussion took place in this session. We dealt thoroughly with the costs of cable TV station operations – costs of equipment, costs of programming per hour, cost of studios, etc. Also dealt with were the many areas of financial support for programming from the cable companies themselves, subscribers, volunteer participants, participants paid by sponsors, government grants, private grants, even to bingo games and possible advertising. Mr. Jarmain pointed out that maybe the biggest problem facing cable stations is not lack of money but quality of programming. He suggested that the boards of education and indeed universities, should be playing a much wider role in the use of cable television. Mr. Jarmain may like to summarize a little more elaborately before he opens this session for questions.

Mr. Jarmain. I really do despair at trying to summarize our session and I am going to risk asking for questions right at this point, if I may.

Q. There was some discussion at the session on the diversity of equipment, especially as regards quality available in the community. Would it reduce costs for cable operators (and presumably you need more funds for programming), if there were some uniform standards, let's say in Ontario?

Mr. Jarmain: I do not think costs would be materially reduced but uniform standards for equipment might be desirable for a lot of other good reasons. The problem is, as many of you know, that we have three basic types of one inch video tape recorders. We have half inch VTR in addition to that and now we are looking at three quarter-inch cassette machines. It's in the video tape recorder area that we run into our incompatibility problem. Why don't we standardize on one? The answer is simple, none of the three are all that good. If there was one of the three that stood well above the others in terms of performance, quality or what have you, then I think you might get people to standardize. But frankly all of them, so far, have been inferior in terms of quality. People are making the best of a bad thing as opposed to choosing the best among good things. Especially in the video tape area, we really need a break through in terms of quality of equipment. I wouldn't like to see us standardize at this point in time.

Q. Would you comment upon the new programming procedure in Calgary, where I believe the existing cable companies have consolidated their facilities and jointly established, with some community organization, their own production house. There is one set of facilities, in a sense one production organization, for all the companies.

Mr. Jarmain: I'm sorry, I am not really very familiar with that situation.

Q. Could it be a transferable idea to other areas, in terms of reducing program costs and improving quality of programming?

Mr. Jarmain. The first statement that you made is that two companies in Calgary have a joint facility. I would plead ignorance but is it possible that you are wrong?

Q. I think that the statement should have been that some of the cable companies in Calgary have surcharges for helping local programming production.

Mr. Jarmain: That statement was made in our session. In applying for a license in Calgary at least one of the companies and probably both, stayed at the same rate and then instituted a surcharge on top of that for local programming. To ascertain their motivations, we would really have to ask them. Flexibility in doing that type of thing is

obviously greater when applying for a new license than when dealing with an established situation with an established rate. Calgary's – and also Edmonton's – situation is somewhat unique in that their systems now are only allowed to carry one U.S. commercial station. I suspect that they have been looking to cable and local programming as an important feature in making their overall package saleable. In parts of the country which we are sitting in right now, the competition from U.S. broadcast and Canadian broadcasting stations for that matter, is somewhat more severe, which in effect means that cable programming has got an uphill fight to gain viewer interest. As to the idea of sharing facilities, there are examples of that here. The cable companies in the Hamilton area are operating together on a joint basis. My personal view is that's what makes them a success. To state the other point of the argument, the CRTC has had the feeling that at least in communities of sufficient size (whatever that means), there is something to be gained from getting local competition going among the two companies or ten, as the case may be. You can't deny that effect either and it is a case of balancing that advantage with the dis-economies involved in having individual companies programming to individual segments of the market. If you can make the case that there are different communities within each community, this provides another justification for dividing it up. Both of these questions are open to debate.

Q. Are cable systems allowed to hook up together to do a program?

Frank Spiller, CRTC: In our cable policy we recognize the fact that in larger areas there may be greater reasons for making joint programs to achieve some kind of overall coverage in the area, but I think that the underlying concern is that we want to preserve very local, vocal programming for areas or neighbourhoods. It is a question of trying to balance the needs of the area.

Q. I wonder if there is a concensus among our cable companies about the use of community programming provided by student units in colleges and universities. The students appreciate it because it gives them an outlet for their protests. But what is the significance, from the point of view of the cable companies? What do they view this type of student assignment is worth? Should time be provided free of charge? Will student participation increase? Should they pay for the privilege?

Mr. Jarmain: I think there are two basic types of student programming. There is programming produced by students that are operating within an established training curriculum. In a community college for example, students are indeed required or expected to make programs. That's one type of programming. The other quite different source of student programming is where a group may organize themselves into a unit quite independent of the college or university and undertake to create programs on whatever subject they think programs should be made on. I think that the attitude of the cable companies toward the latter group of students is the same as it would be toward any other group existing within the community. Mainly that it welcomes such programming and it encourages the groups to come forward with this. I think that problems have arisen from time to time in certain cases in terms of both the technical quality and also the calibre of the programming. (Some people here may be able to speak to these latter problems). The question about what relationship colleges and universities ought to have in the long run to the cable companies, is quite a separate question. I can't speak to that. I think the relationship is going to ultimately flow out of various federal-provincial discussions.

Q. I am under the distinct impression that some cable companies are capitalizing on student help. Students start out by doing their own programming. A few months later they are being used by the cable companies on specific assignments for them.

Mr. Jarmain: Capitalizing is sort of a loaded word in that it suggests some extraordinary gain in all of this for the cable company. I don't think, generally speaking, this is accurate. I think that the job of the cable company is to persuade whoever it can to contribute to the programming made available to the community, on a volunteer basis. If the cable company can persuade you that it would be a good idea for you to come into the studio and help make programs that would be of interest to your friends, neighbours and the whole community then I say, more power to them. I don't think anyone should feel exploited for becoming involved. The cablecasting channel, in my view, is to be a community resource. Its success depends upon persuading and enthusing individuals, groups and organizations, within the community to make use of the facility, and to work together in making it a viable and useful unit in the community.

Q. The only logical and cheap way for some systems to expand programming is to make use of

student help. Do you think this will increase or decrease? Will the students get paid for it by the hour or on a flat rate?
Mr. Jarmain. I see nothing wrong with this. There tends to be a honeymoon in that kind of thing. You may be willing to come in for a week or a month or two and help me out, free of charge, but that kind of relationship has the tendency to wear off kind of quickly. You have to have some motivation yourself for making a program and then it takes it over into the community involvement area, as opposed to just you being a good fellow and coming in and getting experience on a no-pay basis.
Q. In response to that question about who else is in the community, I have had the pleasure of talking to somebody from Wired World. I think that if the gentlemen would permit a two-minute explanation of how they solved their help problem, it would be of benefit to the whole group.
Wired World: We started out finding that there was not enough equipment available in our community for use by public groups. Universities, technical schools, and the school boards were not about to lend equipment to community groups and as a result, we had to purchase a couple of portapacks. We are not program producers, we are merely facilitators. We offer workshops in the community. We receive no encouragement from either cable companies or universities or technical colleges in our area. Only from the people. I am interested that there is still very little discussion about community involvement. We did cooperate to a degree with our cable company in that they had good studio facilities and if people are interested in doing a certain kind of a show, we encourage them to go to the cable company. However, we've now had experience that they are boxed in to such a tight schedule that they are unable or unwilling to allow community groups to come in and interrupt their schedule. If their program happens to fit into one of the categories they are prepared to run it. But if you had to take your taped program to the studio and say "I am a citizen and I have made this tape for the public concern, will you show it for me", the answer is usually "I'm sorry there is no room on our schedule" or "I'm sorry we are going to do the same thing ourselves in another week" or something similar. Wired World provides radio and television equipment with no fuss or bother and that's why Wired World has met with success in community involvement. One of the things that we have found is that probably 80% of our equipment is used by certain age groups — teens to late twenties — an age group that seems very excited about the whole concept. We found this spring that we were servicing the University of Waterloo students who wanted to do videotape programs for their seminars or perhaps produce a videotape for their term paper. They were unable to use the equipment in their own university so they came to us. We're mainly concerned with things that are of interest to the community and in no cases were the students able to justify a program unless it would have an interest and real concern to the community as a whole. We were able to let the students use our equipment.
Mr. Jarmain: I don't have any first hand knowledge of the particular problems or situations to which you refer but my personal reaction would be that maybe we need more organizations like Wired World.
Q. Mr. Jarmain, have you any idea how many people watch your programs?
Mr. Jarmain. I don't think it is necessarily the case of how many people watch but how many people are using the cable station for community programming.
Mr. Waterston: I would like to call on Dr. Mark Waldron who was chairman of the session on Cable TV and Credit Courses and the resource person is Dr. Ronald Campbell of the Ontario Educational Communications Authority.
Dr. Waldron: I'll very briefly summarize our session. Dr. Campbell started off by casting us all into a dilemma because he asked the question "why in the world would you want to put a degree course on cable television?" and we dutifully told him such things as "that it would be available to a wide number of people who cannot come to university", "the cost for students" and all these fancy answers that one traditionally gives. He then said that in fact it was the wrong question to ask. He proceeded to tell us that the real important thing to understand is that cable television is just one of many media available and we must consider all kinds of media. We have to use all of them and that face to face communication is still very important despite all the technology that we have today. He said "we worship television and now we have to learn how to use it". He referred specifically to the Communications Arts 100 Course that was produced this past year, thirty half-hour colour television tapes, texts, audio tapes, assignments, discussions, to form a total package. He said that he had found

three or four constraints that he wanted to point out. One was the problem of the subject matter itself, the target audience having to decide the real wants and needs of this audience and trying to understand it, looking at how adults learn and looking at the teacher resource and what the teacher can do, the confidence he must have, the question of academic freedom, the question of control and discipline in the student. He talked about the relationship between the institution, the learner, and cable companies. He raised the question of copyright, who in fact owns the course. He talked about the cost which is rather an important one, as all being constraints to the use of cable television for credit education. The discussion asked several questions. I'll pick out a few. One question usually asked is who is responsible for course content. He replied that one must follow the Broadcast Act. If a professor breaks the Broadcast Act then, according to him, it will not go on the air. The question was raised "what about plagiarism?", the borrowing of material which goes on all the time in the classroom but when it is being telecast to thousands of people, raises a major issue. I don't think that we really came to any firm conclusion on that question. In any case, cable companies are responsible for what goes on the air. He quoted us the cost for the Arts 100 course, indicating the numbers of students, the fact that over a five-year period it would be possible to do this sort of course at about half the cost of a regular student on campus in a credit course. In conclusion, it was felt by the group, especially by one person who was representing a cable company operation, that the real benefits of a credit course are not necessarily in getting credit towards a degree but in the benefits of the program towards the total community. This is mainly because there is less emphasis today on the fact that one has to total up credits to get the degree, which was almighty five years ago but today has lost a lot of its charm. I might ask Dr. Campbell to come forward to answer questions.

Dr. Campbell. You'll never get the true answer to the total cost of Arts 100, not that I won't tell you what the costs are or what we think are there. But let me pose to you some questions first. When I had in mind to present the Arts 100 course, I had in mind that it would be used for two purposes; a degree course for students on campus, for mature students off campus or towards a degree or credit and that it would also be used for a general audience. I felt the course itself should be inherently interesting enough that a general audience would follow it. I think that we found the same thing as Margaret Norquay did with the Ryerson Open College, that far more people were following it as a general adult course than for the degree. I arbitrarily said that I would attribute half the cost of the course to the general adult use of it and broadcast it twice a week for that purpose, and half the cost would be attributed to the student in the classroom and the mature student effort. Who knows whether I am right or not. We budgeted approximately $7,500 for each half-hour program. Waterloo had costs, we had other costs for public relations and for other things within our own organization, and I quoted a figure in the small groups. I am not entirely certain of the final cost because our accountant is still figuring. What is more important than cost is whether this course was an effective learning experience. If someone would ask that then I would embrace you. What was the learning effectiveness in that course? That is the important thing to know.

Q. Would you like to answer that question now?

Dr. Campbell: There is a study being done which isn't finished. We'll see. Student acceptance was quite good. The off-campus mature students received it much more enthusiastically, were more motivated and I think appreciated it more than the on-campus student.

Q. It would seem to me the economics would come dramatically different if you were looking at a much wider market than you were looking at. To bring that more to home, I think that every self-respecting university is saying that we could produce educational TV programs but the facts may be that the scale of operations has to be so large to make it pay, that maybe it should only be done at a provincial or national level.

Dr. Campbell: Well, there are two things here and I agree with you that when I was asked to come and speak about cable and degree courses, I said to myself, why would you use it on a cable system? If you are really going to use television as it should be used, why use it on cable television. I tried to point out that cable was still one other medium and that you could use cable in the way it could best be used by giving the course over the open broadcast. People could be brought together on an open line and a discussion group on the cable line, or if enough cable companies wanted to bicycle the tape around, you could use it this way.

So, it's again the local community that the cable company is after but again, to make it financially feasible and to use videotape and television and the visual as it ought to be used, it is a mass market. I came to this conference with this problem. I resolved it in my own mind by a number of cable companies using my tapes or tapes of this calibre or using cable as a follow up to the main presentation.

Community Programming — Costs and Sources of Support
Mr. Ted Jarmain

Thank you very much. I'm sort of pleased in a way that we have a small group here rather than a large one.

The title of this session is Community Programming — Costs and Sources of Support. I'd like to begin by asking each of you to introduce yourself, say in a few words why you're at this particular session, and indicate some of the questions you have on your mind and hope to find answers to. I have a few introductory remarks to make but, with a group of this size, I think if we gear the session to your needs and interests and questions it will be more successful for you.

I think it should be obvious to all of you that there is quite a variety of interests represented here and I'll try and be very brief because I think we can best spend our time addressing some of the specific questions on your minds. I think it should also be obvious, if you were present this morning, there are a lot of views about what local programming is or what it should be. I think in talking about possible sources of support, it might be worthwhile to take note of what the CRTC has said local programming, in its view, should be. I would like to just briefly read a couple of statements by the CRTC. I think most of you appreciate what the CRTC has said or not said has quite a bearing on what cable operators do and don't do. Whether that's right or wrong, it is a fact of life.

Local programming was really pushed into existence, in a way I suppose you could say, back in May '69 by the CRTC when the Commission said on the subject of local programming: "CATV can assist in the development of a community identity through locally produced programs. They can also assist provincial and local authorities in the development of educational services. They can participate in the enrichment of the community's cultural life through the distribution of Canadian produced films, educational information and other films of particular interest produced for public showing but not normally available in that area. CATV local programming should complement rather than compete with programming already available to the community through television and commercial movie houses."

Then, after having had a couple more years to think further about this subject and formulate further policies regarding cable television, the CRTC in its July 1971 policy announcement again repeated some of the same basic positions – the Commission has consistently emphasized the opportunity available to cable television system licensees – "to enrich community life by fostering communication among individuals and community groups."

It has also encouraged cable television systems to provide programs which are substantially different from those available from off-air sources. Most television subscribers seek a wider range and a greater diversity of programming. Local programming can form an important means of widening the choice of programs which in turn attracts more subscribers and increases revenue. Local programming often achieves its greatest effectiveness when production techniques and facilities are kept simple and inexpensive. The capability to provide a local channel for community expression depends upon the continued growth of cable television as an active integrated part of the whole broadcasting system. The Commission recognizes the responsibility of cable television system licensee for the services provided through a locally programmed channel and believes that a diversity of local programming best reflects community needs and interests.

Then the Commission attempted to define three basic types of local programming, one they called community programming and here they were referring basically to community access programming, the key words being "this is a process which involves direct citizen participation in program planning and production." Secondly, they refer to a second type, local origination they call it. This type of programming usually consists of coverage of local activities of all kinds whereas community programming, that's the prior category I mentioned, involves local citizens in the planning and production process. Local origination programming usually involves the coverage of organized local activities under the direct supervision of the cable television system's staff. The third category they define, informational programming, this form of programming can provide a counterpoint to the concept of community programming, it can inform the community about matters which are of concern and interest to its citizens. Programs may be of a highly specialized nature, appealing to minority audiences or they may be of general interest. In referring to this category, informational programming, the Commission says "much of this material will probably be produced directly by professional motion picture or television producers yet it should not duplicate the programming available from conventional broadcasting outlets."

I think it's probably fair to say that most cable systems that are involved in cablecasting have some mix of those three components of programming and when we're talking about costs and sources of support, generally speaking we're talking about a mix among those three categories.

What are the costs? To the best of my knowledge no comprehensive survey has been made to-date of local programming costs in Canada. Therefore, all I can give you are impressions which will of course be influenced by my own experience. I could perhaps refer to a study completed by the Rand Corporation for the Ford Foundation a couple of years ago. Based on a survey of several Canadian systems, the study reported and let me just briefly summarize some of the findings of that study. Generally speaking Canadian systems do not pay talent fees. Labor costs range from $15.00 to more than $100.00 per hour of programming and averaged in the range of $25.00 to $50.00 per hour. Taking into account indirect costs, depreciation and so on, the average total cost per hour was in the range of $50.00 to $100.00 and in the study they noted that this was a very small amount compared to a minimum average cost reported by, I believe, the Carnegie Foundation of about $3000 per hour for local origination on educational stations in the U.S.

