Community Television in Peterborough

Community Television in Peterborough

By: David Wells

Keywords: Cogeco, Television, cable, Peterborough, relationship, community, case
study, accessible, effective

Abstract:

This report was designed as a project for the community television programming
department of COGECO Peterborough, in conjunction with Trent University. The heart
of the study is an examination of the relationship between Peterborough and its
community television channel. The goal of this report was to use Peterborough as a case
study to discuss how to make community programming more accessible and more
effective.

Community Television in Peterborough

Introduction
This report was designed as a project for the community television programming department of COGECO Peterborough, in conjunction with Trent University's community based education program. The heart of the study is an examination of the relationship between Peterborough and its community television channel. The goal of this report was to use Peterborough as a case study to discuss how to make community programming more accessible and more effective.

The information in this report comes from a variety of sources: Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) reports and policy statements, the files of Maclean Hunter, Rogers and COGECO in Peterborough, from Peterborough's current community programming department, as well as various other sources discussing community programming and broadcasting in Canada. The purpose of this report was not just to describe the development of community programming, but to also use this information to make recommendations on how to deliver the best community programming possible.

Local programming takes two basic forms. One form is the community programming on cable community channels that exists because of regulation by the CRTC. The other type is locally originated programming on cable and broadcast stations. Unlike community programming, local origination programming does not arise as a result of a community initiative and does not involve community participants in the planning and decision making processes. This report focuses on the community channel, but programming that is locally originated and directed towards the community will be discussed because the forms of local programming that exists free of regulation should be noted.

Executive Summary
If a Canadian owns a television and subscribes to cable, they have access to viewing community programming. Television ownership and cable penetration have achieved levels today that give almost three-quarters of Canadians the ability to receive community programming. For a variety of reasons cable television remains the best, although not necessarily a perfect, way to deliver community programming. Cable systems work well for community programming because they are generally organized around a specific geographic community. Cable systems can set aside a channel exclusively for the use of community programming. Broadcasters with a single station cannot do this. Commercial broadcasters seem unwilling to offer any local programming other than local news shows. This is true in the case of Peterborough's CHEX-TV, which used to offer locally originated programming of relevance to the community, but now the only local programming is found in its news shows, notably *Newswatch 5:30*, its extra news program before the main 6:00 news. A national broadcasting system of community stations would involve the same type of infrastructure that is necessary for the CBC. The

cost of building new production and broadcasting facilities is sufficiently high as to make this option unrealistic. Direct-to-Home (DTH) satellite providers do not serve a specific geographic community. The reasons why cable is the best choice for community programming have not changed since the 1970s.

Community programming is regulated into existence by the CRTC because it is and has been a policy goal of Canadian governments to create a way for citizens to gain access to television in order to express themselves. The very first community programming policy in 1975 dictated that cable companies must assist groups in producing television programming by providing training for members of the community as well as production facilities and staff. This remains the core of the community programming policy today. The original policy also encouraged programming that would cover community events, public meetings and amateur sports as well as local information programming. These types of shows remain the staples of community programming schedules.

Currently community programming regulation does not require large cable operators to continue to help communities produce local expression programming. In 1997 the CRTC created an option that allows cable companies to contribute to a production fund for Canadian television programming. The change came about because of Direct-to-Home satellite providers, who do not operate in a specific community, but none the less had to contribute financially to the goal of furthering Canadian expression on television. Evidence suggests that cable companies are maintaining their community channels. This makes sense considering the long tradition of community programming in Canada and the marketing advantage that it provides cable companies.

The COGECO community programming philosophy is a direct extension of the CRTC's policies, as it must be. COGECO provides access to members of the community wishing to participate in television programming. COGECO has established volunteer programs and encourages the maximum amount of community involvement. Good production facilities, training programs, as well as developed, skilled and professional staff are provided. COGECO tries to make the programming viewed on the community channel of the highest quality and insists that it be relevant to the community in which it is produced. COGECO also strives to provide Peterborough with a fair and balanced source of community information.

In theory, all citizens have access to the production end of community programming. But would-be programmers have to be able to come up with an idea for a program that is deemed to be of relevance to the community by the local community programming department. The program must be able to be realistically produced based on equipment, staff and volunteer availability. The group must also be willing to put the effort forth needed to see the program through to completion. One result of this is that a lot community programming tends to originate from groups that have strong volunteer bases already, like charitable organizations or service organizations. These types of programming are no doubt worthy, but when coupled with the constraints that community programming departments are forced to work under, program proposals that can offer volunteer support are easier to produce. It is important that all programming is considered for production, not just what is easiest to produce.

The CRTC mandate that community channels operate under addresses this concern. The community channel is to exercise discretion in selecting from among programming requests in order to promote balanced programming, as well as being able to fulfill regulatory and legal requirements. In Peterborough the programming department takes a number of steps to ensure that programming is balanced and fair. Program proposals are reviewed at weekly community programming department meetings. Although written documentation is required for a program proposal, the department accepts letters that contain all of the necessary information, not just the official program proposal form. By living in Peterborough, the community programming department remains in touch with the needs and wants of the community. When the community programming department goes out into the community as representatives of COGECO it also helps them to understand what kind of programming is relevant to the community. The programming department also has policies that work to ensure the programming is locally relevant. Community producers must be residents, work in Peterborough, be enrolled in educational classes in the city or hold active membership in a community organization. As well as the producers, the studio and location crews must be members of the community. Always working to ensure balance in programming, and relevance to the community is a key way that community programming can remain vibrant and interesting.

Recommendations
CRTC
1. The CRTC needs to remain vigilant in protecting the right of Canadians to have access to our public airwaves. Canadians want to see more of our lives on television, and we think that it is important to be able to tell our own stories. In a wealthy democracy such as Canada, citizen access to and participation in broadcasting remain important goals. Commercial attrition has worn away some of the strength of early community programming policies. The CRTC should be working to promote these goals, while at the same time promoting Canadian content on television. To achieve this the CRTC should strengthen community programming regulation, ensuring that this special institution survives as long as broadcasting does.

2. The internet offers a perfect place for Canadians to tell their own stories. The CRTC must act to make community programming a part of the internet. The best way to achieve this right now would be to set up a club or community type service free to Canadians, similar to the service that is offered by American commercial internet companies for free to their customers.

Cable Companies
1. Community programming provides a way for cable companies to differentiate themselves from their newest competitor, Direct-to-Home satellite providers as well as their oldest – the free-air broadcaster. The cable industry must remember that it was superior services that made it so successful, whether it was better reception, more channels, Pay-TV or the community channel. The long standing tradition of

community programming should always remain a part of cable television because it is such a great way to offer a unique service to cable customers.

2. Staff and equipment availability determines programming on the community channel. A perfect world would see cable companies increase their commitment to the community channel with more facilities, more equipment and more staff. The very least that cable companies should do is maintain the community channel as it is today. If the community channel is scaled back, subscribers will notice. The difference between DTH and cable services then becomes smaller and customers will switch.

3. Cable companies are becoming popular internet companies because of the excellent quality of their cable internet connections, their existing cable networks and their record of customer service. Success on the internet comes from providing the most and the best services to the customer. This is why Yahoo, Excite and the Microsoft Network keep expanding their services, from search engines, to free e-mail, to clubs and communities. As television and internet technologies converge, community programming on the internet will be a great way for cable companies to market their product, whether it be a club / community type initiative or web-casting the community channel.

4. COGECO should be working with its community stations to provide a programming schedule on its corporate community programming web-site.