Among the group of systems surveyed in Canada, these were all large systems, the annual direct expenditure was in the range, at that time and that's a couple of years ago now, of $40,000 to $60,000 per year or perhaps twice those amounts if indirect costs and depreciation were to be included. Based on my own impressions and on systems I know something about, I would say that the Rand numbers are, in today's circumstances, in the right ballpark although I would also say that the total average cost of actual local productions is probably in the range of $75.00 to $150.00 per hour. The Rand numbers, however, may have included hours during which films were being played or video-tapes of previous local productions were being replayed, both of which involve substantially lower costs, as you appreciate.

Well, that perhaps puts some dimensions on the sorts of costs that are being incurred in the area of local program production today. What are the common sources of support? I guess the first and most obvious source of support and the one being used in most instances, is cable company earnings. Secondly, I would refer to cable subscriber revenues. Now you could ask what's the difference? I think perhaps the difference is, in my view at least, mainly historical. Most cable systems that are programming today have not increased their subscriber fees as a result of the introduction of local programming so, therefore, the funds being expended on local programming are funds that would otherwise, presumably, have been profits of the cable company, earnings of the cable company. There have, however, been few examples of late where a cable company has applied for a license with a specific surcharge being added to the monthly rate to support the cost of local programming. I think of the Calgary license as a case in point.

I think we have to think beyond the present situation and recognize the possibility that, at some point in the future when the technology of our systems permits, it may be possible and desirable to make a direct charge to subscribers for local programming that they watch, directly in relation to the particular programs that they watch. You've all heard examples given of the possibility of offering, say medical programs to the medical profession where you would have a special channel that would be just available to the medical profession and you would charge the doctor some special fee for access to that channel. By no means does that concept need to be limited to medical programming. As we look out into the future five or ten years, there might be a program series on gardening that people who are interested in gardening would be happy to pay for. Looking down the road, this represents, in my view, a very important potential source of support That technology is not with us here today. That is, our cable systems don't have the ability to record what each of us is watching and somehow charge us for it but, looking down the road, that kind of subscriber support opens up pretty exciting new vistas in terms of being able to cater to specific audience needs with television programming.

Another important source of support is volunteer participation. Volunteer participation can take one of a number of forms. Many cable companies operate with production staffs that are, in part, volunteer students, for example, desiring exposure to the tools of the trade. I should mention though that volunteer participation on the production side can tend to wear off over a period of time. The most important type of volunteer participation is in the area of program subjects and program planning – people taking it upon themselves to become involved in the actual making of a program. The time they commit to the enterprise has to be viewed as a very important source of support for the whole programming effort.

Another source of support, of course, is the amount participants are paid by the organizations they represent. Many of the people that appear on our cablecast programs are there because what they are doing on the cablecast channel is somehow consistent with the objects, aims of the organizations which they represent. Therefore, they come and do their thing to further the object of their particular organization. For example, the Department of Labor has just recently put on some programs on human rights. The people involved in that program, the performers, were paid by the Department of Labor and they were furthering the government's objects in this area. I think that's a source of support we probably haven't developed to its fullest but it's one we should certainly keep in mind.

Government grants are another source of support. We heard an example this morning of a program being produced under an LIP grant and there have been other examples. Large industrial concerns have been known to be interested in underwriting the cost of certain program series, some of them for obvious reasons. We can all appreciate that the Aluminum Company might be interested in staging a series of programs on aluminum but it's also possible that a large organization, simply as a goodwill gesture in the community in which it's located would underwrite the cost of, say, bringing a symphony orchestra to the public with the community.

Q. What is the extent, under the CRTC regulations, of the acknowledgement? In other words, how much acknowledgement is permitted?

A. That borderline hasn't been defined, to the best of my knowledge. All I can say is that I would be surprised if an organization brought the symphony orchestra to the people of Guelph and received no more than a credit line for it and then the CRTC took it upon itself to make a case out

of that. The specific words that the CRTC has used in its policy statements are "cable companies shall not, for the time being at least, sell advertising" and you're just as good an interpreter as I am at this state of what those words really mean.

I guess another source of support which I shouldn't fail to mention is bingo. There are a number of programs on cable companies here and there supporting worthwhile causes, or I hope worthwhile causes, where a game of chance, bingo, is really the source of support. I'm not sure I personally want to develop that as the ultimate in financing of programming but that's one possibility.

Finally, and by no means least, there is advertising. As I just mentioned a moment ago, cable companies are, for the most part, prevented from selling advertising as a source of support for programming. However, two or three cable companies in Canada have been given special permission to proceed with the selling of advertising as a means of supporting local programming. I think in every case they had been selling advertising and supporting local programming that way well before the CRTC came into existence.

Another possibility, along advertising lines, is while the cable company is prevented from selling advertising, the local TV broadcaster is not prevented from selling advertising and I can imagine, although I don't know that it has been done to-date, some group might work an arrangement with a local TV broadcaster whereby he would sell the advertising and the division of revenues would be such that both the programming group in the community and the TV broadcaster would be mutually satisfied.

Where should support come from for local programming? I think really all of the foregoing sources that I mentioned are appropriate but the important thing to remember, in my view, is that cablecasting is not, and this is a matter of opinion, is not a professional performing medium. I underline the word performing. Rather, I think it is a facility that individuals, groups, organizations can use with appropriate encouragement and technical assistance — a facility that individuals, groups, organizations with the needs and motivation to do so can use to communicate information, ideas, talents, to the people in their communities. I don't think that money or the lack of it is the biggest problem in cablecasting. If we can somehow stimulate the individuals, groups, organizations that should be using cablecasting to want to do so, then resources can, in the majority of cases, be found. This, in my view, is the real challenge. Cable systems have, I think, had some success in getting a broad base of community participation but there are certain areas where we need to keep trying for increased participation. I don't think and I'm sure this will strike a few chords in the room, as one example, I don't think the universities with their tremendous intellectual and cultural resources have, generally speaking, done enough to communicate with the communities in which they exist. I also think that boards of education have not done as much as they should or could to involve parents in their children's education. It seems to me this is another kind of opportunity. I'd say in both of those cases, whether it be a university or a board of education, if that institution really had a will, desire, strongly felt need, to achieve this kind of communication, the kinds of dollars we're talking about really wouldn't stand in the way.

I'd also hope, moving over to some other areas, that we might engage some of the various amateur performing groups within our communities more in the use of cablecasting as their particular medium of production.

Of course there are the inarticulate, the disadvantaged, and the unorganized people in our communities. They probably need the communication much more than any of the other groups that I've mentioned and I think that's really where the biggest challenge lies — to somehow involve those groups of people in the use of the facility and I'm not sure we've really had significant success to-date in doing that.

Those are a few views on cablecasting and community programming and costs and sources of support. I think many of the questions that you raised when we went around the room at the beginning are very interesting ones and very appropriate ones and I encourage you to, at this stage, put your questions up for discussion. I'm sure we'll have a lively discussion indeed.

The Political Dimension

Mr. Waterston: I would now call on Professor Duane Tulloch, Chairman of the Political Dimension Session who will summarize and answer questions.

Prof. Tulloch: Basically, we didn't resolve anything, we just formulated some questions. The basic question we formulated was who shall guard the guardians? We then spent some time in an absolute futile search for absolute fairness and absolute equity. That took up a good proportion of our time but we did decide, or Richard Gwyn postulated, that there were two basic problems, a political problem, who shall grant the licenses "to print money" and also, how shall their licenses be regulated. Secondly, there was felt a problem at the local level of how to allocate the limited time with competing usages and competing philosophies. This, Richard felt, was not a problem in the long run, as in the long run, technological advance would increase the supply of channels, hence allocation problems would disappear. With that summary, brief as it was, we'll open it up for questions that Richard would answer or hopefully debate. Any questions?

Q. Has the problem of allocation of time really been a big one for cable companies so far?

Prof. Tulloch: No, at the moment it is not a real problem but eventually it may become a very substantive political problem for cable operators. It is putting a very heavy burden on them if they are required to choose between a variety of community groups within the same community. However, at the moment, it isn't a problem because community programming on cable television has been slower to develop than all the experts forecast. In New York, where they have public access channels, the only requirement is first come, first served and to strike a reasonable balance between the first comes, seeing that he doesn't hog prime time every day.

Q. I would like to comment on the comment that cable only goes where it is economically possible. I can't accept that they only go into 30% of the province, that's a pretty rash statement.

Prof. Tulloch: No, the cable companies are in some very small communities, but of course, they started out in some very small communities that couldn't get a signal at all, but there is a limit, you can't expect cable companies to go into uneconomic areas; there are other techniques that you may have to use to send signals into these areas. You may have to take a different institutional structure if you want to put cable television into very remote, widely scattered use.

Q. The basic point concerning rural communities is that cable may not be, in certain cases, the most efficient system of distribution. The technology and economics of cable television today are such that it is not realistic to cover rural areas, if you mean sparsely settled farms and that kind of thing. If you are talking about small compact communities, that is a different problem. So if your assertions are that it may be necessary to have a combination of distribution techniques, for example, UHF cable, then I would have to agree with you. Another one coming along of course, is cassette and may be the answer for the location even out of the range of broadcast transmission.

Prof. Tulloch: You are stealing my line from me, that's what I said during the session – that I felt that the future of the cable companies was as utilities. The logic of economics points towards the continual reduction of CTV companies. Economic logic would indicate perhaps a dozen and perhaps the ultimate monopoly. It's not necessary to have one cable company as we only have one telephone company but the logic would point towards the economies of scale. This of course, raises the question: "if the cable companies are given monopoly, should they not then be regulated as a utility?"

Q. I just wanted to clarify – you referred to the Commission and the educational policy. I would just like to elaborate that the situation at the moment is that the CRTC is required to respond to a request that originates with the provincial government for the provision of an educational channel on a cable television system. But with on air broadcasting, CBC holds the license in the province and the Department of Education provides the programs.

Prof. Tulloch: Thank you. I do see it but if there were no restrictions, there would probably be far fewer CTV companies than there are now. A utility doesn't have to be publicly owned to be a utility; it could be privately owned and it coesn't have to be owned by the telephone company.

Q. I'd like to go back to the political arena for a second. If given the fact that cable companies are primarily based in a small community area and are regulated by an exclusively national body, what do you think are the advantages or disadvantages

of adopting a somewhat similar system in Canada to what is evolving in the States, whereby the municipalities, the local municipalities share the selection process?
Prof. Tulloch: I have not had experience in the United States. There has been a lot of pork barrel politics and kick backs. There has not been a very happy experience in the United States. There has been a lot of selling of franchises by municipalities in the United States and so, on that score, is questionable. The other thing is this, if you're getting into content regulation and if the program develops as one hopes it will, then the potential is there. Regulation at the municipal level is very dangerous because you are putting in municipal officials a fantastic amount of power.
Q. You are saying that these officials are more technical and more stupid than the Commissioner of the CRTC. Any comment?
Prof. Tulloch. No, I didn't say that. I was just telling you what happened in the States.
Q. What do you think of the process where the licensing agency will control applications for Regina or Victoria or God Knows Where with regulations that would not be public ownership but private or co-operative. But the license would be granted to fit the ideology of the Ottawa sector. Now you know we are having a hearing for our town and our community groups will not entertain the possibility of getting up there at all. Will you comment on that please?
Prof. Tulloch. I'll have to duck that one because I am not a member of the CRTC.
Q. Would Mr. Spiller like to comment on this?
Mr. Spiller: There have been several things that have been raised in the last few minutes that might be raised in our Winnipeg conference so I don't feel prepared to comment. First of all the question of public utilization and the question of municipal involvement. As far as the commission is concerned, at the present time under the Broadcasting Act, we have a particular mandate and we have to work within that mandate and I feel that whatever happens beyond that is a very good question and I don't think that we are in a position to comment now. The other question, the matter of the business of community involvement and devising a procedure for public hearing, clearly you provide for community groups to express their point of view at a public hearing on matters that concern them and of course, they can intervene as can anyone else, in the hearing, be it for new license or renewing license.
Q. Do you mean that community groups in Saskatchewan townships requesting financial assistance to go to Ottawa, would get it after the hearing is over?
Mr. Spiller: I didn't say that, no.
Q. Well, how do they get it?
Mr. Spiller: Well there is a new rule that allows people in your community where licenses are being issued to have access to the applications of the voters. Now the question of money to get people from place to place, I think that that is clearly out of our jurisdiction. We provide the facility and the procedure but I don't think that it is up to us to provide transportation and expenses.
Q. Well I get a bit tired hearing about community groups and community access and people being able to go in off the streets to use a cable facility. Who is the person who actually decides at this point which group is to have the facility? I have met some very nice cable operators who seem like eminent, sensible gentlemen but I don't think anyone would like to be in the position to have to decide which group in a hot political situation had access. Now who says No! Stop! Enough! Who goes out to find somebody to represent the opposite point of view? Who prevents this whole thing from becoming a political smear? Am I asking the right person the question?
A. Well the cable operator has to because he is generally responsible for anything that goes on at his station. But this is quite unfair in this particular context; it is putting an impossible burden on the cable operators. As citizen groups become more professional, the politicians are going to get more and more worried about them because people are going to watch. If the programs are badly made with a lot of idealism but not professional quality, the politicians are only moderately concerned because no one is going to watch, but when they get good, the political issue is going to become a very acute one.
Q. And when the community group is attacked by the politicians unfairly, who will arbitrate?
A. Because community groups can also defend themselves by gaining support from other municipal groups, they also have a new leadership, verbally and visually articulate. The one area that is of concern is Toronto. In most of the country it is not a major problem because broadcasting is still based on the cable company. Do you want to make a comment sir?
Q. Yes, I think that you have covered it reasonably well and of course, the first answer is yes, that it

is the cable companies that are still making those judgements. Secondly, I would have to say however, that generally speaking, the problem as described, is not with us at the moment but it could be at some time in the future.
Q. Like next week?
A. No, I don't think it will be, but generally speaking, these difficult adjustments have not arisen and if they arise, I suspect that they will arise gradually and I would hope that the cable companies would grow along with the problem. There seems to be a notion here that we have a powerful manipulating tool at our disposal which I think is false because audiences won't watch or listen to someone coming in off the street and shooting off his mouth unless it concerns them.

I'd like to qualify this question about the political power of cable because it will depend very, very much on the community. Obviously in Toronto where you get this clutter of competition, the cable channel has a hard time getting an audience. However in a small, remote community and particularly in a community with very weak other media, radio, television and newspaper, the local programming and the cable television can become important politically.

Ownership, Rights and Control of Cable Transmission

Mr. Waterston: I would now like to call on Professor Glen Warlow who is going to report on the Ownership, Rights and Control of Cable Transmission session. Unfortunately Mr. David Williams who was the resource person could not be with us for this part of the program.
Prof. Warlow: Our original speaker was to be a lawyer and when he couldn't be here, we substituted Mr. Williams. Now we have substituted for Mr. Williams, Executive Vice-President, Canadian Cable Systems, who regretted that he could not stay because of a previous commitment.

We are going to concern ourselves with the comments that he made but since it involves a good bit of expertise, I'll just quote excerpts from some of his comments.

First on the ownership of cable. "The right of ownership to the cable TV operation is dependent on two things. Number one – meeting the regulations relative to Canadian ownership, which follows an Order In Council. And second – a lot of the broadcast interests that you hold to the extent that they are not in conflict with the proposed cable TV venture." Now we'll look at Canadian ownership. In order to avoid proof of Canadian citizenship, which is usually easier for new Canadians than for the rest of us, the regulation allows to be deemed as Canadian all individuals whose address is in Canada and who hold 1% or less of the total number of issued shares of a corporation. The second aspect of ownership of cable television depends on being able to comply to certain policies of the CRTC as to being able to own a CATV system. This is a gray area but it is generally recognized that the owner of a TV station cannot own a CATV system in the same community or vice versa, or may not be able to own a CATV in one community and TV in another. Similarly, newspapers holding TV licenses are rare but some do exist. There seems to be not so much restriction on radio and CATV but radio and TV are generally thought not to be available to the same owner in one community. There are exceptions to each rule – London, Ontario, for instance, where the radio station, TV station and newspaper, have one owner. The most desirable qualities to have to obtain a license for CATV are, to an individual, to be rich and artistically talented. Unfortunately, these qualities are seldom found together. The control of cable television may be interpreted in another sense and this deserves to be commented on. The view of the

CRTC is that a CATV operator should not only provide good clear signals on a regular TV channel but he should also program a local community channel; and that finally he should make his facilities available to local community groups in order that they may speak to the community. This latter area may be examined from two sides. From a legal point of view, what are the legal rights of individuals or groups in the community to have access to the community cable channel (the point that was just touched on) and how is this occurring? On the practical side, many cable TV companies regularly invite a wide range of community groups to use the cable to address the community. They instruct them in the way to make use of the facility and on the general need of preparation of the of the material before they come to the studio. Regrettably, many such groups find it just too much trouble and are not interested in carrying out their plans. A few groups do become quite proficient and do make regular use of the community facilities to address the community on matters on which they are concerned.

A comparison may be made on cable TV and other media. To telephone a radio talk show is comparatively easy, to write a letter to the newspaper is a little more trouble, but to prepare a program to be seen on cable TV requires both effort and ideas of general interest to those being addressed. I think it is safe to say that most cable TV stations seek programs of interest to their community and are interested that only the laws of libel and slander are not broken and that the program be in good taste.

The cable operators would also be concerned that the laws of copyright be respected. No matter how well he is insured or what protection he seeks from the producers of the community program, the operator is still in the position to be the recipient of a law suit, and to be held accountable by the CRTC in the event that a program libels or slanders some one or infringes a copyright. The legal aspects of the right of the individual or groups to demand access to use the cable are less clear. A few comments were made in the group following these formal comments by our speaker. The CATV should complement not compete with commercial television. The control of content is an extremely sensitive issue but the station is ultimately responsible (a comment that has been made earlier by more than one speaker). Finally, a question which has been asked: "should the programmer and the carrier be separated to increase the discussion of sensitive issues in the community?" It's felt that there may be some inhibition in the discussion of sensitive issues with respect to editorial judgement, what programs come on, etc. Now, I don't have the expertise that either of these men who talked today in the session but there were some in the audience, I know, who did have some expertise. If there are any questions, I would be pleased to try to answer them or direct them to those who are present.

Q. Can I ask what happens when a cable company is not offering any kind of service. What is the recourse specifically?

Prof. Warlow: I don't know. Does any one know? A licensed cable TV company that is not offering any services to the local citizen.

Q. None whatever?

A. None whatever.

Q. You are referring to a local channel?

A. Yes, it is offering programming, of course, but it is not offering any local programming at all.

A. Well the cable policy, as it exists at the moment, still leaves plenty of room for local interpretation. There are, of course, now something like 350 cable systems operating in and around the country. It is very clearly spelled out in cable policy that priority is given to Canadian signals, both local and distant. And then there are two other priorities which are Canadian priorities, if you like: the locally programmed channel and provision of educational services. When these conditions are fulfilled, the facilities have what is called optional signals which of course, could include an American signal.

Q. Then if I understand you, educational and community are given 4 and 3, or something like that?

A. Yes, well the number would depend on the local station.

Q. Would I be right in thinking that most of the systems that are not programming are pretty small in size?

A. Yes, all of the large systems are programming. Unfortunately, I cannot give you the precise numbers but all the systems are very small and in very small communities. You can over-regulate. After all, it is easy to come out with some very hard regulations and act as a policeman, but I don't think that that is necessarily in the best interests of the developing system.

Group Discussion – Ownership, Rights and Control of Cable Transmission

Mr. Williams: I think the words of Mr. Grant or what he has collected touch fairly well on the subject of access which is a much questioned aspect of cable. Cable can be, I think, a much greater influence in a community such as Cornwall than it will perhaps be in a large city such as Toronto. Toronto is fragmented into many different cable companies and what is a community thing? Is is Thorncliffe Park? Is it the metropolitan Toronto area? It's a very different thing as those who come from Toronto well know. The ability of doing something in Cornwall with respect to local community elections, this intrigues me no end. I believe that many suburbanites who live in Scarborough or Etobicoke as I do, go to the polls because people say "go and vote, vote as you like but vote" but they get in that polling booth and they look at a list of names and they haven't the slightest idea of what one man stands for or whether he's on the council or not. I believe that through a period of time cable in a community can enlighten the people in the community, even if they happen to watch it only once a year but if they happen to watch it at election time and make up their minds that what they've seen in that man they don't want or what they see in that man, they want.

Q. In some of these communities, like Cornwall, I don't know how many franchises there are in that community, in that case, theoretically the subscribership covers the political constituency. In many areas I don't think that cable systems are divided on constituency lines, are they?

Mr. Williams: No, but I think you will find that Mississauga will likely do similar to that which has been done in Hamilton where we are participant in Cable 8. Cable 8 is a consortium of all the cable companies in Hamilton who clubbed together, put up the capital and pay the running costs on a pro rata basis of the Hamilton Community Cable System and I think it does a very good job in Hamilton and Hamilton is a nice size community that you can really do a job in. That's another way of doing it and I think that's what will happen in Mississauga.

Q. From what you said, the invitations to the public are very broad and open. What about the costs of their participation, are these absorbed by the cable company?

Mr. Williams: Well, in the cable companies of which I am familiar, we have, as you see, invited people to come in. We would not expect to teach them to use the equipment, we're not an educational teaching place, we are prepared to provide them with the studios and the facilities if they will then take a modicum of instruction as to how to prepare to communicate with the community and go away and prepare that and come back in, we will tape that in as capable a manner as we are able to. We do in fact use quite often people from colleges for camera operators but we do not want to have different people coming in every hour of the day using our equipment. The equipment would deteriorate in no time but to that extent, I don't think we want to have them physically running the equipment. If they have capability, yes. No reason why not but we do want them to address themselves to making themselves interesting and to speaking out on the subject they have which is of consequence to the community. They learn to do that with some ability, to produce something which is generally speaking, sufficiently interesting, that's what we're after.

Q. What about the technical aspect, the union encouragement? Have you had any approaches or blessing from the union?

Mr. Williams: The majority of the cable companies are not unionized.

Q. I'm just wondering about the approach of NABET for example. If there is widespread community programming which does involve the use of videotapes, telecine chains and studio equipment, has there been a view expressed by the unions?

Mr. Williams: I have not had any discussion of this nature. You have to look back a little bit and it all started out with the cable operator desiring to clean up the signals, put them into your home with a clean signal. He then started stretching for the more distant signals which he found he could also clean up and that started the problem. He charged somewhere between $4 - $5 per month to the customer and the customer was willing to pay by the thousands or they wouldn't be on there today. Now then, the CRTC came into the picture and said "we're going to license all you fellows and as part of your license, you just can't take that money which you've been charging for a cleaned up signal and keep it, you've got to provide some community service."

Q. All through the material you were reading, there was the feeling, the word 'should' that was used,

not 'must', you suspect either that the CRTC has no legal right to tell you to order you to get into community programming.
Mr. Williams: I'm afraid I believe they do have.
Q. You believe they do have the right?
Q. What expectancies can a community have? I'm in a community that's presently getting a new head input and they claim they're putting in community television facilities. Now, what expectancies can this community have that those cable people will put in adequate facilities or any kind of facility which they expect?
Mr. Williams: Well I think, first of all, since these kind of facilities do cost a fairly large measure of money, I believe the Kitchener studio facility was about 150,000 capital cost which is significant with relationship to the $4.50 per month or for $50 I think it is they charge per year.
Q. For ten years?
Mr. Williams: I'm suggesting that I think that is a significant cost.
Q. 150,000?
Mr. Williams: Yes. I'm suggesting only the economics of the ballgame. I believe that Kitchener is doing an excellent job of community cablecasting.
Q. I would like to ask you one question about that. I'm, I believe anyway, a reasonably intelligent person and I notice you brought out that brochure put out by Grand River Cable TV. I know several people at Grand River Cable TV and I would have thought if you are going to elicit citizen participation in the system, you would have to develop a method of wider communication. How many people got that communication? How many know it's available?
Mr. Williams: I couldn't tell you that, to be truthful with you. Would you like copies of it?
Q. Isn't it essentially true that community stations by and large are, at least the audiences are, an accidental audience? Because of a lack of augmenting through other media forms?
A. I think this difficulty occurs whether or not the programs prove interesting enough for the viewer.
Q. It's accidental that they even find out themselves.
A. In some cases it is.
Q. Well then, it's not reaching the populace at all.
Q. I'd like to say one other thing. I think right now we have an ideal opportunity to take a look at a situation and make some decisions regarding the future development of cable TV. Historically, if you look at the other forms of mass media, they have totally failed in presenting all points of view within a community. They present only the owner's view of what life is. Cable systems, the way they're going now, will not do anything different. In order to get into cable, you have to be wealthy which means you are again part of the current power structure and you're not going to rock the boat.
A. If you want to own it.
Q. No. I think you should be classed as a common carrier and program responsibility should be taken legally out of the cablecaster's hands.
A. Well as you see two cablecasters that I read from, MacLean-Hunter and Jarmain, felt this wouldn't be a bad idea.
Q. I enjoyed the Thunder Bay episode because I spent considerable time up there in the local college and the citizens' group that was programming that system was really doing an excellent job and they were making a lot of waves but there was no intimation of libel or slander or anything. MacLean-Hunter moved in and again, by their control of the system, made it so bureaucratic and so difficult to access that the citizens' group just gave it up.
A. Well I don't speak for MacLean-Hunter but I am involved with the Grand River Company and I can only tell you that I have MacLean-Hunter in my own home in Etobicoke and they do have regularly a flash card requesting that if you have program ideas or a group, etc., etc. Now the extent to which this is watched is the point that this other gentleman has made. I don't really know how other than spectaculars or interesting programming that is publicized regularly, I don't know how you are going to tell people.
Q. Some form of scheduling to go out with bills, or something like that?
A. The schedule is actually usually already on on the community channel, on the clip cards and those who are ethnic depend on word of mouth when their program is on.
Q. I think what this gentleman is saying and I feel the same way, that I do not watch the local channel on Grand River Cable TV because it is doing nothing worthwhile in the area of real public service, in my opinion. Running a Portuguese program or a German program or another ethnic program when there are so many problems in a city like Kitchener-Waterloo, is not public service programming. It's Mickey Mousing around so you can go back to the CRTC and say "see what we've done? Renew our license."

A. I'm not sure the Portuguese people or the German people would totally agree with you. I have spoken with Dr. Baumgard who is Professor of German Literature at the university in this area, who feels that it's performing a very valuable service in German in the community.
Q. Another point is that we are subject to a whim, people wanting programs are subject to the whim and manipulation of a corporate structure. To further enhance that, those people who have ethnic programming, that way they can get more subscribers in that specific area and at the cost of manipulation the programming will go in that direction.
A. Wired World is a group in Kitchener that I don't believe have any ethnic attachment at all and they are regularly on for an hour each week. Some programs, I'm advised, are quite good and some are not. I think it's the same with cable television.
Q. They'll program groups out of existence, is what I mean. If the group is an interest group and they can't get good programming time because it's more expedient to get subscribers from a different area by giving the ethnic program the prime time.
A. In Kitchener that's not too much of a problem because 88% of the homes are already connected.
Q. All these groups, wherever they're acting to get with any cable group are going to have this happen to them. They're going to program what is expedient for profit.
Q. I've been waiting for five times deferring this and I'll be lost if I don't catch it but now you've posed a question I want to get off my chest first and then go back to the one I wanted when you were going to finish yours. If a group of citizenry who could in ways get capital base of $150,000 appeared before CRTC for a license and there's a competitor there with the same money and the same motherhood pitch about what they'll do, who do you think will get the license?
A. If there is a community group with the financing and who was the other one?
A. One of the marketplace groups, MacLean-Hunter, Jarmain.
A. The community group will.
Q. I think this is right and that mood is getting richer. I know this. Now, the question I wanted to put. Let's say that somebody comes along in a situation like Hamilton and he goes on two or three times and letters come in and people phone in and say "as long as you have that guy on your program dealing with common problems or a community, we're going to turn in to listen" and that fellow finally says "I want to be placed on your payroll on that basis." Can you hire him?
A. I think we could, yes.
Q. Do you know the name Tom Beckett?
Q. Well aren't five stations working together in Hamilton?
A. Yes, but I can't be in all cities at all times.
Q. They'll know who Tom Beckett is and Tom is charisma.
A. These are things that do happen. As a matter of fact this is another thing that I think cable will do. I think it will uncover amongst many people who do not think of themselves as being creative or talented. I will uncover a measure of talent and those people will ultimately gravitate to the CBC and the commercial stations.
Q. I'm saying the same thing the CBC is, I don't want to talk any more but that would mean that eventually the cable people will want licenses and want to get them renewed and probably will end up with a very sophisticated style in terms of what I would call, repertory type personnel.
A. Cable TV must do a good job of complementary programming but not compete with the TV stations by competitive entertainment programs.
Q. Once the capital cost has been recovered we can look forward to that.
A. Complement, not compete with programming already available in the community through television, these are the words of the Commission.
Q. Yes but look what's happening in Mississauga.
Q. Yes but if they all join together like Hamilton...
A. I think you will find there the alternative to that, in my mind, and I know Charles Templeton quite well and respect him very highly, I believe that the six will very much more quickly wire Mississauga which should have been wired some time ago, and if they throw in together as they should on a community programming, Mississauga will get exactly what they want and they'll get it faster. In fact our company has two small segments and they were the first segments that were ever wired in the Shipp developments in Mississauga and we appeared at those hearings and volunteered to give those up to the successful encumbent who surround us. That turned out to be MacLean-Hunter.
Q. Was that Zimmerman?
A. Zimmerman is in there, MacLean-Hunter is in there, Rogers is in there, Conway's in there.
Q. But Templeton isn't?

A. That's right.
Q. I just wanted to kick around something that I haven't thought through myself but thinking of the disenfranchised and how he gets access and who he talks to if he does get access. I was thinking of the guy who can't afford cable, who is in the community and realizes that some reform is necessary. How useful a medium is the community channel to that guy if he gets on and speaks to 10,000 subscribers? How effective is it?
A. Depends on what he says.
Q. Yes but given to whom he's saying it. Is it utopian for the disenfranchised to think that community cable is going to give them the vehicle for reform or change that they think is necessary?
A. I don't think it is going to be all things to all people, I don't really know that you can make it a strong competitive force in a community against its commercial competition and if you do, I fear that perhaps you could put the commercial station out of business in a smaller centre. I would not wish to be in a position of seeing Kitchener lose its commercial television station.
Q. I hate to disagree with you. I think it would be the greatest thing in the world.
A. Well it's a CTV station and I think it does bring in a very considerable amount of good entertainment, but they do operate for profit. There are other commercial television stations in Canada who are not succeeding financially at all and there is a question as to whether they will continue to be there.
Q. Given the kind of fragmentation that takes place as a result of U.S. programming on cable and the fragmentation that takes place within a community as to off air and so on and say, for example, that 23% of the people are watching programming on cable, of that 23%, what percentage is looking at the three U.S. networks? It seems to me that the community audience to community cable is a very almost statistically unfindable number of people and if the disenfranchised or the community group is thinking that this is going to be some kind of vehicle for expression for them, I wonder just how valuable for them. A lot of attention is being given to the value of the community channel and the role that the cable company can play in this and yet we're talking to a very, very minute. . . How much weight can you give to that? In terms of order of magnitude you would say that community cable is really meaningless.
A. By the same token, we have the CBC which is also paid for by the public and this is another area where people can address themselves and they do run a lot of programs such as Cross Country Check-up, a talk show throughout Canada.
Q. It's impossible for the CBC to focus on the kind of problem that's being talked about in community television.
A. Community cablecasting will be more successful in Cornwall than it will be in Toronto, it will be more successful in Kitchener than it will be in Toronto, mainly because of the size of the community.
Q. I'd like to allude to what I think is an element, that I've just accepted as an acceptable phenomena. This is a chap who is a real good technology type, carries a portopack so that you almost forget he's got the portopack on because he talks to you in such a way that you want to listen to what he's saying. Somebody, in terms of his submission for federal aid in a project, blackballed him and I happen to know that there was some argument to support this. So he made an appointment with this fellow and came in and he too, didn't realize the portopack was on the fellow's shoulder. So he went through a process of questions which made this fellow finally concede he was misled, that he was wrong and he was sorry and apologized and so forth. Then the fellow went out the door with it on tape. He showed this at the meeting at Memorial University in Newfoundland about a month ago and brought the house down. Now, what I'm saying is, it was almost a taping of an exchange because the fellow wasn't aware that the very obvious process of the tape going around . . . you see what I'm trying to get at. There may be something like the Gray Report sensation. Are they going to screen stuff?
A. Well, different cable people do different things of course. I think the greatest difficulty is finding sufficient interesting material and getting that knowledge of when it's on to the people so they can watch it.
Q. The one comment that bothers me that I've heard come up constantly is the big trouble cable companies have getting good programs. What is good and in whose opinion? The cable operators? This is why I would like to take the legal responsibility away from the cable operator.
A. Well that's not in disagreement with some of the operators.
A. I can answer that, if you don't mind. Do you know the first project that Stanley Burke initiated

in Barrie two years ago? Canvassed the community and came up with a list of three basic issues – the pollution of the Bay, the location of a new arena, everybody wanted it but didn't want it near where they lived, the pollution too was a little touchy politically, and the third one which came out number one when they had a reassessment, the plight of the young people in that area and the kids who are coming right off the highway, going across Canada, settling if they can. That was taped as a debate in the city council chambers with the mayor and certain members of council, public and private agencies and community colleges and so forth. They went down to the studio right after the taping, Channel 10, and the manager said "we will have to edit this so that we can fit it into the time we've got" and everybody said "you take one minute off that showing and we'll tear down your station." The manager said, with some apprehension, I think, "all right" and it went for an hour and fifty minutes the next night with the phone number of the station dubbed in or wherever the calls could be taken and it was so good it went on another night. Is this what we're saying – we want the kind of stuff that is real in terms of the people involved and that the stations do take a risk?