COGECO Peterborough Community Programming Department
The community programming department in Peterborough faces the same challenges that other community channels do. The department is aware of these challenges because they are the same ones that re-occur in community programming reports and in departmental meetings over the years. The fact that these challenges come up again and again does not reflect negatively on the community programming department. These are problems that the channel always faces because of limited resources, be it staff, time, money, equipment or volunteers. The mark of a good community programming staff is that they are aware of the areas that need constant diligence and are working to do make improvements in order to deliver the best possible programming.

1. Strengthening the volunteer base. Volunteers always need to be recruited and trained. Just as high school media classes have provided a new corps of volunteers consisting of students that are looking for hands-on experience to help them get into post-secondary education. Peterborough's post-secondary institutions, Sir Sandford Fleming College and Trent University could provide even more volunteers.

2. Improving the look of the channel and increasing production values. Production values on the community channel always seem like they need to be improved when compared to commercial television. Volunteers can play a large role here, helping to design and build better sets, as well as having more training and gaining more experience at things like lighting and camera-work.

3. Marketing the community channel. This can take a variety of forms. The excellent relationship that the programming department has with the community helps to market the channel. Newspaper ads listing programming, both regular shows and specials, always helps to promote the channel. This has to be coupled with ensuring the reliability of the schedule. A local web-site that promotes the Peterborough channel specifically including, among other information, the schedule would help. This could be achieved through a volunteer initiative. The programming department must also work to ensure that members of the community are promoting their programming as well.

4. Increasing contra and sponsorship. Contra and sponsorship help to cut down on the costs of producing programming, allowing more programming of higher quality. Reaching out to sponsors is part of marketing the channel.

5. Sharing of programming. The sharing of community programming between cable systems was initially thought by some to be a weakening of the focus on original local programming. However, cable systems can now share programs. If the price is right, and the program would be of interest to the Peterborough community sharing among cable systems is a great way of augmenting the existing programming schedule. COGECO Peterborough should continue the sharing of signals among local broadcasters, for example when Trent Radio carries the audio of the Council meeting. This is a great way to increase the reach of community programming.

6. It is important for community programming departments to ensure that archetypal community programs do not freeze out other types of programming. Due to the nature of the production process it takes a combination of a great program concept and a highly motivated group or individual to make a program like this happen. Community programming departments in Peterborough have shown a willingness to take on new and exciting programming. Continuing to work towards ensuring balance in programming, and relevance to the community is an important way for community programming to remain exciting and engaging.

Television in Peterborough
Cable Television
In 1956 Henry Young opened the doors of Peterborough Cable TV at 215 Charlotte Street. Three employees worked alongside Henry, stringing the lines, installing and maintaining the cable equipment, selling the service and negotiating with subscribers.[1] A programming department was initiated following the move to larger facilities on Sherbrooke Street, in 1971. One staff member, Bill Spencley, updated weather information and public service announcements on a turning wheel of cards set up in front of a black and white camera.[2] In August 1974 a second move to 685 The Queensway took place. The were further improvements to the programming department a character generator with computerized weather information and 16 pages for public service announcements was added as well as two black and white cameras, two VTRs and other equipment needed to produce a television show.[3] During the summer of 1977, Maclean Hunter Limited purchased Peterborough Cable TV and operated Maclean Hunter Cable TV in Peterborough until the merger between Maclean Hunter and Rogers Communications Inc, which was approved by the CRTC on December 19, 1994. A third move took place soon afterwards in January 1995 to 1111 Goodfellow Road. In 1997 Cogeco Cablesystems purchased a number of Rogers cable systems across Ontario, including Peterborough. Currently Peterborough Cogeco Cable Solutions serves over 28 000 subscribers and employs 25 people.[4]

CHEX-Television
CHEX Television began broadcasting on March 26, 1955, as an affiliate of the CBC Network. The first program broadcast was NHL Hockey. The station was owned by Roy Thomson (49%) and the Davies family (51%) owners of the Peterborough *Examiner* and the CHEX-AM radio station. The Davies family also owned the newspaper the Kingston *Whig-Standard*. Also owned by the group were CKWS-TV and CKWS-AM in Kingston.[5] The station, studios and transmitter were located on Television Hill, just outside of the city of Peterborough. In 1976, the Thomson and Davies families decided to sell to Claude Pratte and Paul Desmarais, who later sold to Power.

Defining Local Programming
There are two types of local programming that are discussed in this report. Community programming, which stresses local content and production. It has been described as being television for the community by the community[6]. This is the type of programming found on the COGECO community channel, and to some degree on CHEX. Local programming is programming that is produced by broadcast or cable stations in the community, and then broadcast on local stations. This type of programming differs from the programming on the community channel because it does not arise as a result of a community initiative and does not involve community participants in the planning and decision making processes[7]. CHEX used to produce and broadcast many local origination programs, like 'Romper Room' and 'Campus Quiz'. In 1976 the Bureau of Broadcast Measurement (BBM) Fall Survey found that commercial broadcasters CTV and the French TVA were broadcasting more local programming than the CBC and Radio-Canada networks. This local programming consisted of local news programs,

local information programs and some locally produced entertainment programs[8]. For the purposes of this report, community programming will refer specifically to the local programming on the cable community channel and local origination programming will refer to other types of local television programming. The community programming that appears on the cable community channel is the focus of this report, however it is important to note the other types of locally originated programming that exist within communities.

Community Programming

Television is an incredibly powerful medium for the exchange of information, especially its delivery. Television is also a significant presence in the life of most Canadians. In 1997, 98.7 percent of Canadians owned colour television sets[9]. Also in 1997 Canadians were watching on average 22.7 hours of televisions per week[10]. When one considers that 72.2 % of Canadian homes are cable subscribers it becomes apparent that community programming on cable has the potential to reach almost all Canadians[11]. Community programming is unique within the Canadian broadcasting system because it provides individuals and groups the opportunity to express their views and interests through the medium of television.[12]

The Origins of Community Programming on Cable

Community television programming in Canada draws on a long tradition of groups seeking to tell their stories. These groups can be from remote areas that are under-served or large urban areas, as well as everywhere else in between.[13] The CRTC found that in 1969 the Canadian broadcasting system was not satisfying the demands of freedom of expression on either the public or private level.[14] However it was decided that it was not the mandate of other public broadcasting entities, like the CBC and TVO to provide community programming. The Broadcasting Act (1968) stated that cable television, as part of the Canadian broadcasting system, "...should be effectively owned and controlled by Canadians so as to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada."[15] The CRTC saw that, "...as an instrument of a democratic government that it had the duty of finding means of safeguarding public rights in the use of electronic media."[16] Early on the CRTC was very careful to point out that local programming should complement, rather than compete with the programming available on commercial television.[17] This was perhaps to placate broadcasters who feared that cable companies were gaining an unfair marketing advantage. At this time the CRTC was only encouraging the cable television industry to assist in the development of community programming, it was not yet policy. In 1974 Statistics Canada found that some cable operators were spending less than 3 % of their gross revenues on local expression or community programming, while others were spending more than 10 %.[18] The CRTC's 1975 Policies Respecting Broadcasting Receiving Undertakings (Cable Television) required cable companies with over 6000 subscribers to reserve a channel for residents of the community.[19] Also at this time in 1976 the CRTC allowed cable companies to move into the lucrative pay-TV and specialty channel markets. In exchange for this the CRTC insisted on more local programming like the coverage of community events, council/school board meetings and amateur sports as well as assisting community groups in producing their own shows by providing facilities and training.[20]

Pierre Juneau, president of the CRTC described the situation, "We have said in effect to cable operators, you make a good profit importing signals free off the air and re-selling them; now return...to the public...some dividends.[21]" The CRTC was able to achieve this by threatening a ten per cent surtax on all cable revenues for the purpose of supporting community channels.[22] The readiness of cable companies to comply was an indication of the profits that were being made. But also it indicates that there was a market for community programming. Community programming also became a way for cable companies to differentiate themselves from broadcasters, by offering more services to the customer. The cable industry has always been about service to the customer, whether it has been more channels, better reception, Pay-TV or the community channel.