A. This was not a cable enterprise, this was something on the private television station.

Q. Why did the cable company have problems in time and schedule?

A. I don't think they had problems in time. They were probably a little uptight.

Q. Was it on a community channel?

A. A community channel.

Q. It was just the idea that it might be too long.

A. Content and length because there were some very harsh statements made.

Q. I'll give you an instance where this kind of thing should have happened and what really bothers me about this whole cable area. You're talking about Kitchener-Waterloo. Carl Pollock owns, lock, stock and barrel, the only TV station, one of the two AM radio stations, the other one is rock and roll and is not listened to by adults, one of the two FM stations, he is also a close personal friend of the publisher of the only daily newspaper in town. Now, it has been established that when debate was taking place on the downtown redevelopment, that there was in fact collusion between the media, city council and the developers to keep the facts from the public. My contention would be, cable wouldn't have discovered it any better than they would but this is the place where they should move in and make such a stink about it. It was a student newspaper that blew the whistle, by the way.

A. I'll say this, in London which is the system that we are involved in that had been programming longest, they have tried very, very hard and with a considerable amount of disappointment to arouse enough people to watch their community channel and I think they've tried many, many things and have been disappointed that they have not been able to get the percentage of viewers. They haven't stopped trying. I think London has again a consortium, I believe that MacLean-Hunter owned the other half of the city and they have clubbed together for a single community channel which I think is good for a community that size or in Hamilton or in Mississauga.

Q. The laws though, as far as slander is concerned, it's still the cable company that is sued. Until such time as that is changed, I can't see any cable company . . .

A. This is what the lawyer develops in this material which I selected for discussion at this meeting. I felt this was probably the area of your interest.

Q. I agree one hundred per cent that the law, as it reads now, places responsibility on the cable operator but what I'm saying is that if it is to serve as a truly community resource, that legal responsibility must be removed from the cable operator.

A. Then the suggestions that Jarmain and MacLean-Hunter make, that they in fact think it might be useful to have separated the programmer and the owner of the hardware, is that what you're suggesting?

Q. To carry that assumption further, what financial relationship would you have with such a production organization? It cuts off a potential source of revenue, you're never going to get into the local advertising business if you're not controlling the programming.

A. Each would say what they want as an amount per month per subscriber then you might find an interesting discussion as to the willingness of the subscriber to pay either or both. I don't know the answer to that. I'm sorry but that's an area that I think should be developed by those who are interested.

Q. I would like to pick up your comment in relation to what is done in other business circles. Why shouldn't one of the licensees take a chance on a libel issue and see what a court of law will do with it?

A. Well that's happening right now in Vancouver with respect to commercial substitution.
Q. Do all of your cable companies have insurance against libel and slander?
A. We have a very general policy but with a substantial $10,000 deductible.

Citizen Involvement and Education in Cable TV

Mr. Waterston: For the next session we have Prof. Findlay who reported on Citizen Involvement and Education in Cable TV and Mr. Phillip Lind of Rogers Cable as resource man.
Prof. Findlay: I am simply going to report on the many ideas that we talked about as a strictly lay person or lay observer. First of all, at some stage, we defined access. "Access" was defined as the circumstances in which any group which has views to express to the general public can have access to a community cable channel. The question of individual access presented some difficulty in discussion; reference was made to the individual with really nothing to say but who insists on saying it and to the view that groups should come before individuals in the allocation of time. (I am not talking about concensus, I am just talking about ideas that we talked about in the group.) Two categories of groups were talked about by Mr. Lind: 1) the neighbourhood groups, such as foreign language groups with cultural programs, and 2) political groups which take positions on some aspect of social change. Much time was spent discussing the technical problems of cable broadcasting as they relate to community groups, both the hardware aspects — equipment, cable facilities and so on (how to provide facilities for the community group) and the software aspect — the informational presentational aspects of programming (how to bring about the production of interest in programs that people will listen to). Mr. Lind talked about four general kinds of problems: 1) problems concerning the provision of the helping aspects — providing the general facilities and equipment for community groups, 2) problems concerning how to make programs interesting, 3) problems concerning how to schedule or to bring to the attention of the people the scheduling of programs, and 4) problems relating to difficulties experienced in sustaining the efforts of community groups.

Concerning the hardware problems, it takes two to five hours to produce a fairly good half-hour program; it is expensive and we have to find ways to increase the hardware or, rather, to overcome the hardware problem. Community groups do not know how to handle hardware; there is a general lack of technical knowledge by community groups.

There are trends towards community organization that provide this kind of facility to serve and help community groups that are not really concerned with the hardware aspects. Community groups tend to be interested in the software aspects and seek assistance in getting out their particular information – their educational aspect. This brings us into the software problems.

How to make programs interesting and the need for workshops were discussed. Who should operate them? We had some new suggestions. Apparently, in Richmond Hill, theatre groups are assisting local groups by helping with their program presentations. There is a need for training in the use of movement. Mr. Foss sympathized this morning that we had to learn to read in class and now we have to learn how to move in the TV medium, develop showmanship qualities; how to look presentable is as important as using the hardware itself. Then there is the problem of advertising. The actual times when certain programs are going to be offered. Slides, of course, are generally used to indicate scheduling. As to the difficulties in sustaining the efforts of community groups, very often it is suggested that it is a one time thing; groups present something and they don't come back again. There may be divisions within the groups. The chairman, or president may make the presentation; he or she may not be the most appropriate person to make that presentation. Getting to know the people in the community who can best do this kind of thing is a public relations problem.

The problem of control brought up questions such as: who can be put on the program? Who decides this? Criteria for programs? We got into questions of morals and language, coming into the area of family programming. We talked about the legal responsibilities of the cable companies to the public and the related need for some degree of control. Some felt that we didn't want to go too far in this direction; we wanted to keep programming as open as possible. There were thus differences of opinions between those who wanted to ensure "quality programs" and those who wanted programming to be kept as open as possible.

We talked about the problems of funding. There are certain Ontario government strides in this direction. It was suggested that little provision for hardware comes from the federal government for community programming. There was the question of how much assistance cable companies should offer to community groups. The possibility of extra cable charges was suggested as well as the possibility of including a percentage of advertising time on local channels. Now it appears, as an observer, that we are in a period of establishing confidence and credibility in respect to the community cable channel as a community participation, educational media. We have hardware problems; we have software problems; we have problems developing interest; developing useful programs; developing public awareness of these, and general public interest and participation. Once community channels are accepted as "the thing" and "where the action is", there is a problem, or there is more likely to be the problem, of establishing the criteria and standards for program selection and scheduling. This may become more pressing. As the session closed, there was a question concerning the development of community advisory boards. Perhaps this is too difficult at this stage. Certainly the group raised a lot of questions. Answers are much more difficult but we have talked about some things.

Mr. Lind: First off it has been a long day and a heavy one. I'll take a few questions and let's get out of here. Don't let me dissuade you. No questions? Yes.

Q. What advice do you give to incite citizen involvement?

Mr. Lind: Well, we perform the functions of using the buzz words "video animators" as much as we can. By sending people; in fact we have some producers that are just community people and they do not work in the studio at all. They just spend time out with neighbourhood groups and are attached to those groups, not as the programmers, just as someone to keep the particular thing going.

Q. Specifically, how do they find these groups and how do they work?

Mr. Lind: You've just got to be aware of your community and I think that you can find the groups. It's not so hard to find groups. You have to try to relate the advantages of using cable television as an expression medium. That is the software thing. In terms of hardware of course, our company, like most other cable companies, supply a certain amount of hardware. We supply mobile hardware as well so a group

can take that equipment out into the streets or use it in the studio. Whatever they want.
Q. Are these people – the community programming people – employed by Rogers or are they volunteers or what?
Mr. Lind: We have producers that are employed by ourselves, yes, but they don't undertake the normal broadcast cablecasting function per se. In other words, they don't have responsibility for an hour or two, or seven, or whatever it is per week, in the same sense that a normal producer would have.
Q. In your experience, how much enthusiasm has been generated by the community to get on cable?
Mr. Lind: Well, I think that "enthusiasm" is pretty strong. We talked a great deal in our seminar about varying environments – small towns where there is no television and larger towns where there is fantastic over-concentration and fantastic information overload. Also, today, we are working with an under-capacity of space but, basically, even if we share a community channel with a broadcaster, he goes from three to eleven every day. There is still a lot of stuff around to put on. We're pluralists in our programming concepts at the moment. Ultimately that will be fragmented and go to different channels, different ideas, different concepts will go to different channels.
Q. You talked about having mobile equipment. When you send this mobile equipment out to the community, does it go with your producers?
Mr. Lind: No, it does not go out with producers.
Q. I want to ask if you have one studio or two studios or what?
Mr. Lind: Yes, we have one studio in Toronto. What size? You mean in square feet? I really don't know.
Q. Do you produce more programs outside or more inside the studio?
Mr. Lind: No, we produce much more inside.
Q. For what reasons?
Mr. Lind: I suspect for much the same reasons as other people find, that it is a mobile unit. It is very, very expensive and it is four or five hours out for a half-hour of actual production; the other thing is you can't control the environment as well. I think half-inch (tape), for most instances anyways, is the answer. If it could only get a little better it would be very desirable.
Q. Do you have bingo?
Mr. Lind: Do we have bingo? We have it in a smaller system outside of Toronto.
Q. Is that what you are talking about?
Mr. Lind: Yes, the magazine that talks about what is going on and the programs going on and also we have bingo cards – big deal!
Q. Is that the only way you publish your programs?
Mr. Lind: Well not really. In the smaller communities, often the newspaper will help you out. We haven't found that same show of co-operation in Toronto. You see, we have 10 systems there, or at least 8, and if they listed them all across we'd be a page a week and I don't think they want to do that for us.
Q. Is this adequate?
Mr. Lind: In the smaller community, yes. But it is not sufficient in the large community. Everybody talks about this today, you know. How can we plug into what is going on in the community cable channel. We either sit in front of the thing and watch the flip chart and nothing else; so it's not simple.
Q. I'd like to know if the CRTC didn't say to cable companies: "we expect you and we want you to provide this community coverage and this community access," what would the general feeling of the cable company be? Would they really just assume not to be bothered with all this?
Mr. Lind: Do you want me to be a chauvinist or what? I think it would vary. I think I could give you a couple of cases right off the bat where people were going to do it. Marcel Farley, incidentally, has been doing it for ten years, well before the Commission was even established, and a number of other systems. Ted Jarmain's system would be doing it for sure. They wouldn't? A number would not because a number see themselves in the same function as Richard Greene, sort of a utility type function, just carrying TV signals. But I suspect that now, he is changing his mind. We would, because we are broadcasters too, you see.
Q. I thought your statement was that we had been doing it for a long time, like Marcel, and that is not true.
Mr. Lind: You have been doing it, I know you would. It makes sense there. There are ten channels and there is one local channel in London and wouldn't it be a natural to have another channel?
Q. What I am wondering is whether it is just too damn much trouble. It's kind of like a can of worms; it provides a lot of headaches and so on. A business that is trying to make money is really not concerned about that.

Mr. Lind: Yes, I would like to speak to that. I think it is fair to say that the CRTC gave the cable companies a pretty strong prod to get these local programs. There were relatively few that were in it then. I think, basically, that the prod was taken and really that an accurate description of the situation today is that the cable companies have devoted a certain percentage of their revenues to local programming. There are very few people who suggest that they are recouping their expenditures or even a fraction of them through added revenues. And my own personal view, and I think the view of many cable operators, is that, if I can't make a buck out of it, at least I would like to have the satisfaction that the money is well spent. I think that that is what is concerning people now.

Getting and Keeping People Involved
Philip B. Lind

We have been conversing, over these past days, about the many faces of cable television. Certainly, there is great promise to cable, but it is there ***only*** if we seize the opportunities now. Often the result of recently enjoyed success is stand-pattism and it is my hope that we in the country become more innovative. We are fast losing our reputation for technical leadership in the world. For example, several systems in the United States have already 18 operating channels. We must continue to assert ourselves on the cable programming side — somewhere, I believe we currently remain well ahead of the Americans.

My topic today has been given to me as "Getting and Keeping the People Involved." That matter is, of course, at the very heart of community cablecasting. It is true that we can define cablecasting in several different fashions, but it is my intention to deal mainly with cable productions produced either by or for community groups. This could properly be called "access", although most purists would insist that true access programming is only that produced by the group. But, we can examine those aspects later. First, we should satisfy ourselves that there is a need for this kind of service. The rationale is two-fold. First, that in the overall broadcasting framework, there are certain segments that miss out. There are various sub cultures with socio-economic stratas that are ignored and this can be corrected by neighbourhood cable television. As Dorothy Todd Henault notes: "Here we have found the nitty gritty of society's dilemma. Cities are becoming uninhabitable, governments and institutions are unresponsive, people feel powerless and forget how to get together for the simple things". And even if that sounds like too much "bleeding heartism" it's true that in all "together" neighbourhoods, rich or poor, there really does seem to be evidence that people want to dabble in programming. The second reason is that, ignoring the technical aspects, it makes eminent sense for people to be able to have some control over the media, that in turn exerts a certain measure of control over them. This is particularly true in the

case of television, which as Marshall McLuhan noted, is an absolutely pervasive medium. The result is that over the years we have become so inundated by the television sensation that, as one writer recently put it, "In our society you don't really exist until your existence is confirmed by seeing yourself on television," or as Dorothy Todd Henault puts it, "How to break through the walls of apathy and alienation? People must become convinced of their problem solving capacity on a scale that is meaningful to them. This conviction arises as a result of actual experience and participation in a creative social process. For this reason the means of communication, the real two-way communication, must be made accessible to ordinary people for dialogue in a meaningful local debate. In this way we would generate a much more vigorous problem solving capacity based upon local initiative and creativity."

I think, then, that we can all agree on the need for such services. The real question is how - how to make community cable dialogue a workable proposition. And the answer seems to be in the title — Getting and Keeping the People Involved. It's the animation process that requires real study. I am reminded of a recent American panel on this subject when Theo Sklover said in addressing cable operators "and it is time, as you have heard again and again and again; it is really time to start to do something about this access that we have all been talking about; and time to put money, talent and real commitment into community utilization of the cable". It's true. The time has come, but I think that important strides have already been made, especially in the Toronto cable systems.

But first let us touch briefly on the matter of "control". This subject has probably generated more heat than anything else in cablecasting. There are two rather different things involved — control of the cablecasting channel and control of the programme itself. As far as the cablecasting channel is concerned, cable companies have, at this point, reserved the right (as indeed they must, under the terms of their licensing agreements) to control the basic programming format of the channel. Most cable programmers feel, as does the Commission, that the channel offers an opportunity to programme many different types of fare. Also in certain areas, cable programmers are aware that there is, generally speaking, a shortage of cable channel space at the moment. So right now, the concept is one of "pluralism", with access type programming being only one of several types of programming competing for space. This tends to offend those who believe that the cablecasting channel should be exclusively hard core access. But, fortunately, "help is on the way" and technology is going to cure the situation. When the 20 channel concept arrives, and it will shortly in Toronto, one of those channels should properly be dedicated to pure "access". In fact, it's the law in New York City. Perhaps I could read one section of the agreement between the city and the cable companies operating in that area.

Access channel - "The company shall lease time and if necessary adequate studio facilities to members of the public. Appropriate technical assistance shall be furnished by the company. Time shall be leased on a first come first service, it being the intent that such public channels serve as a significant source of diversified expression. In order that there be a maximum opportunity for freedom of expression, such programmes shall be free from any control by the company as to programme content, except as it is required to protect the company from liability under applicable law."

This then leads us into the second aspect of control, and that is content control. This is not generally as much of a problem as some would like it to be. Control of the content does indeed reside in the hands of the group doing the programme, subject only to considerations of libel and bad taste. Even these last aspects can be interpreted in differing fashions. It is hoped, by many, that this type of cablecasting ought to have the same rules as publishing, or indeed even a looser interpretation. Access programming *must* be freed up from the bonds imposed on an earlier technology.

The matter of control is central to the problems of animation, or getting people involved. If people are to go out of their way, on an entirely (except or OFY or LIP) volunteer basis, they must be able to feel that they are participating in the end product, or as McLuhan might say, that they indeed are the end product.

Probably the first genuine experiments, in the producer being the product concept, were carried

out by the National Film Board in their "Challenge for Change" programme. The concept of people power in electronic media was a new concept and they felt they had to introduce it a little bit at a time to experiment with it. They did this by means of providing both hardware equipment and software information to people residing in their experimental areas. The project, named Community Development, began in 1967 in Newfoundland. From there projects spread to other areas including St. Jacques in Quebec and Drumheller. Perhaps the most controversial video project was that of Thunder Bay. There, the Film Board dedicated major resources into a project called "Town Talk" Town Talk was to be the process whereby all the citizens, who had things to say, would do so, mainly using cable TV. There are many fascinating aspects to that experiment, not the least of which was the ability to study and analyze parts of a community when those parts suddenly become switched on electronically. The unfortunate side to view, and one that is not mentioned by the NFB, is what happens when the crews move out. Expectations were raised and then dashed. Some blame the Film Board, some blame the cable company, some blame the community leaders. One thing was clear, where there was promise, there is now disillusionment - where there was excitement now there is lethargy.

So that is point two in getting the people involved – you ensure certain aspects of control and you ensure that the will to proceed is not crushed by unnatural happenings. That is, people must believe that it has a chance of working.

There are several other animators in the NFB vein, but they are mainly movements spawned in and nurtured by people within the community. One example is the MetroMedia group in Vancouver. Let us see how they describe their role.

"In our commitment to these goals, we have had to become both an information centre and a political organization. We now have to collect, and make available to the community, information on communication projects that have gone on, on media resources available in the community, on the various types of hardware and communications techniques, and on the political issues and decisions involved in our media institutions. In that respect, we have also become organizers, trying to inform community groups about the issues surrounding cable TV, CBC, the wired-city concept, etc. We have presented and intend to continue to make representations to the various political bodies."

It might be well to label these groups, the NFB and MetroMedia, as "intermediate animators." That is, they sponsor other people to get involved in the process. And as mentioned earlier, they work, as do the cable companies in their respective communities, to help people overcome the fear of hardware.

But all that has changed with the advent of one inch and especially half-inch video. As Michael Shamberg notes in guerilla television "portable video systems offer decentralized production, while alternative distribution systems like cable TV mean that small scale, non-mass market information flow can be supported by the end user." With video tape, he adds, "the common place becomes information and the camera is open to everyone." And the Big Rock Candy catalogue calls video tape "a means of perceptual discovery and interaction." All stress the importance of the new hardware in the feedback process. All were concerned that historical media structures were designed (or at least it happened that way, by design or not) to minimize the feedback process. Now, portable video tape provides some answers to this. Thus a third concept involving people lies in overcoming their own fears of television hardware.

It's fun to speculate about the new hardware. When community goes on TV, it's merely an extension of the old party line. Did you hear about the system in Yellowknife or Whitehorse where the cable system merely pointed the camera out the office window towards the liquor store. Now *that* programme was watched because it told people about other people. As a sideline perhaps, it told people where the action might be on any given night, putting TV into the hands of everyone makes everyone a real life producer, in the same manner that the Xerox makes everyone a publisher. McLuhan talks of "flip", a process whereby people are driven out of one sensation by a constant bombardment. TV in the hands of people might flip some people, already turned off, back into TV – neighbourhood style. The neighbourhood producer becomes a participant programmer. Community TV does affect the community – it lets you know

who are the actors and the actor-uppers. The role of the programmer changes. He only records what is happening – maybe Andy Warhol was right after all. One thing is clear. People become passionate as opposed to dispassionate.

The final matter to consider is the cable company. For now we head back down to the real world, where in examining the day to day operations, we see where some of the problems exist, but also where the opportunities exist.

It is definitely true that many cable companies are convinced as to the need for community programming. Yes, it is a CRTC suggestion, but the companies are not doing it just for that. They see it as a way to sink roots deeper into the community; to legitimize themselves as participants in the neighbourhood process. They see programming as a means to attract new subscribers, by providing programming not available off air. It is true they are pluralists. They do seek a wide variety of programming content even at the neighbourhood level. And it is true that cable companies also use the concept of audience as one measure in defining the success or failure of a programme. This is not to say that they are playing the rating game, but some audience does count. And that means that cable programmers will (a) not just programme in one format and (b) will be interested in seeing just what neighbourhood response is elicited to each programming concept.

It is true that in the Toronto experience, at least, "access" programming, though it may be doing the most good, generally has the least audience. Now there are many reasons for this, but probably the most important is that it just isn't interesting enough. I think that will change, no doubt, as people get more familiar with the hardware.

When people want to get involved they approach the cable company and they have the option of doing a programme that is technically done in the studio by the company technicians, or it is done in the studio by their own technicians, or it is done partially or entirely in the streets on half-inch. In every instance it costs money and some way must be found to get more money into this process. No one is much interested in the "talking heads" format anymore – you must be mobile. Yet mobile also implies edits.

Our firm does a considerable amount of access. Perhaps 70% of our content is access, in one form or another. We are on the verge of announcing some very new corporate policies in this regard, that will see, I suspect, all access type programming to be produced on half-inch tape and, to ensure the ability of groups, who want to edit, to do so.

Production costs, particularly in a one inch studio are heavy indeed. Half-inch appears to us, and this is after several years of experience, to be the best method. Thus, where we already have half-inch machines available for loan to community groups, we will likely have more. Significantly, the Ontario government has established an operation called "a space" where this type of equipment is available to those who want to programme. It is our hope that governments will greatly expand these kinds of projects, so that more hardware is available, not just cameras but also editors. We see the day when cable companies will become merely the carriers for certain types of access programmes. As an aside, you might well wonder what is the role of educational institutions in the matter of neighbourhood community programming. With few exceptions, their record is dismal. But as well as hardware, still more sotfware is necessary. Software, as we discussed in our groups yesterday, is the ability to present information in an interesting fashion.

I have talked for the most part about some of the fundamentals of community produced programming. In most instances, I have made the assumption that the demand for and interest in community programming exists. Yet we have heard it said by quite experienced people that this is not true in all communities.

What, then, is first needed is recognition and awareness. The intermediate animators, mentioned earlier, are valuable in this. So too are the educational institutions, schools and libraries. But in their case, it would be only consistent to also encourage the use of their hardware. But the cable companies play a key role here. Turning people onto the opportunities of cable requires more than a form letter; it requires systematic and constant education. And this education must take the form of hands on training in either hardware or software, or both.

It's easy to be cynical and talk of programming

ego trips, sure there's some of that. And there's also the political trip – the ideologists who use the whole access fight as another way to flog cable companies and governments. But I believe that sincerity abounds in most people wanting to do programmes.

It is probably true to say that over the next two years, we will be reaching the moment of decision for neighbourhood programming. We are getting to know how to get and perhaps even keep the people producing, on a regular or one shot basis. We also know that the viewing people are not as involved and the solutions to this are either elusive or expensive or both. Audience is, after all, important to most programming groups because it makes their task seem more important to them.

So it is now up to us to work with added energy, to give community programming a chance to play a part in our lives.

Technical Aspects of Cable Broadcasting
Moderator: Mr. George S. Atkins

Ladies and Gentlemen, there are less than 28 years left in this century and the Rand Corporation has predicted that there will be cable systems with 400 channels in operation before the year 2000. During that time all those channels are not going to be only transmitting TV programs or relaying them as we have been hearing for the last day and a half now.

The topic assigned to this panel is "Technical Aspects of Cable Broadcasting" but we've taken the liberty of changing the word "Broadcasting" to "Communications" because while broadcasting has a one-way connotation, communications signifies a two-way exchange.

I think we might liken cable today to what electricity was 40 years ago in rural Canada. I'm thinking of the farm area because some of you who have always lived in the city have lived with electricity all your lives but 40 years ago it was just going to the farms. At that time the main use for electricity was to have a light bulb hanging somewhere so that we could see more easily. Cable can now be considered to be about that stage in its development today. Look at what has happened to electricity – people even brush their teeth with it now. Over the years, new uses have been found and they still are being found for it and of course there are plenty of uses for cable that have not yet been thought of.

In this context we're going to discuss the present uses of cable, employing present day hardware. We're going to talk about possibilities of expanding services with the hardware that we have; who uses cable and who the users could be on both ends; the use of cable in education, the exciting potential of two-way cable; and cable communications compared with other communications techniques, that is with radio. television, microwaves, satellites and other such things.

Of course Canada is the world's leading country in the use of cable. At this time, 1 in 4 homes in all of Canada are hooked to a cable system. Is there any reason why we shouldn't continue to be the leader? Surely we should maintain the leadership.

Our first speaker is well-equipped to discuss cable as it is now as well as its possibilities. He is a native of Calgary, a University of Alberta graduate in Physics. He was previously engaged in explora-

tion geophysics and he worked in the computer field. He is one of the pioneers in cable – for 18 years he has been in this field – in fact, he started the first cable system on the Prairies in 1955. At the present time he is the Vice President of Engineering at MacLean-Hunter and also the President of the Canadian Association of Broadcast Consultants. Mr. Israel Switzer.

Panel: Mr. I. Switzer

Thank you Mr. Atkins. Ladies and gentlemen. I'll talk a few minutes about some of the technical aspects of cable television broadcasting. I'm pleased to see the term 'broadcasting' used in the title for the seminar because in assessing the technical aspects, both present and future, of cable and public communications by cable,I think it is important to realize that cable television is a broadcast medium, not a closed circuit medium. There are some very important technical consequences to that. Over the air broadcasting is a method by which pictures or voice and music are communicated through the radiation of Hertzian waves to a large general population. Let's speak of television, of television sets. A broadcaster with cameras, with program origination equipment, broadcasts with a transmitter and a transmitting antenna and he radiates a signal, so to speak, to the world at large. In that population, there are television receivers which have been designed to receive these broadcasts. That system is controlled by a set of standards. As it happens the Canadian standards are almost identical to the U.S. standards but are substantially different from those used in many other parts of the world. What we use is called the NTSC system and the term is also used for the colour system that we use. NTSC you know stands for 'Never Twice The Same Colour'. When you get involved in colour origination, in colour transmission, both over the air and by cable, you'll come to realize how true that is. Some of the other systems in use in the world today are the SECAM system which was originated in France. SECAM stands for 'Something Essentially Contrary To The American Method'. The other system which is used in other parts of Western Europe and in Great Britain is called PAL. It was originated in Germany and stands for 'Peace At Last'. In any case, there is a basic set of standards which governs things like the number of scanning lines, synchronizing wave forms, some of the frequencies that are used. One of the things that it does not cover and I think that this is widely misunderstood among the potential users of cable broadcasting, is that there is no standard for picture quality as such, I mean technical picture quality. There are no standards that govern how sharp a picture has to be, how clean it has to be with respect to noise, with respect to dropout and actually, as far as the government is concerned, I don't believe there is any rigorous

standard with respect to a thing called timing stability which is an important thing when you come to deal with low cost, low budget video tape recorders. So let me impress on you then, that there are no standards for most of the things which are popularly associated with picture quality, either in colour or in black and white. Let me point out also that cable is not a closed circuit system – cable is just a modified form of broadcasting. One starts with cameras, one puts it through a small box called a modulator which is really just a miniature transmitter with an output of a fraction of a watt rather than the thousands and thousands of watts which the big over the air transmitters have and then, instead of being propagated through space to a general population of television receivers, it's conducted through coaxial cables to that same population of television receivers. The television receivers used by the subscribers, the people who are connected to a cable television system, are in no way different from the television receivers that are used to receive over the air broadcasts. So let me set forth for you then this general principle, that if a television picture is not good enough to be broadcast, then it is not good enough for use on a cable television system, because the receivers, which are the most critical part of the system, are exactly the same, on cable and for a broadcast transmitter. The converse is then true, that if a picture is good enough for distribution on cable, it is also, therefore, good enough for distribution by a broadcast transmitter.

Let's start to look then at some of the equipment that is used, both for over the air broadcast and broadcast by cable. First, cameras for broadcast use. Let's distinguish colour and monochrome. Professional television, that is, television that is broadcast over the air makes very little use today of black and white. For example, when a black and white film is broadcast over a colour chain, they just turn the colour burst off. The cost of cameras for that purpose, – a first line, first quality, network quality television camera for colour- costs about $80,000. A videotape machine for first line broadcast use starts at about $70,000. The newest models that are called cartridge machines and which have really the sole purpose of enabling a commercial broadcaster to stack ten second commercials back to back and bombard you with these things, the machine which does that so beautifully and elegantly costs about $150,000 to $175,000. Transmitters, for example, a major transmitting installation, a 1000 ft. tower and a big antenna capable of 100,000 or 300,000 watts power, costs several hundreds of thousands of dollars, running from $300,000 up to $1,000,000 dollars for a high-power broadcast transmitter installation. As we go from that down to the scale of equipment typically used in cablecasting, we find the cameras like Sony camera is probably of the order of $1,000. It uses a vidicon tube which costs anywhere from $100 to $200 to replace and it is, of course, black and white. The videotape machines that you see in this room, for example, are priced around $3,000 to $4,000 compared to the $70,000 for the two-inch VTR for broadcast television. Colour equipment is used relatively infrequently in cable broadcasting but a low cost colour camera is considered to run in the $9,000 to $10,000 order of magnitude. So when you see that kind of contrast, a contrast of about 10 to 1 typically in the prices of equipment, you may ask yourself then, why is the broadcaster using such equipment? Is he paying too much or is the cable broadcaster not getting enough in technical quality in his equipment, because, generally speaking, you get what you pay for.

I'll just deal briefly with my particular analysis of the reasons why equipment of this type is used. To the network broadcaster particularly, the cost of equipment is a relatively small part of the overall cost of production and distribution. When you have perhaps one hundred people assembled in a studio, doing a program which will be broadcast nationally or internationally, through some hundreds of television stations and over thousands of miles of microwave, then the cost of the cameras and the cost of the tape recorder is a very small proportion of the total cost of that television project. Consequently, they feel they can afford to spend the money required, particularly for reliability, because an equipment outage in a very high priced production is an extremely expensive thing. Additionally they want to get the last possible refinement of technical quality. In cable broadcasting, the equipment used is very low in cost because the cost of the hardware and the cost of the tapes is a very, very high proportion of the total cost of that project. Labour is mostly volunteer, the distribution facility is usually provided by the cable company at no cost, so the cost of the hardware looms particularly important.

Now, what are we getting for the money that is being spent on cablecast equipment? Well, I am actually disappointed in it because I think one of the major problems, I call it a misconception, in talking about the social uses of cable broadcasting, is that all you have to do to get your message across on television, is merely to *appear* on television. I suggest to you that that is not actually the truth. There has to be more to it than to just get on to television, either cable or broadcast. There has to be (1) a message to be told. There must also be, surely, some kind of minimum standard of technical quality because only dedicated people will watch a poor quality cablecast program. Of the equipment that we have, the videotape is critically important. Phil Lind for example, mentioned the potential use of half-inch and the very great impact portable equipment like the Sony Portopack and equivalent machines have made. These have made a great impact in the nature of the thing that you can put on the cable but the quality of these systems leaves much to be desired except for viewing by very dedicated people. You have, in Toronto, substantially a 12 channel situation, and people tune back and forth across that dial and on six or seven, or eight or nine of those positions you have the picture quality represented by millions and millions of dollars of investment in the highest possible quality of equipment and then you tune to Channel 10, the cablecast channel and you see a picture which is not clear, which is noisy, which has wavy, wiggley lines on it because of instability, which has rough crude cuts because of the lack of edit facilities on some equipment, and poor production values because of the lack of any kind of even semi-professional approach to the process of editing and process of production. As I say, you have to be a particularly dedicated person to stand for all this. What can be done then? I'm not too hopeful. Generally speaking, as I say, you get what you pay for and the picture quality that we are getting is because we are not able, I don't say not willing, to spend more.

I think that there could be an improvement if there was more stress on the production and the origination of cable programming and to things like the normal routine maintenance of equipment, things like the cleaning of heads and to the early replacement of vidicons before they get excessively noisy or get burns in them. I find that there is a great deal of stress in the educational process, in turning out people who know how to use a camera, who know how to point it, who know how to use a switcher. There are people who know how to operate equipment, but there is very little emphasis on training people to actually maintain and repair this equipment. I'm speaking now of electronic technicians, not visual program people. If we had more people available, not a great many more, but certainly a reasonable number of people, adequately trained in looking after the equipment, things would be better. I am shocked sometimes, as the chief engineering executive in our company, at some of the problems that we get just from absolute stupid abuse of equipment – zoom lenses being dropped, cameras being dropped, tape recorders being operated in very vile atmospheres. A videotape recorder is an immensely complex machine, very sensitive to things like cleanliness, proper handling and good quality tape going through it. In all of those things improvement can be made to get the most out of the equipment which we have and which we can afford. I am not hopeful that the cost of broadcast equipment will come down to a level that many community groups could afford. There are cases where there is very high quality equipment which could possibly be available for use by community groups. Some of the colleges, some of the high schools, have, for example, professional quality camera equipment – Hammarskjold High School, for example, in Thunder Bay. There are three notable high schools in the Province that have equipment and probably half a dozen community colleges that have first class equipment.. We have found, in practice, because of the complexity and high capital cost of this equipment, that they are very carefull about letting it be used by relatively unskilled personnel or allowing it off the premises.