Canadians and Television

Introduced as a public service, the role of the community channel is to facilitate self-expression by members of the community[23]. In Canada, part of the reason that community programming on cable works well is because cable reaches almost 90 % of Canadian homes[*]. This was not always the case. In 1970 only 27.5 % of Canada's urban homes were linked to cable television systems.[24] Commercial broadcast television has proven to be undesirable for the distribution of community programming. There were other reasons why cable television was chosen for community programming. In the 1960s broadcast television's high barriers to entry made it not a good choice for building new stations to offer local programming.[25] A cable system can set aside one or more channels for community programming without affecting its other programming. This allows it to 'narrow-cast' to specific audiences, interested in specific events or issues, while at the same time offering popular commercial channels[26]. Commercial broadcasters cannot do this, their single channel does not allow the serving of both the minority and the majority at once.[27] Also, cable licenses have generally served smaller areas and one community and are thus ready-made for serving a specific geographical community.[28] Today cable remains the best way of delivering community programming.

Altruistically, the drafters of the *Broadcast Acting* (1968) also thought that using cable television to promote Canadian, specifically local, expression was a good way of balancing the increasing flow of American broadcasting signals that were being brought into Canada by early cable television systems, then called Community Antenna Television systems.[29] In 1972 Statistics Canada reported that Canadians without cable spent 12 % of their viewing time watching American program, but those with cable spent 36 % of their television watching time viewing programming form the United States.[30]

Today broadcasters, despite traditions of locally originated programming, seem unwilling to air programming that is not popular. The most popular programs in Peterborough during the BBM Peterborough Fall 1998 and Spring 1999 TV Sweeps were almost invariably popular American network programs like 'Wheel of Fortune', 'Friends', the Grammy Awards and 'ER'. The only Canadian programming that appeared were sporting events like the National Hockey League playoffs, World Figure Skating

---

[*] In 1999 89.6 percent of Canadian homes were passed by cable. 72.2 percent of all Canadians subscribed to cable, and 80.1 percent of homes passed by cable choose to subscribe. (http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/useoftv.htm)

Championships, the Grey Cup, news programming by Global, CTV and *Newswatch*, CHEX-TV's news program.[31] Global and CTV's news programs originated from Toronto, so can hardly be considered local programming in Peterborough. This is not new in Canadian broadcasting history. In the early 1970s television broadcasters were found by the CRTC to program large amounts of shows from national networks (much of it non-Canadian) and syndicated programs that did not reflect any specific community.[32] Profit-driven television (primarily from the United States) has helped to redefine television in Canada as primarily for entertainment purposes. Its fast-paced formats do not demand the full engagement of the viewer, their mind and emotions, only asking that the eyeballs be present for advertising.[33] But this type of programming does not represent everything that Canadians want to see on television. The public has said that with networks like NBC, CBS and CBC one does not know what is going on in the community.[34]. Canadians also told the CRTC that we would be 'very interested' (30%) or 'somewhat interested' (38%) in having access to a greater number of programs featuring Canadian stories.[35] This does not necessarily mean community programming, but community programming would provide part of the solution. Despite wanting more Canadian programming, 79% of English Canadians responded to a CRTC survey that their favourite program was American.[36] This is the duality of Canadian television watching. We want to see more of ourselves, but at the same time we love the slick American programming.

Current Cable Community Programming Regulation
The *Broadcasting Act* requires that all broadcasters contribute to Canadian programming in order to promote Canadian culture. In 1997 the CRTC decided that all distributors (both satellite and terrestrial) wold be required to contribute at least 5 % of their gross annual broadcasting revenues to assist Canadian programming. Satellite distributors contribute directly to a fund, administered independently of the CRTC, the Canada Television and Cable Production Fund. Cable companies that serve larger communities have the option of contributing the entire 5 % to the Production Fund or devoting 2 % of their gross annual broadcasting revenues to fund local expression. Smaller cable systems can devote the entire 5 % of the funding to local programming.[37] Large cable systems now can abandon their community channels. This signaled a policy shift on the part of the CRTC. Protecting community programming is no longer as important to the CRTC as promoting Canadian programming. In 1991 the CRTC *Community Channel Policy* dictated that cable companies must use 5 % of their basic revenues to support community programming.[38] It is hard to argue against increasing Canadian programming. It is something that Canadians want to see on television. The CRTC found that more than two thirds of Canadians want to see more Canadian programming[39]. But, an increase in Canadian programming should not have come at the expense of community programming. More than 80 % of Canadians feel that it is important for people to have the opportunity to make their own programs and to tell their own stories or share their own interests on television[40]. The CRTC should be working to serve both these needs, not sacrificing one for the other.

Without the CRTC, the community channel would not have developed into its present form. Without the continued involvement of the CRTC a strong possibility exists that

cable companies may eventually shut down their community channels or at least leave them to operate on their own. This would open the door for advertising. Local advertisers do want access to the community channel.[41] However advertising would take away from the autonomy that community channels enjoy. Community Programming Producer David Feeley described it well, "Could this raise enough funds to operate and even improve the programming on the channel, maybe, but would our perspective towards programming change more to mimic that of the broadcaster? Yes."[42] A strong regulatory presence is needed to maintain the original spirit of the community channel.

The COGECO Community Programming Philosophy
The COGECO Cable Solutions community television philosophy is to provide free and easy access to those wishing to participate in community programming. COGECO has established volunteer programs and encourages the maximum amount of community involvement. Good production facilities, training programs, as well as developed, skilled and professional staff are provided. COGECO tries to make the programming viewed on the community channel of the highest quality and insists that it be relevant to the community in which it is produced[43]. The objectives of the COGECO philosophy are to assist local citizens with the production of community programming that is of the highest technical and aesthetic quality. COGECO also strives to provide communities with a fair and balanced source of community information. Another goal is to foster community awareness and pride. The community channel also tries to recognize and encourage any individual, group or business organization which aids in this process.[44] This philosophy is an example of the recommendations and guidelines set forth by the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission.[45]

The CRTC mandates that the community channel is to exercise discretion in selecting from among programming requests in order to promote balanced programming, as well as being able to fulfill regulatory and legal requirements. In Peterborough the programming department takes a number of steps to ensure that programming is balanced and fair. Program proposals are reviewed at weekly community programming department meetings. Although written documentation is required for a program proposal, the department accepts letters that contain all of the necessary information, not just the official program proposal form. By living in Peterborough, the community programming department remains in touch with the needs and wants of the community. When community programming department goes out into the community as representatives of COGECO it also helps them to understand what kind of programming is relevant to the community. The programming department also has policies that work to ensure the programming is locally relevant. Community producers must be residents, work in Peterborough, be enrolled in educational classes in the city or hold active membership in a community organization. As well as the producers, studio and location crews must be members of the community. Working to ensure balance in programming, and relevance to the community is a key way that community programming remains vibrant and interesting. An example of this happened in 1994 when Maclean Hunter - Peterborough helped Sharon Richards, a woman who had given up a daughter for adoption twenty-five years earlier, produce a program on birth parents and the searching for family.