We are seeing some improvements in videotape. I'll name hardware names without necessarily implying endorsements because it's easier to talk about them that way. We have found for example, that half-inch equipment stands up fairly well and that one gets a tolerable picture quality out of it, directly comparable to one inch equipment. We do find, though, that it is no better really, than one inch equipment and we're not really happy with the one inch equipment. Certainly there is an economy in using the half-inch but we don't think we're ahead quality-wise; I would use the term 'acceptable' for it. Our company has tried out – we now own two of the new Sony ¾ –

inch cassette machines and we find these machines particularly good. We have found these, so far, giving us probably the best quality we have seen from low cost videotape equipment. They have a problem – you can't edit with the machines and they're difficult to cue – and while we're getting fairly good picture quality out of them, we have trouble preparing material for them. We find that we have to prepare and edit on other equipment with its limitations and then dub to this ¾-inch cassette format for distribution. Surprisingly, we don't really know how they have done it at the price. That particular machine has an outstanding stability characteristic and gives quite good colour results.

I don't want to abuse my time privilege too greatly but let me try and sum up the problem this way – that really, we get what we pay for. What we are getting is not really high quality when judged by professional standards and that is maybe turning people off who are marginal viewers. The problem is money. If there were more money available for cablecasting and I presume that one way or another, money will be found, please consider diverting a significant or certainly, a sufficient portion of it into (1) upgrading the class of equipment which is being used and (2) providing adequate and proper maintenance for it.

Now the cable systems themselves. Canadian cable systems do not lack the technology or know-how to expand their channel capacity. The hold-back in doing it is strictly political. There are a number of Canadian cable systems that are ready to expand their capacity to 20 and 24 or 30 and 32 channels, just as soon as the relationship of cable to the broadcast industry can be straightened out. I think it hinges on that. I suspect that the CRTC, the Commission that regulates the industry, is not quite certain or perhaps distrustful of what cable systems would do with all that capacity. Until they are sure that that capacity will be used in a manner that the CRTC considers consistent with its objectives, as soon as they find the ways and means of doing that, the channel barrier will be overcome. There are some economic problems involved but I think those will straighten themselves out. When we talk, though, about order of magnitude increases in the number of channels available, I think there will be some problems. I think there is no doubt that the ultimate communication system, or television communication system, is one that allows a kind of random access. This is the same kind of ability that we have with the telephone system today. The ability to pick up an instrument, punch the buttons or turn the dial on it and automatically dial through to virtually anyone in the whole world. Just by dialling, we have instant voice random access virtually to anybody anywhere. If we look forward to a similar facility with video, the ability to communicate in a video sense, that is in a picture sense, with anybody, anyplace at any time or possibly just as important, the ability through some kind of video system to communicate with a source of information, a computer or a video library or something like that, also on a random basis, this is, no doubt, the ultimate television system. We are still some time away from that. Neither 20 nor 30 nor 300 channels will give us the capacity to do that. There are in Toronto today, some 250,000 households on cable. Imagine the total number of possible interconnections between 250,000 households, both for picture phoning, so to speak to each other and for video access to all the millions of potential video sources that are available, that a cable system whose capacity is measured only in hundreds or even in thousands of channels, can't approach that kind of capacity. I think we are looking, when we talk of 30 or even 300 channels on television, to a system that is basically still a broadcast system one that is intended for the communication of information from some central source, possibly a diversity of central sources, perhaps even 300 central sources, outward then to larger audiences. We may, with a 300 channel system, have 300 sources broadcasting to perhaps as few as 100 or 10 receivers each but still, basically in concept a broadcast system. There may be and likely will be some interaction in the reverse direction but still not on the scale which approaches the random access video system. We will, in time, and I'm speaking of probably 30 to 40 years from now, have that kind of video random access system but I rather doubt that it will be within our professional lifetimes.

Panel: Mr. J. D. Livingston

Because I'm going to have to take issue with some of what Mr. Switzer said, I had better identify my biases at the outset, so that you will be able to add the necessary pound or two of salt to my remarks.

My employer, RCA Corporation, manufactures quite a variety of electronic equipment, including equipment for what's called cable television — system equipment, and also TV receivers. In addition, we are a software house, in that we own an American television network, NBC, which generates a quite limited amount of television programming, and also Random House, a publishing complex not only in the traditional print medium but in various audio/visual media as well. Beyond that, RCA markets a variety of services in connection with this hardware and software. Thus our interests (and my biases) range through the entire spectrum of what's been discussed during this conference. cable TV hardware, software and services, all focusing on those consumer information services that have concerned us here.

At RCA we look at what's called cable television as a broadband communications system, a new kind of communications system that's just beginning to spread and interconnect. We describe it as a broadband system because the frequency spectrum carried on coaxial cable runs up to 300 million Hertz, as compared to the 3000-Hertz capacity of a telephone communications system — which means that cable has an enormously greater information-handling capacity than the telephone system's twisted pair of wires. Apart from capacity, there are other significant differences between the two types of systems. As Mr. Switzer pointed out, the telephone system is a point-to-point system — that is, you can call from your phone to virtually any other phone in the world. The enormous amount of switching equipment this capability entails is the principal expense of a telephone system, not in the distribution system as in the case of cable TV. Where we part company with Mr. Switzer is that we don't believe today's cable TV systems or tomorrow's broadband communications systems will be point-to-point systems. We don't think point-to-point capability is required to perform the types of communication function involved.

The second point I want to make is that what's loosely called cable is already a combination of cable and ground microwave. Tomorrow domestic satellites are going to be added, and the day after tomorrow it may go to wave guide or who knows what? The term "cable" focuses on today's hardware, you see; and that's unfortunate because it can tend to limit one's thinking about what this new communications system is and what its full potential may be.

When will it begin to achieve that potential? Mr. Switzer says maybe in thirty years. I say maybe in 15 years, depending on the regulatory climate of major geographic markets such as Canada and the USA; depending on the speed with which the requisite technology is developed; depending most fundamentally on what is the consumer demand for new kinds of information service — something nobody knows today; we can make some guesses, but it's important to keep in mind that they are only guesses at this stage.

At any rate, tomorrow this broadband communications system will be interconnected (a process that's already begun); it will be interconnected nationally and internationally on a real-time basis. And it will be interactive, two-way. That is to say, today's cable TV is a one-way system that delivers signals from the head-end of the local cable system to the individual subscriber's terminal. (Today that terminal is a standard TV receiver. It has advantages, it has limitations, it's going to have to change — and it is changing.) Tomorrow's system will have the output capability — today's one-way capability — plus an input capability, the ability to signal from your terminal, from the TV receiver in your home, to the head-end of the system, and through the head-end perhaps to remote sources of information.

In order to make this two-way system work, your terminal, your television set, is going to have to be individually addressable — which is no problem technically, it's a little chip built into each of millions of TV sets at a cost of a few dollars for a piece of hardware at the system head-end to identify the specific household from which an input comes — a request for special kind of information service, for example, or an expression of your opinion in an opinion survey.

The head-end hardware will be able to identify

the source of an input and if necessary record it for summing up, adding up votes on an issue – or for making an incremental charge to the subscriber for special service, just as the phone company automatically makes an incremental charge for the long-distance services you use.

At your terminal there will be in time a variety of input devices so that you can make a variety of inputs to the system head-end. These might be so simple as fire and intrusion sensors to protect the security of your home – or a little four-button (yes/no/maybe/go) signalling device such as an RCA subsidiary has recently installed in the Orlando, Florida, cable franchise for test purposes.

Later on we see some new kinds of output devices showing up in or at your television set. The only one I want to mention here is what the trade calls a "frame-freezer." As no doubt you know, the moving pictures your TV set shows are made up of 30 frames of video information per second – frames similar in function to the frames in a strip of motion picture film. The frame-freezer can seize a single one of these frames – for example one that's individually addressed to your TV set only, in response to a request you've made for information – and display that frame for as long as you want to look at it. These frame-freezers exist today, using a variety of technologies, most of them prohibitively expensive; but tomorrow, produced in large quantities, they're going to be extremely inexpensive.

Tomorrow's cable system is going to have the capability, as I mentioned, to charge you incrementally for whatever special information service you may request. The most obvious one and the first one that is becoming a reality is pay cablecasting, that is to say, the delivery to the TV receiver in your home of new, first-run feature films without commercial interruptions for a dollar, two dollars maybe. This is feasible today on a one-way system in a somewhat different sense. That is, on a one-way system you are going to have to pay for access to the special programming, whether you use that access or not. Tomorrow, when the capability exists at the head-end of a system to determine whether your television set is turned on or off, and whether if it's on it's turned to an extra-charge channel, say a channel on which a new feature film is running, and the capability then to record your incremental use of that programming and charge you accordingly for actual use. If you watch the film for half an hour and in come the neighbors and they've already seen it, you turn it off and you don't have to pay the full rate for the film; you only pay for the actual use you make of the communication system. Again, just like long-distance telephone service.

Another early application of two-way capability that we see developing is merchandizing. I won't go into that unless someone wants me to later on. Opinion surveys, I've already mentioned, security, environmental control is becoming quite a problem in a lot of communities in the States and therefore, people are willing to pay extra for a higher level of home security. Instruction, very obviously, and then further out such functions as highly individualized instruction are possible. Individual access to a broad range of reference materials, most of it probably stored well beyond the head-end of the system for economic reasons. Computation capability, if you want that to figure out your income tax, and transaction which might be a complete merchandizing experience. You buy the hat and you pay for the thing while you sit at your terminal, your television set; or it might be a municipal transaction, you vote on some municipal issue.

These are the major functional points I want to mention about tomorrow's kind of broadband communication system, because the functional parameters of such a system affect the format and the nature of the software that the system utilizes. "Software" includes entertainment programming, and also other kinds of information packages, like instruction or reference or whatever. This frame-freezer that I mentioned earlier we think is going to be an essential capability of the system, because it takes only a thirtieth of a second to fire you the frame of information that you have requested. It takes a six megahertz channel, a channel capable of carrying colour television video and audio to fire you that frame, but it requires only one thirtieth of a second of time on that channel for that purpose.

Now, we are accustomed on our television sets to see motion and in most mass-audience, audience-oriented entertainment programming, that's

necessary, but suppose you want to look at page 573 of the Encyclopedia Britannica – reformatted, of course, because of the limitations of your television set. You don't want any motion; the less motion the better. You don't even want audio in that case. What you want is a single frame, which will require only a thirtieth of a second to address and fire it to your television set. It's going to take you ten or fifteen or twenty seconds to absorb the information thereon, during which time the system is firing lots of other frames to lots of other people. Then you may request another frame of information. The system, because of its ability to arrange information packages hierarchically – that is to say, what is it you are likely to want first and what is it you are likely to want next – has probably already made a bet with itself that the next frame of information you are going to want, since you asked for that first frame, can be predicted; and it has put that frame in a standby buffer device. When you ask for it, here it comes, with considerably less delay time. You can see how that would work with regard to reference, now it could work in reference to computation and transaction.

How about entertainment? I see two major changes in entertainment programming as this kind of information system develops. One is the fundamentally important fact that entertainment can become not a passive experience as it is today – you go home and kick your shoes off and sit on the end of your spine and stare at that idiot eye and it talks to you and it shows you pictures and whether there is any information transfer or not is questionable. Well, maybe you don't feel the need of information transfer at that moment. I don't suggest that the kind of mass audience, one-way programming that exists today is ever going to disappear or even significantly diminish. I don't think it will. But I think it is going to be supplemented by new kinds of entertainment experiences, entertainment that is not audience-oriented.

Let me give you a silly example – it is silly because while we can see the capability, nobody really knows how to utilize this capability yet. Suppose you want to re-fight World War II, a major battle in World War II. You think you can do better than the generals did which is a fairly safe assumption perhaps. You want to play a war game.

Firstly you don't need continuous frame output from the system to play a war game. That could work on a single-frame basis very satisfactorily. You do need a couple of kinds of computer. One of them is simply a communications controller. Another, more complex computer has been programmed either to assist you in being General Patton or to assist, let's say General Rommel in coping with your attacks. Maybe that costs you twenty-five cents a half-hour or an hour to play that game. Nobody knows how the economics are going to work out; but maybe on a given evening 500,000 people across North America decide they want to play war games, say 50 cents times 500,000 is a quarter of a million dollars gross a night for a new kind of programming, a new kind of entertainment experience.

This is a very, very powerful new kind of communications technique, a delivery system capable of a tremendous variety of applications, susceptible to an increasing degree of individualization. You get what you want when you want it, not when it happens to be convenient for a network programming activity to shove a piece of programming on the air.

To come back to time, Mr. Switzer said 30 years. I say maybe if pay cablecasting provides the impetus for growth in the States, at any rate, that we anticipate it will, I think it could be cut in half because of the tremendous revenue-generating potential of pay cablecasting. You see, many of you in this room no longer go to theatres to watch films. The over-thirty-years-of-age audience has virtually disappeared from film theatres. There is an enormous pent-up market demand among people of this age group for first-run feature films delivered to the home via cable; and if it develops as I personally anticipate that it will, the amount of additional revenues that that new kind of consumer service will generate is going to pay for the rebuilding of one-way systems into two-way interactive systems – which can then, over a period of time, offer a variety of other new kinds of consumer information services. Fifteen years is just about as safe as thirty years, because I don't expect to be around fifteen years from now – and if I'm wrong about timing, you'll have to take your complaint to somebody else.

Panel: Mr. Ian Easterbrook

Ladies and gentlemen, these are a few hesitant and brief remarks addressed to the problems of the future and I suggest perhaps the alternative to the technology which the other gentlemen talked of, the possibility of a kind of people technology and I'll explain to you the kinds of things which I have in mind. It seems to me, generally speaking, what we are talking about is communications from one person to another or to others, and it seems to me that a prerequisite for efficient and effective communication is going to be improved *interpersonal communication*. I hope this won't sound too vague. It occurs to me that speech is a very inefficient medium. In fact this is something which the Bell Telephone Company has drawn upon in terms of sampling of a variety of telephone lines. They decide that they will, instead of devoting two wires to join you and yet another person entirely, they can split that pair of wires in such a manner that you perhaps share it with fifteen other people which suggests that the efficiency of verbal communication is rather low. Generally speaking, people's vocabulary is very low as communicators in terms of writing or speaking. We're very inefficient and if we are going to have the kind of technology in the future which we've heard about, we may have to do something about our own personal communications. This means surely, thinking clearly and concisely, removing from business communications and memos and so on, large amounts of unnecessary verbiage.

Also, another theme which I have about interpersonal communication is this, that in some ways we are less efficient than machines in this respect. Computers at least have a sort of anticipatory function, that is to say that they are able to anticipate that there may be errors and correct them. In other words, if you look at the bottom of a telegram or the address label on a magazine which is mailed to you, you may find that the computer has anticipated errors and repeats a number of digits or words so that if errors do occur, they can be corrected. Human nature is not as efficient in this way. You frequently say things and expect people to interpret them precisely the way you meant them to be interpreted. Again, human nature suggests to me that this seldom occurs and that if we are going to have an expanded technology then we must have an expanded control of our own communications. In many ways we must, it seems to me, gain touch with reality as the poet/composer Mason Williams suggested "when television gets off into life, it gets lost".

The other area that seems very important to me is emotional communication and this again seems to me in the twentieth century, a lost art. The kind of emotions which are communicated normally between people are very limited and particularly so on television, those that are frequently maudlin or shallow; anger and fear are now very private things, they are not things which we talk about with other people and it seems a great loss. If you watch a small child, he will smile simply from the pleasure of an experience and it occurs to me they feel this smile from pleasures which we observe on a television screen. Most young people, it seems to me, have only one approach to televison and that is as if it were self-parody. To a certain extent television has lost its credibility with the under thirties. So if, as someone has suggested, television and particularly CATV is to become a 4 or 5 billion dollar industry by 1980, and I assume that these leaders in U.S. technological market forecasts must be taken seriously if they're asking $225.00 for copies of their report, then a number of things are suggested to me. Firstly that we will probably look for more minority programming, particularly on cable television. The death of large generalist publications in the United States and the increase in specialist minority publishing suggests that cable TV, particularly in the future, is going to look to minority audiences, to large numbers of very specific audiences. I would also hope, looking to the future, that if we are going to have an excellence of technology, that we have an excellence of content, or an excellence of ideas, or an excellence of emotional communication and this will depend, to a large extent, on the willingness of people to make decisions of quality and of content, it will depend upon decisions of people who are dedicated to television as an art and as a craft and they may frequently have to make decisions, it seems to me, to do things well or to not do them at all.

Another thought for the future is that if we are to believe McLuhan, it's the artist of today, with a personal vision, who can see what tomorrow will be like, and so I would suggest that we must look at those people of our generation with a personal

vision for some information about life in the future. These then, are people who are poets or are visual artists, in one sense or another, who are sensitive to sounds and words, shapes and colours. Perhaps one of the things that attracted me about the community television service productions which were done through Guelph Cable TV, was that in many cases, they were personal visions. They were not programs meant to appeal to a large number of the Guelph population but they represented views of life of a number of young people. I think to a certain extent they should be respected for that reason alone. If you can share someone's personal visions then you may have a better idea of what the sub-cultures are about and what the life of tomorrow may be.

A last thought deals with the responsibilities which occurs to me that television should have, not only to find out how many people are watching but find out if viewers care, or laugh, or enjoy, or are addicted to programming. Finally, it seems to me that if bad money is not to drive out good, if chaos is not to triumph over order, can we afford not to seek at least some of these goals.

Federal-Provincial Issues In Cable Broadcasting in the Community
Speaker: Senator Keith Davey

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. I came here in spite of a number of inhibitions which I will confess almost immediately. One of the reasons however I did come was to tell the only story I know about the University of Guelph. I apologize to those who have heard this story before, I'm sure some have. Two people were talking in Toronto and the one said to the other "the University of Guelph" he said, "my God, all that ever came out of the University of Guelph were hockey players and ugly prostitutes." The second fellow said "just a minute, my wife is a graduate of the University of Guelph." The first fellow said "what position does she play?"

A story about Guelph makes it possible to tell a story about Vancouver. The story about Vancouver isn't very good, not very funny except it's true and it really happened to me. I was speaking at the Vancouver Institute and the guy who introduced me was extremely nervous. He was supposed to read from a prepared biography "his career in broadcasting was paralleled by an intense degree of activity in party politics." Only, as I say, this guy was nervous and what came out was "his career in broadcasting was paralysed." Well, that's not the story. The same speech, the same occasion — now the guy gets up to thank me, another guy, he's more nervous even than the fellow who introduced me and honestly, this really happened on the same occasion. He said "ladies and gentlemen, it is now my privilege to spank the speaker." So I shall attempt not to paralyse you in the expectation that you will not want to spank me. The inhibition I have, I confess, is having studied the agenda. I'm terribly impressed with the people who have been here. I'm terribly impressed with the matters with which you have been concerned. It really wasn't until I had looked at the program and considered my own position that I realized that the Chairman had possibly handed me the most difficult of all possible assignments, specifically drawing a map with a substantially uncharted territory.

I propose to begin with some reference to the Senate Committee on Mass Media. I was grateful to the Chairman for his flattering words about our

Committee. Indeed, I had intended to say precisely that -- that we did perform in about a tenth of the time and for about a tenth of the cost, I believe, of a Royal Commission covering comparable territory. Reception to the report varied greatly. Let me give you two examples. A few people were outraged. Here for example, is the Halifax Chronicle-Herald two days after our report was tabled. Now you would have thought in two days they might have regained their composure but not quite. Here's the front page of the Chronicle-Herald, three pictures side by side -- Martha Mitchell, Spiro Agnew and me. Others were considerably kinder. I would refer in particular to the Columbia Journalism Review who wrote in their tenth anniversary issue and I quote "the Report of the Special Senate Committee on Mass Media is a reminder, not only of close U.S. ties with Canadian media systems but of our poverty in lack of a comparable document. Nowhere do we have so in-depth, authoritative and comprehensive a statement of media problems or proposals for dealing with them." The Review commends the report to the widest possible audience and urges consideration of its proposals.

I should perhaps add Mr. Chairman, that two weeks ago it was my privilege to speak at the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism and to be confronted with about 250 students, most of whom had in fact read the report because it was on the course. It was a gratifying experience indeed. Well, as you know ladies and gentlemen, our study considered cable as an integral part of the Canadian mass media structure. For openers in our study, we were anxious to examine the dimensions of the media's creditibility gap. Now I suspect that most here will concede the existence of some credibility gap between the media and those the media owners purport to serve. The far more fundamental question of course is why does any such credibility gap exist at all? Here's the way we tried to answer that in our report -- we said that "if the media turned people off, it is because society at large turns them off. If newspapers are losing friends, it's part of the same process by which Parliament is losing friends, and the courts and the corporations and the schools and the churches." I'm going to set that quotation aside because very near the completion of my remarks, I would like to return to it momentarily and read you the next sentence after that particular quotation.

What I want to say initially and what I've said in many parts of Canada, is that I think it's manifestly unfair to attribute all of society's ills to the mass media; it's handy but it's hardly realistic. That said however, I think it's equally unrealistic for the people who own and control the mass media in Canada to minimize the role they do play when it comes to influencing the lives and shaping the views, the lifestyles, of their millions of viewers and readers and listeners. Of course, that was very much where the Senate Report entered the picture. I've spoken about the report so often and in every corner of Canada that I've learned to summarize, if not our message, then at least our posture in a very few words indeed. We had three concerns: 1) more media voices 2) better media voices 3) Canadian cultural survival.

This afternoon I propose initially to examine cable and its jurisdiction as each relates to each of these three concerns, that is, more voices, better voices, Canadian cultural survival. But first, I want to stress that the problems of broadcasting, perhaps I could say the *problem* of broadcasting, is one that concerns the whole country and not just the federal government. At the same time, ladies and gentlemen, I think the express intent of the Parliament of Canada which, after all, represents all of the people of Canada was very clear in the 1968 Broadcasting Act. Indeed, here I can speak with some knowledge because I was the Senator who piloted this legislation through the Upper House. The basis of a Canadian television policy was established by Parliament in the Broadcasting Act; it was not to be determined by the CRTC. The Act was clear that broadcasting undertakings were an integral part of a single Canadian broadcasting system. When the CRTC speaks of integration of cable television into the broadcasting system, it is pursuing implementation of this basic policy decision of the Parliament of Canada.

Let me turn to these three concerns our Committee had and let me talk about both cable and the jurisdiction of cable in the light of those three concerns. The concern, as many of you know, which prompted me to propose a Senate committee for mass media in the first place was, of course, the ongoing trend towards media concentration. I have with me a catalogue of statistics which I will not labour the meeting with; suffice to say the problem continues and is aggravated almost daily. Now I do not believe that

most owners and managers of mass media in Canada lack a sense or responsibility or lack tolerance for a diversity of views. I do not believe that there is a small group of men who meet for breakfast every morning and decide what it is they will make the Canadian people believe that day. Emotion I think often outruns the evidence of those who argue a conspiracy theory of propagandist manipulation of the masses. On the other hand, ladies and gentlemen, one reason evidence is so hard to come by is that the media tend to give less publicity to their own abuses than to say those of the medical profession. The media operate as a check on other institutional power centers in our country. There is however, no check upon the media. Just as it is a mistake to over-state the existence and potential for abuse, so, in my judgement, is it a mistake to ignore the evidence that does exist. In this area, most of our Committee's recommendations were print-oriented. That was simply because the CRTC has consistently appeared mindful of the virtue of the widest possible divergent, community ownership of mass media and indeed appears to have striven for same wherever possible when dealing with both conventional broadcasters as well as cable broadcasters. As will momentarily be apparent of course, I believe that more than any other single medium, cable offers a unique opportunity for the multiplication of media voices. Indeed, it is when we turn to discuss ways and means of developing better media voices in Canada, that it seems to me that cable really comes into its own. At this part of our study, of course, we were confronted with a very difficult and very tough subjective judgement, the kind of a difficult subjective judgement which perhaps you've made from time to time yourself – what on earth is a good newspaper? What is good cablecasting? How would you define a good radio station? Well, most of the media owners who appeared before our Committee, for example, told us it was enough to report accurately everything that has happened in the past twenty-four hours but surely, speaking of newspapers, at least, this is something that any newspaper worthy of its name must do as an absolute rock bottom minimal requirement. Surely such obvious rock bottom, minimal requirements are not those against which we should measure performance and quality. We thought there was something more, the standard we chose to employ was pretty straight forward and I quote "how successful is that newspaper or broadcasting station in preparing its audience for social change?" Now to insist that this is the media's main job it seems to me, is not to suggest any built-in bias for or against any notion of progress. Change need not be feared if it is understood but day after day we are assaulted with the news of violent events which we have not anticipated or whose causative factors have not been explained, then we can hardly expect to avoid the feeling that events chase each other across our lives without rhyme or reason and are so far beyond our ability to affect or control that we might just as well lapse into apathy or seek change of authority through violence. It is my opinion that we are fortunate to live at a moment unprecedented in history when change has become the central fact of life. Change is ubiquitous; the velocity of change smashes, it seems to me, quite literally against every person in this room on a daily basis. Yet it's also a matter of fact that most Canadians do not like change, they fear change, they distrust it, they resist it and yet at the same time, most of the Canadians I meet would be prepared to concede that at the present time in our society there really are some things that need to be changed, indeed, there really are some things which must be changed.

From time to time some of my friends rub their heads and say "yes, okay, so far, so good but why on earth must everything be changed at once?" Well, of course, I'm sure I don't have to remind this audience that young people have almost exactly the opposite concern. Kids who have known only relative affluence, who are better educated than any other comparable group before in history, who take the most staggering technological advances for granted, cannot for the life of them understand why social progress lags so far behind technological progress and I say "good for them". I find myself increasingly in agreement with Charles Reich in *The Greening of America* when he writes " there is a revolution coming. It will not be like revolutions of the past, it will originate with the individual and with the culture and it will change the political structure only as its final act. It will not require violence to succeed and it cannot be successfully resisted by violence. This is the revolution of the new generation." Paradoxically, Mr. Chairman, and I have statistics here to document this statement, I won't trouble you with them, is that while most young people have an overwhelming commitment to reform, it is equally true that the overwhelming majority of

young people at least for the time being, still want to work within the system. And of course, it is inaccurate to suggest that the only advocates of social change in society are young people. Lou Harris made that abundantly clear in a recent study which appeared in a number of American newspapers. Again the Canadian statistics are comparable — let me quote Harris — it was headed "Public Backs New Priorities" and he said "In the wake of America' eventual disengagement from the Vietnam war, the American people would like to see priorities in Federal spending changed so that less is spent on international and defence programs abroad and more is spent on domestic programs such as aid to education, aid to cities and pollution control." The times really are changing. More and more people are developing a new set of priorities and just as clearly, the trend is away from material wealth, toward social need. People's need to be identified as individuals distinct from mass, is growing and will continue to grow. Distinctiveness will ultimately gain more by what you do rather than by what you own. Curiously, Canada's new radicals and corporate elite have one thing in common — they tend to blame government for most of what is wrong in society. Not too surprising however, they approach their all too convenient target from different directions. I am grateful to Douglas Fisher in a recent column in the Toronto Sun when he capsulized the philosophy of Canada's new radicalism which really proposes and I quote "new arrangement with a heavy emphasis on people's groups with a local base, a community small enough for an individual to take part in and understand his life situation."

Mr. Chairman, I hardly qualify as a radical but then I don't think I have to qualify as a radical to realize the virtue of community access to the mass media, and of course, I hardly need to remind delegates to this particular convention that community access should be cable's greatest strength. Suddenly, hardware is available at the grass roots, suddenly it's possible for ordinary people, not academics, not politicians, not journalists, not even broadcasters, not just to communicate but to become involved in communicating and that, it seems to me, is at least as important. Now ideally, the quality of this community programming will escalate or will it? Or does it really matter if the quality of the programming escalates? The CRTC it seems to me, has consistently championed this point of view and would probably agree with my suggestion and no doubt a suggestion which has been expressed before at this particular conference, that every community college and university in the country should have a community media co-ordinator.

But surely the CRTC has served us best in that fragile, delicate area of Canadian cultural survival, the one area, it seems to me, where left unchecked, some cable entrepreneurs I'm afraid would have wired us all off to Washington. Now, let me make very clear that some of my best friends really are American. I watch Johnny Carson every night I'm in Toronto, we can't get him in Ottawa, I want Boston to win the Stanley Cup, I live and die all summer long with the New York Yankees and if there are any baseball fans they'll know it's been die now for a decade. I'm fascinated by the American political process which I read about endlessly. I subscribe to Atlantic, to Esquire, to Harpers, I read the Christian Science Monitor every day and like some of you, every Sunday afternoon I lug the New York Times home from the corner drugstore but damn it all, I'm a Canadian and I want to remain a Canadian! If, for example, it's parochial to worry about the ever-increasing Americanization of Canada's advertising industry, to use an example we referred to in our Report, then I guess I'm parochial. It was clear from our study that at the present rate, in just seven more years advertising too will be just another American industry. I must say one wonders about laws insisting upon Canadian ownership of mass media if the principal source of revenue of that self-same mass media is controlled from a foreign country, even if that foreign country is the United States.

Now Canadian cultural survival, and I'll be speaking about it tomorrow night in northern New York State and I'll be saying there as I say now, that Canadian cultural survival is uniquely a Canadian problem. It's our problem, it's not the Americans' problem. It results in part because only 20 million of us reside smack up against 200 million of them who collectively comprise the most powerful nation in the world. Perhaps if you would allow Mr. Chairman, I would like to read my favorite passage from our Report. It's a passage which more effectively than most, in my opinion, sets this Canadian-American relationship into perspective. I quote "geography, language and perhaps a failure of confidence and imagination, have made us into a cultural as well as economic

satellite of the United States and no where is this trend more pronounced than in the media – Marcus Childs on the editorial page, Little Orphan Annie back near the classified ads, Nixon and Tiny Tim, Jerry Reuben and Johnny Carson and Lawrence Welk and Timothy Leary on the tube, the Beach Boys and Blind Faith and Simon and Garfunkel on the radio, the latest V.C. body counts courtesy of AP and UPI, the self-image of an entire generation shaped by Peter Fonda riding a stars and stripes motorcycle. Need we continue. We are not suggesting that these influences are undesirable nor that they can or should be restricted. The United States happens to be the most important, the most interesting country on earth. The vigor and diversity of its popular culture which is close to becoming a world culture, obsesses, alarms and amuses, not just Canadians but half the people of the world. What we are suggesting is that the Canadian media, especially broadcasting, have an interest in and an obligation to promote our apartness from the American reality. For all our similarities, all our sharing, for all our friendships, we are somebody else. Our national purpose, as enunciated in the British North America Act, is peace, order and good government, becoming a modest ideal that is beginning to look more and more attractive. Their purpose is the pursuit of happiness, a psychic steeplechase which has been known to lead to insanity". That's the end of the quote and I may say that the CRTC's track record in this area speaks for itself.

Now you will recall Mr. Chairman, my earlier statement that broadcasting problems concern the whole country and not just the federal government. If I may quote Secretary of State Pelletier, he said "it must be recognized from the outset that broadcasting and telecommunications are very closely related to a number of fields of provincial responsibility; education, for example and that they also affect economic and cultural fields which are a prime concern of the provinces. It is also evident that some of the services provided by broadcasting or telecommunications are essential to certain provincial functions, not only in these sectors but also in many areas which are the proper concern of the provincial administrations." Going on with the quotation "Provincial authorities observe with understandable interest the manner in which federal institutions carry out their duties since the policies, decisions and actions of the federal government affect the quality and quantity of a number of services under federal jurisdiction in their areas." Ontario and Quebec, however, have made it abundantly clear that they are not prepared to submit to a meek acceptance of the dominant federal role in these matters. In Quebec, Bill 35 made it clear that Quebec wants full authority over communications including most especially and as a beginner, cable broadcasting. The Quebec argument, it seems to me, is based on a rather legalistic argument that presumes to separate cable from the overall Canadian mass media structure. The Bill has, as you probably know, received second reading and now reposes in committee where it has been for almost six months. Presumably the Quebec government is presently giving its priority concern and understandably to economic, rather than cultural concerns.

Here in Ontario, Premier Davis has spoken on several different occasions about Ontario's interest in cable jurisdiction. I felt that his original statement smacked of empire building for its own sake. He spoke in Hamilton and said this, "what we seek to do instead is to assess the real needs of the people of Ontario in the field, contrast those needs with the reality of telecommunications under the federal jurisdiction and express our opinions and take such actions as we deem appropriate in the interests of Ontario." Well as I said, I felt that smacked of empire building and I said as much in a speech to the Toronto Advertising and Sales Club when I suggested that that kind of comment sounded to me like Ontario separatism. In retrospect and in the light of subsequent statements by Premier Davis, I think my observation about Ontario separatism was probably quite unfair because here is Premier Davis on November 27th last, he said, and I quote, I'm quoting the Globe and Mail, (he was in the position of defusing some of the apparent anti-federal line in the earlier speech). This was the statement he made, "certain areas of interest were delineated and desired to discuss the situation further with the federal government, nothing more." I underline and repeat, *to discuss the situation further with the federal government, nothing more.* Indeed, as far as my friend, and I use the term advisedly, as far as my friend the Premier is concerned, I'm in an extremely charitable mood indeed. Indeed, I'm prepared today to even forgive the incredible statement he made before the Managing Editors' Institute in Kitchener and I'll quote this one from the Star. It said "Premier

Davis renewed his attack yesterday on federal communications policy and warned the CRTC it is denying," now get this, "denying newspapers the right to compete on an even basis with other media". He said "the policy deliberately or accidentally denied to the newspapers of this and every other province the access to the very technology which they need for future development". Well, God help us. However, in fairness to the Premier, let's remember he was speaking to a group of editors, he was speaking smack in the middle of an election campaign and heavens knows, the ploy worked extremely well.