Current Community Programming On COGECO

Examples of recent COGECO programs include 'The Open Line' a weekly program that provides quests from political, medical, social services and other areas, an opportunity to present their ideas in a live open-line phone-in format. 'The Open Line' is simulcast on Trent Radio, 92.7 FM. City Council coverage takes place every third Monday, as COGECO offers exclusive coverage, proceeded by a half hour review of the evening's agenda. 'Sway Shop' is a program where viewers are invited to call-in and sell buy, trade or give away household items live. 'Plugged In' profiles local heroes, sports, arts, culture and more. 'Junction 28' is a showcase of local musical talent, including studio and location performances as well as interviews. 'Norm's Forum' is a weekly live phone-in program where Norm McHardy and his guests discuss items of interest mainly to the senior audience, COGECO also covers local special events and sports. This type of programming has existed on cable community channels for decades. Beginning in the early 1970s local programming has consisted mainly of local sports, civic meetings, parades, fairs, panel discussions, talent shows, as well as news and commentary.[46]

Local Programming on CHEX

Among the local produced shows that were produced in the early years by the staff of CHEX-TV were 'Calendar', a magazine program hosted by Marie Callaghan each afternoon, a Saturday afternoon teen 'Dance Party' hosted by the CHEX radio morning man Del Crary, and 'Romper Room' with 'Miss Betty' – Betty Thompson.[47] CHEX-TV has a long tradition of local programming including the 1987 series 'Chestnut Avenue' about working women that was undertaken with other Ontario television stations. 'The Incident at Purdy's Mill' dealt with the 1837 Upper Canada Rebellion and one its sympathizers, William Purdy, a mill owner from Lindsay. 'Canadian Characters' was a 13 part series featuring Canadian historical figures, 'Weekend' was a half-hour weekly series with author/broadcaster Doug Hall featuring authors, politicians and newsmakers. 'The Editorial Page' was hosted by Trent University Professor Robert Page. The half-hour weekly series featured educators, newsmakers and politicians. 'The Silver Basketball' was a daily education/entertainment children's series featuring many on-location segments. 'Starburst Country featured local production of music video performances of area performers like Ronnie Hawkins. 'Campus Quiz' was a weekly quiz series involving teams from public and separate schools.

The above examples are from CHEX's early days of programming. In recent years, like other commercial broadcasters, locally originated programming has virtually disappeared from CHEX. A study of undertaken by the Friends of Canadian Broadcasting found that local and regional programming, excluding news shows, has declined 38 per cent over the past 10 years[48]. Of interest though is a new emphasis by CHEX local programming, specifically community news. *Newswatch at 5:30* is a local news program that airs before the 6:00 evening news on CHEX. The station promotes the new program as a softer approach to news that focuses on stories of interest to the Peterborough community. This programming change indicates that there is still a market for local programming. Community channel employees know that advertisers are interested in buying space on their programming schedule. It would be great to see broadcasters

attempt more locally originated or community orientated programming again and tap into this market

.

How does a program end up on cable?

A community member must develop a proposal and fill out a form with very basic information about the program (the programming department also accepts letters that contain all the necessary information). If the proposal is deemed by the community programming department to be of interest to the community and fits within the current resources, a producer would have a further discussion to ascertain if a program is possible.[49] Often conditions will be attached to an approved proposal in order to ensure that it can be effectively produced.[50] A staff producer will then work with the group and volunteers to get the show on the air. This can involve taping in studio or on location, pre-production work, sets, graphics, scripts, and post-production editing and packaging.

Some reasons why a program may not make it on to the community channel are that similar types of shows have already been produced, that it does not have satisfactory production values (like sets) or that content is deemed to be not of interest to the community.[51] Community programming staff are often stretched thin, and sometimes this may lead to program ideas not being developed into shows. An example of this would be not finding time to work on another program given the current schedule and that fact that there might be a City Council meeting that week.[52] Proposed shows may miss out on a chance to get on the air because the group was not able to get organized.[53] To a certain extent the community channel is misunderstood within the community. It is not widely known that the channel is not mandated to produce every proposal that it receives.[54]

Volunteers

Volunteers are the most important component in community programming[55]. Volunteers receive training at Cogeco through publications like *Volunteer Information Handbook* and *Studio Training Handbook*, which includes information on camera operations, floor direction, and safety, as well as training sessions. Community channels need to train their volunteers to be effective. They also need to have a sufficient number to help with the production of programming. Volunteers come from many different parts of the community and for many different reasons. One community channel had a volunteer end up with the channel after calling to complain about the sound quality on a program.[56] High school media classes have created a new corps of volunteers who want to gain experience in order to pursue post-secondary education.[57] In Peterborough, increased exposure at and involvement with Sir Sanford Fleming College and Trent University could help to generate an even larger volunteer base. Volunteers are not the end solution to all of the problems with community programming, there is not an inexhaustible supply of people that can devote hours and hours to producing local television[58]. The quality and size of the volunteer base is something that community channels always strive to improve.[59]

Sharing Programming
The sharing of programs takes place between outside cable systems and other broadcasters within the community. In May, 1993 the Rogers Station in Ottawa offered the Order of Canada Ceremonies to Maclean Hunter.[60] A local radio station, CKPT has used a live audio feed of a Christmas concert recorded at the Landsdowne Place mall.[61] Cogeco has teamed up with another Peterborough community programming broadcaster, Trent Radio, to broadcast City Council meetings. CHEX sometimes uses community channel feeds or footage for parades, the Remembrance Day service and election coverage. One of the reasons that television broadcasters like community channel feeds of these events, is that due to the nature of a lot of community programs, community programmers have developed an expertise in filming and broadcasting these types of events. Municipal election coverage is one are that COGECO in Peterborough has excelled at. The community channel in Peterborough has been able to outpace local broadcasters in reporting results and covering the city.[62] The sharing of programming, whether it be programs that may be of interest to the community or sharing between broadcasters within the same community are important because help to increase the reach of community programming. This was something that was not always allowed under CRTC regulations. But the CRTC *Public Notice 1991-59*, which set new guidelines for the community channel allowed that programming exchanges could take place. The CRTC used to prohibit the sharing of programs because it wanted to promote original local programming.[63]

Local Advertising on the Community Channel
Advertising of the kind seen on commercial television stations is not allowed on the community channel. There are three types of advertising that have been allowed. Sponsorship is oral or written acknowledge contained within a community program for direct financial assistance from a business or organization within the community. Contra advertising is oral or written acknowledgement contained within a community program that has received goods or services free of charge for use in connection with production of the program. Cable systems with less than 2000 subscribers are allowed to run twelve minutes of conventional local advertising per hour.[64] Sponsorship and contra are ways for the community channel to improve production. Community programming departments are always looking for more sponsorship.

Marketing the Channel to the Community
Sometimes community programming employees get an chance to see a part of their community that they may not have seen otherwise, as is humourously described in the February 10, 1993 Maclean Hunter Community Programming Meeting minutes. Under the heading "One Lump or Two" was a note that current a community television producer would be Maclean Hunter's representative at the opening of a new Tea Room.[65] This is also an example of the community channel promoting itself within the community, something that producer Bob Clemes mentioned was an important part of marketing the Channel. "We really do marketing and promoting by attending local events. To be out there and be seen certainly helps."[66] A 1982 Maclean Hunter report on its community stations recommended attending public speaking engagements, press conferences, sitting on committees as a representative of the channel as good ways of promoting the channel within the community.[67] In the past newspaper listings in the Peterborough *Examiner*

have helped to promote the programming. Media releases are an excellent way of promoting programming. The COGECO Peterborough employees are aware that a web-site would be very helpful in promoting the community channel.[68] COGECO operates a corporate web-site that covers Peterborough, that gives general information on community programming and how to become volunteer[69]. But the site does not include any specific marketing of the Peterborough channel's programming.