Now, two observations seem to remain, broadcasting and that includes cable, according to the Act and again, this is very clear, must serve the interests of national unity. Therefore, it seems to me it must lie totally within the control of the federal authority. Strip away cable, deploy cable into provincial jurisdiction and the entire national broadcasting system begins to crumble. It's not that the provinces, even British Columbia, will conspire to destroy Canada. It is rather, if I may quote Secretary of State Pelletier again, that "this country could not exist without a strong and cohesive broadcasting system, a necessity moreover, that surely must be clear to all. I do not think that any modern state could survive without this indispensable link binding together its people and its territory. Canada has maintained such a link across her time zones despite the great distances and all other obstacles involved. Canada intends to continue to do so. Communication produces a feeling of community, balkinzation of communications poses a threat to our community. It is not possible to conceive of a country that is denied the image of itself. The intercourse between its various elements in a civilized dialogue that electronic means make possible to a greater degree, than ever before." Now recall Premier Davis, if you will, he said "a desire to discuss the situation further, nothing more" and then listen to Secretary of State Pelletier just one more time. He said "for that reason, I am pleased with the interest shown by some provincial authorities in these matters and I am most anxious that vigorous talks between the federal and provincial governments commence. Furthermore, I am sure that complete frankness on my part will be welcomed. There can be no genuine dialogue between the provinces and the federal government if we cannot state our convictions as clearly as do those with whom we speak". I think that such discussions have taken place, such discussions will no doubt continue to take place. It is encouraging, ladies and gentlement, to realize that set stage arguments about jurisdiction are never as fruitful as that form of dialogue which Lester Pearson christened "co-operative federalism". I would suggest to you that ETV is a case in point and so, I would argue, should be a great deal of community programming, much of which could easily be described as adult education. Hence, it is primarily of provincial concern but just as clearly, the ultimate jurisdiction, it seems to me, must remain federal. How fortunate we are and I say this most sincerely, to have men of such good faith as Secretary of State Pelletier and yes, Premiers Davis and Bourassa, Messrs. Cartin and Lalier, in such highly sensitive positions. These will be the future of the cable industry, and of course, the very same thing must be said for Pierre Juneau.

You know, I suppose my greatest failure in terms of the Senate Committee Report on Media has been my own failure to follow through on that excellent section of the Report which deals with broadcasting. There are several reasons why. I suppose one I must concede would be my own inertia. Perhaps another, the fact that there was, very clearly, far greater public interest in the Report's print recommendations. Presumably this was because this was the first time that newspaper people, magazine people, print people generally were brought before a government committee. For broadcasters, a trip before a parliamentary committee was, of course, old hat but chiefly the reason I felt content not to pursue our Committee's recommendations in the broadcast area, is because of my own profound belief that we in this country are all so extremely well served by the CRTC in general and its diligent chairman, Pierre Juneau in particular. Pierre Juneau understands, ladies and gentlemen, that he is serving the people of Canada, not the Canadian broadcasting industry and he does so in a manner which, in my opinion, is consistent with the three basic concerns of our Committee – more voices, better voices and Canadian cultural survival. Hopefully for example, the CRTC will persist in its requirement for increased Canadian content. The reality of Canadian private broadcast profits, the staggering influence of Canadian radio and television on the 5,000,000 people who will sit this evening anaesthetized in front of their set not really caring

much what comes on, the fact that so much of the American programming that does come in here, not all of it, but so much of it is junk, the fact that Canadians have proven they can produce attractive as well as popular programming, sometimes given the opportunity, sometimes given the prod, all of these things, it seems to me, reinforce the wisdom of the CRTC's posture on Canadian content. From time to time, it seems to me, that Mr. Juneau comes under staggering pressures but he always sticks to his guns and, in the process, always manages to incur the wrath of exactly the right critics, whether it's irate, would-be Mississauga cable entrepreneurs, whether it's Southam Press Limited who spanked Pierre Juneau soundly but not very sensibly in their recent annual report, whether the outriders for Western broadcasting or even the more bloody and incidentally publicity-minded of his parliamentary critics. Here indeed is a beautiful man with a commitment, not just to Canada, but with a commitment to Canadians. Yesterday, both Mr. Juneau and myself, spoke to the Association of Canadian Advertisers in Toronto. This was the advertising establishment, not just the advertising agencies but the national advertisers represented usually by their corporate presidents and here was Pierre Juneau appearing before this advertising establishment with a plea for more, perhaps even total Canadian production, of all advertising appearing on Canadian television. I think we really are getting somewhere. Perhaps it's also about time to consider regional Canadian content quotas.

Last year the Financial Post devoted much of a particular issue to a study of the advertising industry and the study was entitled "Advertising Under Pressure". The advertising industry is under pressure but take it from me, so are politicians, so is the church, the business community, young people, academics, all of us, every last person in the room is under some form of pressure but none, I would suggest, more so than is the mass media. Let me return to the quotation and complete the sentence. The sentence I read was "if the media turn people off, it is because society at large turns them off. If newspapers are losing friends, it is part of the same process by which Parliament is losing friends and the courts, and the corporations and the schools and the churches". Now here is the next sentence "we hesitate to wade too deeply into the swamps of sociology and McLuhanism but it does seem clear that all the conflict, the hassle, the demonstrations, the social anguish which currently surround us have at least one common characteristic – they're all concerned with people versus institutions". People versus institutions – everybody wants to be somebody but for millions, that's becoming tougher every day and I say it's really little wonder that so many of these incredible shrinking powerless people become alienated. That's why I hope there really is a whole new way of living coming our way, as Pepsi-Cola reminds us almost hourly; the advertising culture has joined the counter culture. I hope that the whole new way of living which is heading our way is something far more significant than just a new lifestyle, something far more significant than just coloured shirts and sideburns.

Well let me conclude. The world, ladies and gentlemen, is not about Soviet built MIG's and the European Common Market, the world is not about Dow-Jones indices and the FLQ, the world isn't even about drugs and pollution. The world is about people. Hopefully, and in increasing numbers, they want to be heard, they want to become involved, they want to participate in every sense of the word. You know, far more than the people in society, the people in this room are able to mount perhaps the single, most effective fight that I can imagine against what is assuredly public enemy number one. That, of course, is that soul destroying apathy which so predominates the sodden center of the political spectrum. In spite of undertainty, in spite of controversy, in spite of growing pains, I urge you to press on in full measure with the expansion of cable broadcasting into and from the community.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy once said it all, "the credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood. Who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions, who spends himself in a worthy cause. Who at the best knows in the end the triumph of high achievement and if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat." Thank you.

REGISTERED APPLICANTS

H. R. Anderson
c/o National Film Board
Room 512, 150 Main St. W.
Hamilton, Ont.

Michel Arpin
C.R.T.C.
Ottawa, Ont.

D. Bell
774 London Rd.
Sarnia, Ont.
Lambton Co. R.C.S.S.B.

David Bennett
Brock University
St. Catharines, Ont.

Bernard Benoist
13 Place d'Auteuil
Domaine des Hauts-Bois
Sainte-Julie-de-Vercheres, P. Q.
Office de radio-telediffusion du Que.

Lloyd J. Beverly
Government of Ontario
Toronto, Ont.

Norman Bradley
Box 338
Parry Sound, Ont.
Parry Sound Cable TV

Pascal J. Calarco
Program Consultant, Learning Materials
Ontario Ministry of Education
279 Weber St. N.
Waterloo, Ont.

James P. Catty
9 Castle Frank Dr.
Toronto, Ont.
Security Analysis Ltd.

A. Chagnon
521 Chemin de l'Anse
Vaudreuil, P. Q.
Videotron Ltee.

R. Cawley
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Man.

Brian Campbell
39 Kingswood Drive
Oakville, Ont.
Community Group

B. J. Culp
Co-ordinator A.V. Education
Peel Co. Board of Education
Resource Centre
Windy Oaks Drive
Mississauga, Ont.

Ray Cunnington
Box 202
Bloomfield, Ont.
Loyalist College
Box 4200, Belleville, Ont.

L. E. Curtis
23 Thorndale Crescent
Hamilton, Ont.
Halton Co. Bd. of Education
2050 Guelph Line
Burlington, Ont.

D. A. Dawson
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ont.

Marion Dempsey
Mowat Block
Bay & Wellesley
Toronto, Ont.

A. R. Devlin
Dean, Continuing Educ. Div.
Centennial College
651 Warden Ave.
Scarborough, Ont.

Pat Douey
126A Glen Road
Toronto 5, Ont.
Keeble Cable Television Limited
1216 Lawrence Ave. W.
Toronto 19, Ont.

G. Downie, Director, A-V Centre
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ont.

R. Dupre
Special Analyst, Office of the
Vice-President
CBC, P. O. Box 8478
Ottawa, Canada K1G 3J5

P. R. Dyke
Educational Media Adviser
Box 6000, Kingston, Ont.
St. Lawrence College of AAT

Murray D. Edwards
11 Dunbar Road
Toronto, Ont.
O.E.C.A., 2180 Yonge St.
Toronto 295, Ont.

Robert Elford
Dept. of Part-time Studies
Trent University
Peterborough, Ont.

F. G. Flynn
537 King
Peterborough, Ont.
Chairman, Office of Adult Educ.
Diocese of Peterborough

Marcel Farly
National Cablevision
Montreal, Que.

R. Faris
15 Bell St.
Regina, Sask.
Head, General Studies Program
Dept. of Extension
University of Saskatchewan
Regina Campus

C. R. Finley
46 Hill Drive
Aurora, Ont.
Ryerson Open College

Ted Footitt
286 Willa Rd.
Mississauga, Ont.
Kodak Canada Ltd.
3500 Eglinton Ave. W.
Toronto 15, Ont.

Gertrude Gagnon
1801 Riverside Drive
Ottawa, Canada
University of Ottawa

Thomas Godden
Lakehead District Catholic S.B.
Thunder Bay, Ont.

Kerry Gilmor
Richmond Hill Cable TV Limited
244 Newkirk Road
Richmond Hill, Ont.

Phyllis Goldman
51 Weatherstone Cr.
Willowdale, Ont.
North York Public Library

R. Gowing
O.D.A.F.
University of Guelph

Brian Hamill
Room 271
Parliament Bldgs., Queen's Park
Toronto, Ont.

Ruth Hammond
Publicity & Public Relations Ser.
83 Sherwood Ave.
Toronto 315, Ont.

M. E. Hay
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Man.

Goro P. Hirasawa
127 Decarie Circle
Islington 676, Ont.

Lowell Hicks
Manager Programming Studies
CBC, P. O. Box 8478
Ottawa, Canada K1G 3J5

Pamela Hodgson
126A Glen Road
Toronto 5, Ont.
O.E.C.A. Information Officer

W. E. Holroyd
Manager, Broadcast & Display Sys.
RCA, 21001 Trans Canada Highway
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.

F. W. Hyder
R. R. 2 W. Arthur St.
Thunder Bay "F", Ont.
Ontario Dept. of Education

Margaret A. Jeffery
77 Howard St., Apt. 511
Toronto, Ont.
Public Relations Officer
Royal Conservatory of Music

G. Jocius
O.D.A.F.
University of Guelph

Ross Johnson
Program Consultant
Ministry of Education
1082 Princess St.
Kingston, Ont.

Roger Keay
327 Batavia Place
Waterloo, Ont.
University of Waterloo

B. E. Kingsley
100 Maitland St.
Toronto, Ont.
Ryerson Open College

George Knight
R. R. 1
Demorestville, Ont.
Lennox & Addington Brd. of Educ.
Napanee, Ont.

Heather E. Knoepfli
9 Pinehurst Cres.
Islington, Ont.
O.E.C.A.

Marie Kurchak
75 Albert St.
Ottawa, Canada
Assoc. Director
Citizen Communications Study Group

Marilyn Lambert
60 Meadowbrook Drive
Kitchener, Ont.
Wired World, Inc.

Geoffrey H. Lane
1045 Michigan Ave.
Sarnia, Ont.
Lambton College

Mr. Larose
University of Ottawa
Ottawa, Canada

Beverley Lazier
239 Albert St.
Kingston, Ont.
Queen's University

Keith Lindberg
59 Village North
Niagara Falls, Ont.
Niagara College AAT
Welland, Ont.

Lynne McLauchlin
47 Duke St., Apt. 7
Hamilton, Ont.
Cdn. council for International
Co-operation

David D. Matheson
157 Willow St., Apt. 2
Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
Cambrian College AAT

F. J. McKenna
774 London Rd.
Sarnia, Ont.
Lambton Co. R.C.S.S.B.

Duncan McLelland
201 Cedar Cr.
Painswick, Ont.
Simcoe Co. Board of Education

Laura Murray
111 Crescent Rd.
Toronto, Ont.
A-V Services, Metropolitan
Toronto Library Board

Kevin O'Leary
Downtown Community TV
315 Dundas Street W.
Toronto, Ont.

Stephen Orgill
2301 Otami Trail
Mississauga, Ont.
Peel Community Services

Thomas B. Pace
Extension Division
Laurentian University
Sudbury, Ont.

James W. Pearce
267 The Donway West, Apt. 9
Don Mills, Ont.
Dept. of Transp. & Communications

John Pearson
Dept. of Treasury, Economics &
Inter-Governmental Affairs
Municipal Research
801 Bay St.
Toronto 5, Ont.

William A. Rathbun
12 Nightingale Place
Scarborough, Ont.
Director of Communications Branch
Ministry of Transp. & Communications
Downsview 464, Ont.

C. W. Rea
Hamilton Teachers' College
1400 Main St. W.
Hamilton, Ont.

Fred Riche
78 Radford St.
Hamilton 15, Ont.
National Film Board

Jean Paul Riopel
1147 Midland Ave.
Scarborough, Ont.
York Cablevision
16 Bimbrook Rd.
Scarborough, Ont.

D. P. Robertson
Director Academic Services
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ont.

Don B. Rogers
14 Draper St.
Toronto 2B, Ont.
National Film Board of Canada
1 Lombard St.
Toronto 210, Ont.

C. Edward Root
2033 Kingsley Rd.
Ottawa, Canada K2C 2X6
Information Division
Canada Dept. of Agriculture

Simon Reilly
111 Sparks St.
Ottawa, Canada

Wm. H. Smuck
258 Quickfall Drive
Waterloo, Ont.
College Biblio Centre
20 Railside Rd.
Don Mills, Ont.

Barbara Whalen Smith
493 Davenport Rd.
Toronto 7, Ont.
President, Words Unlimited

Michael Smith
Managing Editor
Municipal World

Peter Somerville
836 Commissioners Rd. W.
London 62, Ont.
Co-ordinator Instructional Media Centre
University of Western Ontario

Fred Soughton
Box 398
Thunder Bay "F", Ont.
Chairman, Northwestern Ontario
Regional Council, O.E.C.A.

Wendy Spears
164 Cumberland St., Apt. 3
Toronto 5, Ont.
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

William Spenceley
161 Sherbrooke St.
Peterborough, Ont.
Peterborough Cable TV Limited

Frank Spiller
Chief of Cable
CRTC, Ottawa, Canada

P. Stone
7 Cartwheel Millway
Willowdale, Ont.
Humber College AAT

Sister Bede Sullivan
74 Wellesley St. W.
Toronto, Ont.
Seneca College

Rudolf V. Svoboda
147 Fairway Rd., #27
Kitchener, Ont.
Conestoga College AAT

Larry Taylor
697 Vine St.
St. Catharines, Ont.

Daniel Terry
39 Kingswood Rd.
Oakville, Ont.
Community Development Task Force

L. D. Todgham
Director, Instructional Media Centre
University of Toronto
123 St. George St.
Toronto 181, Ont.

Milford Waller
208 Bridge St.
Belleville, Ont.
Hastings Co. Board of Education

L. S. Walters
96 Glen Rd.
Toronto 5, Ont.
Scarborough Cable TV

Tony Williamson
Room 202, 75 Albert St.
Ottawa, Canada
Director, Citizens Communication Study Group

Don Wilson
Asst. to Director
Division of Continuing Education
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby 2, B.C.

Geoffrey Grenville-Wood
75 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Canada K1P 5A5
Cdn. Council for International Co-operation

Robert J. Wylie
208 Bridge Street
Belleville, Ont.
Hastings Co. Board of Education

James A. Yardy
376 Oak Street
Newmarket, Ont.
Jarmain Cable TV Limited

Merle Zoerb
Terracomm Cable TV Ltd.
Park Royal Plaza
Mississauga, Ont.