To some degree marketing has become easier with the change of focus on the part of the broadcasters. Most radio and TV broadcasters have reduced local content and moved either to regional or network programming. This has created a void in local content that fits very nicely with community programming undertakings.[70] Getting out and serving the community helps the parent company improve its image. When people thank the community programming department for its hard work and professionalism, they make positive associations with the parent company.

The Importance of the Channel to the Community – The Thank You Notes
The political, social and cultural goals of the Canadian government as expressed in the *Broadcasting Act* explain the importance of giving citizens access to the powerful medium of television. The 'Thank You' notes that the stations have received serve to illustrate the reasons why community programming to its community. The is an enormous list of non-profit organizations, service clubs, and other charitable causes that have used the community channel either for programs, coverage or public service announcements. However the community channel also meets needs in the community that may not be as public or as prominent.

"This is a short not to tell you how very much I appreciate cable 6 and the beautiful music you play. In this day of raucous noise it is a breath of fresh air. I do hope that you will never discontinue the service. Giving us the correct time is also a great service. I set my clocks every night by channel 6. I live in an apartment and others have told me how they depend on channel six."[71] We can be guilty sometimes of forgetting that television does not have to be exclusively a sound plus visual medium. The television can deliver sound only and visual only extremely effectively. Bell ExpressVu offers 35 radio stations as part of their services, ranging from classical, to popular, to sports to the CBC. The community channel provides a valuable service to the community in the form of public service announcements and community bulletin boards, which run as text only on the screen.

The Pre-School Room at St..Peter's Child Care Centre expressed their thanks for a visit from the community channel staff. They enjoyed the taping and seeing themselves on television. This is also true of amateur sports, as well as any event that is covered by the community channel – it is great for citizens to be able to get on television. Television has such power in our society that it is special when real people can be a part of broadcasting.

The organizers of St. Andrew's Church's Victorian Palour Concert in 1995 thought that it owed part of its success to the promotion received on the community channel. "It is very difficult raising funds for worthwhile projects today but the goodwill and support of

companies like yours is exactly what is needed for our wonderful community to achieve its goals."

The community channel often broadcasts events that are not covered by commercial stations because they are not seen as being profitable. An example of this is Rogers coverage of 1997 Nokia Cup, world championship curling. One community programming viewer commented that the news channels and TSN were not provided any coverage other than highlights sandwiched between higher profile programming like hockey and basketball. This is a great example of narrow-casting, which is one of the fundamental values of community programming, the delivery of programming to the minority audience. When the channel covers an event like the Nokia Cup that people want to watch, even though it may only be a very small audience, it provides an opportunity for people to watch things that would not be covered at all or adequately on commercial television.

The community channel plays an important role in allowing communities to become involved in the political process. In 1993, new elected Member of Parliament Peter Adams was the guest on 'Open Line' in order to speak with the public.[72] A 1982 Survey of Maclean Hunter community channels found that many people changed their voting decisions as a result of watching the channel.[73]

The following excerpt from a Thank You note from the Royal Canadian Legion Peterborough (Ont. No. 52) Branch following the community channel coverage of the Remembrance Day Parade and Service illustrates how community programming serves needs in the community that run much deeper than information or entertainment. "As you know, many veterans are getting on in years and are unable to get out to Confederation Park and take part in this prestigious annual event. Due to your thoughtfulness, people can sit at home and enjoy the parade and service in the comfort of their living rooms."

The above examples of Thank You notes received by the community programming departments in Peterborough over the years illustrate that the channel is important. It does meet specific needs within the community. These needs may be simple like music and the correct time, or special like actually seeing oneself, or ones friends, neighbours or relatives on television. They may be helping to raise money for charities and other worthy causes or aiding the political process. No one else narrow-casts programming to the minority audience. And Pay-TV never helps shut-ins take part in Remembrance Day.

Community Programming and The Internet
The cable television industry has shown a steady decline in spending on program origination or community programming as a percentage of expenses since peaking in the early 1980s.* This shrinking percentage of program origination probably means that community programming is less of a priority to cable companies than it was in the 1970s when it was a more prominent political, social and cultural issue[#]. Cable companies have

---

* Please see Appendix: Broadcast and Cable Statistics – Cable Television Industry Statistics
# Please see Appendix: Broadcast Regulation in Canada

been focusing, rightfully so on the internet. It is essential to ensure that community programming has a place on the internet.

Community programming could be greatly aided by the convergence of broadcast and telecommunications technologies. Canadians are changing our telecommunications habits, we are watching less television, reading fewer newspapers and magazines and listening to the radio less, but using computers and the internet more.[74] The cable industry will continue to grab an increasing share of the home internet market because of its advantage in speed, combined with its existing cable network that provides access to almost all Canadian homes. By the end of 1999, 20 % of Canadians were using cable as their internet hook-up.[75] Set-top boxes will bring the internet to TV soon. As TVs get larger, people can watch TV in one window and use Web services in another. That can mean getting information about the show or, more likely, buying products associated with it. If web-sites offer TV-like programming there will a whole new source of channels, unregulated by government.[76] In May, 1999 the CRTC indicated that it would not regulate the internet because it found that it was achieving the goals of the *Broadcasting Act* without regulation. The CRTC also found that some forms of exchange on the internet did not constitute broadcasting. The CRTC was also concerned that it might put the industry at a competitive disadvantage in the global marketplace.[77] Other TV and internet services like email and Pay-Per-View will also be available on integrated systems. Already many commercial radio stations are available on the internet and television is following.

Regulation of the internet may not be the only may to promote community programming on the internet. Large American companies like Excite, Yahoo, Lycos, and Microsoft have developed communities or clubs that are on-line to offer increased services to their customers to make their web-pages more appealing. These companies make their money from advertising just like broadcasters. They offer services like search engines, free email, horoscopes, weather and sports scores to entice people to use their service. The communities or clubs are areas where, for free, individuals can start up web-pages devoted to common interests. The clubs and communities have real-time chat capability, and storage space for text files, pictures, movie clips and audio files. The club or community services are very popular in the United States, but have not yet caught on in Canada. This is probably due to the fact that the United States is more 'wired', or connected to the internet than Canada currently is. Yahoo is the only large company that offers the club feature on its Canadian page. Sympatico.ca offers Forums, which are similar to clubs and communities. As internet use grows in Canada clubs and communities will become more widely used.

Despite the fact that much of the appeal of these clubs is due to the fact that members from around the world can be linked by common interests, they provide an excellent opportunity for community programming. The concept of internet clubs and communities could be applied to specific geographical areas. These clubs could then serve their geographic communities in much the same way that the community channel currently does. The federal government has begun an initiative to connect Canada. Ottawa is working to provide public access to the internet in rural and remote areas, is

connecting public schools, promoting e-commerce and putting the government itself on-line. If Ottawa were to set up a community / club type service free to Canadians it would be a great way of furthering their goal of getting Canadians on-line, as well as meeting long standing objectives of protecting and promoting Canadian culture, through a new form of community programming.

Currently, only 36 percent of Canadians own a personal computer and only 21.5 % of Canadians have a modem.[78] Computer literacy is also concentrated in high-income homes.[79] This is similar to the early days of community programming on cable, not even the majority of Canadian had access to cable. The same fear of American domination of the internet exists that was part of movie theatre, radio, and television development as well as a reason for the creation of a system of community programming. In 1999 71% of all web sites world-wide were American.

The Future of Community Programming
Currently cable companies are choosing to maintain the community channel over the Canadian Television and Cable Production Fund because of the positive association with the community channel is due to the positive services that the channel provides to communities.[80] This makes sense in a community like Peterborough that has a long history of successful community programming on cable from Peterborough Cable, Maclean Hunter, Rogers and now COGECO as well as on the local broadcaster.[81] Through their outreach to communities and services that they provide, community channels are valuable to their companies as public relations arms.[82] Cable companies must ensure a solid relationship with the communities that they serve or business will suffer as their service offered becomes little different than DTH systems or broadcasters[83]. The cable industry wants to keep community programming as a way of differentiating itself from new rival the DTH satellite services like Bell ExpressVu. A report prepared for the Canadian Cable Television Association noted that, "Cable television's strength in programming lies in the provision of local and regional programming through local station distribution..."[84]. In 1992, Ken Stein, then president of the CCTA noted that cable could compete with DTH providers by offering the same services and expanding existing unique services like community television.[85] Indeed in 1997 when the CRTC was formulating its new distribution policy, cable operator argued that DTH services should not be required to create community channels that will compete with cable television's 30 year history of community channels.[86] The community channel offers the parent company a way of promoting any other services that it offers. In Peterborough, COGECO ran an information program in 1997on high-speed cable internet access, which of course it began marketing.[87]

If cable companies decide to opt for the Production fund community channels may be face lean times in the coming years. There are those that work in community programming that believe that in the future the community channel will have to be more creative in the spending of its budget.[88] Others feel that in the future the community channel will be running commercial content.

Canadians still want community programming, programming that features stories relevant to Canadians, as evidenced by the 68% of that told the CRTC that they would be interested in seeing more Canadian programming. The community channel seems to be a good way of meeting this need. In 1982, 87.5 % of respondents in a Maclean Hunter telephone survey indicated that they had watched the community channel at least once (the number was 69% for Peterborough). Respondents answered the question, "Do you think it is important for people to have the opportunity to make their own programs and tell their own stories or share their own interests on television?" resoundingly in the affirmative with 82.8 % of Peterborough saying 'Yes' and 82.6 % nationally.[89] Community programming is unique because it does not have to answer to the advertiser. This allows the channel to present programming that people can relate to coming form their own town or city.[90] However it must be noted that community programming on cable is not perfect. Even though almost three-quarters of Canadian homes have cable, there is still more than 25 % who do not have access to community programming. Community programming is a wonderful thing, but not everyone can afford access to it, in terms of money and time.

Community programming on cable television allows the Canadian government to achieve goals of promoting Canadian culture. Citizens can gain access to the public air waves to tell their own stories. Valuable services are provided that meets diverse and important needs in Canada's communities. The cable industry gains an additional service that can be used as a marketing tool when competing with broadcasters and Direct-to-Home satellite distributors. It also seems unlikely that commercial broadcasters will venture into any serious local programming. Because of all these things we need to ensure that community programming remains a part of broadcasting in Canada. But we also must work to ensure that community expression is included on the world wide web in some way.

Endnotes

[1] Cogeco Community Television, *Volunteer Information*, March, 2000, p.4.

[2] Cogeco Community Television, *Volunteer Information*, March, 2000, p.4.

[3] Cogeco Community Television, *Volunteer Information*, March, 2000, p.4.

[4] Cogeco Community Television, *Volunteer Information*, March, 2000, p.4.

[5] http://www.chextv.com/promo/theco.htm

[6] http://www.media-awarness.ca/eng/indus/tv/comm.htm

[7] CRTC, Local Programming on Cable Television, Summer 1972, p. 13.

[8] CRTC, Television in Canada: What Canadians Choose to Watch, 1977. P. 11.

[9] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usetv.htm#Canadian Cable Television Statistics – 1997

[10] http://www.statscan.ca/english/Pgdb/People/Culture/arts23.htm

[11] http://www.media-awareness.ca/end/issues/stats/useoftv.htm

[12] CRTC, Cable Television Community Channel Standards, June, 1992, p. 2.

[13] CRTC, Sharing The Community Channel, November, 1978, p. 2.

[14] CRTC, Community Access to Radio: 2nd Preliminary Report, 1969, I-4.

[15] CRTC, Broadcasting Act, 1968, Section 3(b).

[16] CRTC, Community Access to Radio: 2nd Preliminary Report, 1969, I-8.

[17] CRTC, Public Announcement – 'Community Antenna Television, May 13, 1969.

[18] S.E. Gordon, "How CRTC Wants Cable Television to Tune in Communities", Financial Post, January 10, 1976, p. 26.

[19] CRTC, Policies Respecting Broadcasting Receivings (Cable Television), 1975.

[20] S.E. Gordon, "How CRTC Wants Cable Television to Tune in Communities", Financial Post, January 10, 1976, p. 26.

[21] M. Wolfe, 'New Demands From Ottawa On Cable Television', Saturday Night, June 1975, p. 83.

[22] S.E. Gordon, "How CRTC Wants Cable Television to Tune in Communities", Financial Post, January 10, 1976, p. 26.

[23] http://www.media-awarness.ca/eng/indus/tv/comm.htm

[24] CRTC, Cable Television in Canada, January 1971, p. 5.

[25] CRTC, Preliminary Report on Means of Implementing Community Programming Objectives, 1969, p. 2.

[26] CRTC, Cable Television in Canada, January, 1971, p. 28.

[27] CRTC, Cable Television in Canada, January, 1971, p. 28.

[28] CRTC, Cable Television in Canada, January, 1971, p. 28.

[29] CRTC, Annual Report 1970-1, 1971, p. 1.

[30] M. Wolfe, 'New Demands From Ottawa On Cable Television', Saturday Night, June 1975, p. 83.

[31] http://www.bbm.ca/Get_Data_Tidbits

[32] CRTC, Cable Television in Canada, January, 1971, p. 28.

[33] James Day, The Vanishing Vision: The Inside Story of Public Television, London: University of California Press, 1995, pp. 6-7.

[34] Dorothy Forbes, What's Going On? A Community Channel Experience, Maclean Hunter Cable TV, 1982, p. 52

[35] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/useoftv.htm

[36] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/useoftv.htm

[37] CRTC, News Release – "CRTC's New Distribution Policy Framework Sets Course For Full TV Competition with Strong Canadian Content", March 11, 1997.

[38] CRTC, Public Notice 1991-59, June 19991.

[39] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/useoftv.htm

[40] Dorothy Forbes, What's Going On? A Community Channel Experience, Maclean Hunter Cable TV, 1982, p. 367.

[41] David Feeley's Questionnaire, April 5, 2000.

[42] David Feeley's Questionnaire, April 5, 2000.

[43] Cogeco Community Television, *Volunteer Information*, March 2000, p. 3.

[44] Cogeco Community Television, *Volunteer Information*, March 2000, p. 6.

[45] Cogeco Community Television, *Volunteer Information*, March 2000, p. 3.

[46] CRTC, Cable Television in Canada, January, 1971, p. 29.

[47] http://www.chextv.com/promo/theco.htm

[48] Arlan Gates, *WHAT'S ON TV? An Analysis of the Availability of Local/Regional and Canadian Programming in Winnipeg in 1997/98*, Friends of Canadian Broadcasting, June1998.

[49] Tim Caddigan's Questionnaire, April 6, 2000.

[50] Maclean Hunter, *Programming Department Annual Meeting Minutes*, July 7, 1992.

[51] Maclean Hunter, *Programming Department Annual Meeting Minutes*, July 7, 1992.

[52] Maclean Hunter, *Community Programming Meeting Minutes*, February 10, 1993

[53] Maclean Hunter, *Community Programming Meeting Minutes*, October 21, 1992.

[54] Tim Caddigan's Questionnaire, April 6, 2000.

[55] Bob Clemes Questionnaire, April 5, 2000

[56] Dorothy Forbes, What's Going On? A Community Channel Experience, Maclean Hunter Cable TV, 1982, p. 153.

[57] David Feeley's Questionnaire, April 5, 2000

[58] Ron Verzuh, 'Community Cable 'Stifled' By Industry' Little Media, September/October 1991, p. 15.

[59] David Feeley's Questionnaire, April 5, 2000.

[60] Maclean Hunter, *Community Programming Meeting Minutes*, May 5, 1993.

[61] Maclean Hunter, *Community Programming Meeting Minutes*, November 17, 1992.

[62] Tim Caddigan's Questionnaire, April 6, 2000.

[63] Ron Verzuh, "Community Cable 'Stifled' By Industry", Little Media, September/October 1991, p. 15.

[64] CRTC, Cable Television Community Channel Standards, June 1992, p. 8.

[65] Maclean Hunter, *Community Programming Meeting Minutes*, February 10, 1993.

[66] Bob Clemes' Questionnaire, April 5, 2000.

[67] Dorothy Forbes, What's Going On? A Community Channel Experience, Maclean Hunter Cable TV, 1982, p. 72

[68] Bob Clemes' Questionnarie, April 5, 2000.

[69] http://www.cogeco.ca/cable/tv/pborough.html

[70] Tim Caddigan's Questionnaire, April 6, 2000.

[71] Muriel Yewer, Thank You Note, April 14, 1993.

[72] Peterborough *Examiner*, Wednesday, October 27, 1993.

[73] Dorothy Forbes, What's Going On? A Community Channel Experience, Maclean Hunter Cable TV, 1982, p. 30.

[74] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usenet.htm

[75] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usenet.htm

[76] Ross Laver, Maclean's, 'Out to Be A Phone Guy, Too" February 21, 2000, p. 39.

[77] CRTC, News Release – "CRTC Won't Regulate the Interenet", May 17, 1999.

[78] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usenet.htm

[79] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usenet.htm

[80] David Feeley's Questionnaire, April 5, 2000.

[81] Bob Clemes' Questionnaire, April 5, 2000

[82] Bob Clemes' Questionnaire, April 5, 2000

[83] Tim Caddigan's Questionnaire, April 6. 2000.

[84] CCTA, The DBS Report, 1992, p. 72.

[85] 'The CCTA's President Argues His Industry Can Withstand the Threat From US Satellite Television", Financial Times of Canada, February 17, 1992, p. 31.

[86] Cablecaster, June, 1997, p. 26.

[87] Peterborough *Examiner*, Monday, October 6, 1997.

[88] Tim Caddigan's Questionnaire, April 6, 2000.

[89] Dorothy Forbes, What's Going On? A Community Channel Experience, Maclean Hunter Cable TV, 1982, p. 367.

[90] David Feeley's Questionnaire, April 5, 2000

Appendix - The CRTC and Community Programming

In 1969 the CRTC released a *Preliminary Report on Means of Implementing Community Programming Objectives*. The report began by defining community programming as being "supplying public service programming on a local basis in such a way as to be both responsible and responsive to the community to be served.[1]" The CRTC was shaping the direction that its policies would take by defining community programming as broad concept that was applicable to both radio and in the future television. "This report deals exclusively with the means of providing community program service through radio because the short term applicability of community program concepts to television does not seen very high. Broadcast television is not useful for community programming because of the high cost of entry into the technology is so high as to prohibit programming by all but large commercial operations. CATV, (Community Antennae Television, as cable television was then know.) on the other hand, has a low cost of entry and the Commission's CATV policy will certainly assure that channels are available for community purposes. However, the reach of CATV is extremely small and will probably continue to be so for the next 5 to 10 years and there is some reason to believe that community programming is of most interest to sectors f the community which are not normally large scale TV viewers. For these reasons research so far has centered on the possibilities of supplying community radio programming. [2]" Of interest to note is that the report recommended four options for increasing community radio programming. They were: decentralizing the CBC (which the CRTC is trying to forth it to do today), rental of Canadian Educational Broadcasting Association facilities, regulation of private broadcasting stations, and the establishment of community stations (similar to the CBC Northern Service). The problems facing community radio were problems that other forms of community broadcasting would face. And the solutions offered would be the same as indeed regulation of private sector was the method chosen to force cable operators to provide community programming.

The "Community Access to Radio: 2nd Preliminary Report" was published later in 1969 in July. Early in the report is mention of a study of community CATV at the CRTC. The report asserts the right of the CRTC as the legislated regulating body of a democratic government, that values freedom of speech, to act in the best interest of the people by promoting community radio as a recourse for freedom of speech. The CRTC also shows its left-leaning early politics and grasp on cultural and social media studies. "The nature of commercial broadcasting is not conducive to free expression and the CBC concerns itself almost solely with national issues." And, "The private station owner is in the business of packaging audiences and selling them to advertisers. The two main fears that reoccur in Canadian broadcasting history seem to be fears of big business domination and fear that American culture will swamp ours in an unregulated world. Again the report points out that while the practical parts of the report concern themselves with radio that the more general sections are valid for all broadcast media. The report mentions that

---

[1] *Preliminary Report on Means of Implementing Community Programming Objectives*, Canadian Radio Television Commission, 1969, p. 1.
[2] *Preliminary Report on Means of Implementing Community Programming Objectives*, Canadian Radio Television Commission, 1969, pp. 1-2.

access to commercial broadcasting in the United States is negligible, like in Canada. However, public broadcast is very different being controlled by the federal government in Canada and 95 % of similar stations being licensed to state and municipal governments or educational institutions. But the report mentions that the access is still limited in both countries. The Report recommended an intensive study of community stations, a study of the regulation of present broadcasters, co-ordination with the Educational Broadcasting Agency and informal discussion with CBC management.[3]

1969 also saw the CRTC issue a public announcement on Community Antenna Television, known today as cable. "CATV can assist in the development of a community identity through locally produced programs."[4] Cable companies could participate in the enrichment of community's cultural life through Canadian films and educational information. CATV local programming was to complement, rather than compete with programming already available to the community through commercial television.[5] This public announcement declared the CRTC's views on the value of local programming. Over the next six years the CRTC was to eventually decide that forcing cable companies to provide a community channel was the only way to meet the policy objective of providing local programming. The government saw the CBC as a national broadcaster, not a local programming provider.

Throughout the 1970s the CRTC paid a considerable amount of attention to cable television as it revolutionized the way people watched television. The CRTC produced a number of studies on cable television and on community programming (both radio and television). *Cable Television in Canada*, published in 1971, contains a brief history of Canada's cable television, a look at regulation to date, a look at cable in the United States and a section on community programs. The Report found that network television was becoming very popular, but that these programs did not reflect any specific communities.[6] The nature of cable licences, which were given to companies that served small areas and one community were ideal for broadcasting local programming[7]. The cable system could set aside a local channel for those members of the audience interested in some specific local event or issue while still providing the same service to other viewers. *Local Programming on Cable Television* was a 1972 survey of 85 cable operators. A *Resource for the Active Community* was produced in 1974 to aid communities with producing local programming. Its sections included everything from an introduction to the role of radio and television in Canadian society to the tips on the scheduling of resources, people, equipment, and programming for cable television.[8] *A Background Paper on Community Broadcasting in Canada*, published in 1976 noted that there were two main areas where community programming needed to expand. In remote areas where concerned Canadians had taken the initiative to seek out funds from a variety of sources to provide service. And in urban areas where particular groups felt that their

---

[3] *Community Access to Radio; 2nd Preliminary Report*, Canadian Radio Television Commission, 1969, section 5.
[4] *Public Announcement – Community Antenna Television*, <u>CRTC</u>, May 13, 1969, p. I.
[5] *Public Announcement – Community Antenna Television*, <u>CRTC</u>, May 13, 1969, p. I.
[6] *Cable Television in Canada*, CRTC, January 1971, p. 28.
[7] *Cable Television in Canada*, CRTC, January 1971, p. 28.
[8] A Resource for the Active Community, CRTC, 1974, p. V.

needs were not being met.[9] The 1977 CRTC study *TV in Canada: What Canadians Choose to Watch* included some information on local programming. The study found that local programming consisted almost entirely of local news and information programs with the exception of CTV and the French private network TVA, which registered some viewing of locally-produced entertainment programs.[10] The report also noted an increase in the viewing share of American stations.[11] The In 1978 the CRTC explored the question of sharing the community channel for federal House of Commons proceedings and one-time programs like the license renewal of the CBC[12] in a report entitled, *Sharing the Community Channel*. Later in the 1970s *Cable Television – Survey of the Community Channel* (1979) was published. It reported the results of a 1972 survey of community television programmers. The report found that 26 per cent of programming was community video, 6% community audio only, 3 per cent non-community television and 65 per cent locally originated programming.[13] The report goes on to assess that the chief purpose of community programming is to encourage participation in community activities.[14] This was defining a very narrow role for community programming. Later community television productions include the <u>Community Television Handbook for Northern and Underserved Communities</u>, July 1983.

In December of 1975 the CRTC released *Policies Respecting Broadcasting Receiving Undertakings (Cable Television)*. Which was the Commission's first community television programming policy. Prior to the decision the CRTC had been only encouraging cable operators to carry community channels, now the CRTC was going to impose regulation[15]. It required cable companies with over 6000 subscribers to provide a local channel for residents of the community. [16]. The policy stressed local content and production. Valuing narrow-casting and citizen participation, the CRTC insisted on more local coverage of community events, council and school board meetings and amateur sports. Community programmers were also required to assist community groups in producing their own shows by providing training and facilities.[17] One option that the CRTC explored was a ten per cent surtax on all cable revenues in order to support community channels. Statistics Canada research showed that in 1974 some cable operators were spending less than three per cent of gross revenues on local expression, while some operators were spending more than ten per cent.[18] One reason that the CRTC

---

[9] *A Background Paper on Community Broadcasting in Canada*, Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, 1976, p. 2.

[10] *TV in Canada: What Canadians Choose to Watch*, Canadian Radio Television Commission, 1977, p. 11.

[11] *TV in Canada: What Canadians Choose to Watch*, Canadian Radio Television Commission, 1977, p. 13.

[12] *Sharing the Community Channel*, Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, November 1978, p. 1.

[13] *Cable Television – Survey of the Community Channel*, Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, March 1979, p. 5.

[14] *Cable Television – Survey of the Community Channel*, Canadian Radio – Television and Telecommunications Commission, March 1979, p. 6.

[15] M. Wolfe *New Demands From Ottawa On Cable Television*, <u>Saturday Night</u>, June 1975, p. 83.

[16] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/indus/tv/comm.htm

[17] S.E. Gordon, *How CRTC wants cable TV to tune in communities*, <u>Financial Post</u>, January, 10, 1976, p. 26.

[18] S.E. Gordon, *How CRTC wants cable TV to tune in communities*, <u>Financial Post</u>, January, 10, 1976, p. 26.

was keen to promote local programming on cable could have been that in 1972 Statistics Canada found that Canadians without cable spent 12 per cent of their time watching American shows, while those with cable spent 36 per cent.[19] Again this policy was to raise the issue of American dominance of broadcasting. Robert Short, president of the Canadian Cable Television Association said, "Exposure to US median, whether print or electronic, is no threat to Canadian unity. It could work the other way – the Canadian strength of character could sort it all out."[20] However the CRTC's Pierre Juneau stated that, "We have said in effect to cable operators, you make a good profit importing signals free off the air and re-selling them; now return...to the public...some dividends."[21] Canadian sentiment was that, "... the CRTC has permitted the American border to move 100 miles north by allowing cable companies to bring in more and more American channels".[22]

In the early 1990s some critics said that the cable industry was stifling use of the community channel and that the CRTC was letting them do it[23].In June of 1991 the community channel policy was changed with CRTC Public Notice 1991-59 "Community Channel Policy". The policy required cable companies to use five percent of basic revenues to support community programming. This reaffirmation of community programming came after massive cuts at the CBC. Media observers offered that the CRTC may have been hoping to replace defunct CBC stations with stronger community programming.[24] Other funding was to come from sponsor-ship, simple written or oral acknowledgements in return for financial assistance or the provision of goods and services. Cable companies with fewer than 2000 subscribers were allowed to sell twelve minutes per hour of local advertising if they were in communities with no local radio or television stations originating programming[25]. Ken Stein the president of the CCTA argued that cable companies could counter the marketing of Direct-to-Home satellites by offering the same services and expanding services like community television.[26]

Until 1997, cable companies held a monopoly on cable distribution services because the CRTC would not provide more than one distribution license to one area. This changed in June 1997 when the CRTC opened the market by eliminating the 'one-license, one-area" rule. At the same time, the CRTC announced that telephone companies could now apply for broadcasting licenses and cable companies could enter the local telephone market.[27] In March of 1997 the CRTC issued a news release entitled, *CRTC's New Distribution Policy Framework Sets Course For Full TV Competition with Strong Canadian Content.* What this new policy did in effect was to remove the almost all requirements for cable

---

[19] M. Wolfe *New Demands From Ottawa On Cable Television,* Saturday Night, June 1975, p. 83.

[20] M. Wolfe *New Demands From Ottawa On Cable Television,* Saturday Night, June 1975, p. 83.

[21] M. Wolfe, *New Demands From Ottawa On Cable Television,* Saturday Night, June 1975, p. 83.

[22] M. Wolfe, *The Desperate (and Sometimes Ridiculous) Battle to Save Canadian Television,* Saturday Night, September 1975, p. 36.

[23] Ron Verzuh, *Community Cable 'stifled' by industry,* Content, September/October 1991, p. 15.

[24] Ron Verzuh, *Community Cable 'stifled' by industry,* Content, September/October 1991, p. 15.

[25] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/indus/tv/comm.htm

[26] *The CCTA's President Argues His Industry Can Withstand the Threat From US Satellite TV,* Financial Times of Canada, February 17, 1992, p. 33.

[27] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/indus/tv/cable.htm

companies to fund a community channel. Satellite distributors of Direct-to-Home (DTH) services were required to contribute five percent of gross annual broadcasting revenues to an independently administered fund called the Canada Television and Cable Production Fund. The Production Fund has the goal of increasing the range and quality of Canadian programming available to consumers. Terrestrial distributors were broken down into two categories. Class 1 undertakings serving larger communities could devote up to two percent of gross annual broadcasting revenues to the funding of local expression, with the remainder of the five percent going to the Production Fund. But distributors were given the option of allocating the entire five percent to the Production Fund. Undertakings serving smaller communities (Class 2) could devote the entire 5 % programming contribution to local expression, in order to maintain and enhance the level and quality of local programming.[28] The cable companies continued to try and use community programming to differentiate their programming from that of the DTH companies. Cable operators argued that DTH providers should not be required to create community channels that will compete with cable and its 30 year history of community channels.[29]

---

[28] http://www.crtc.gc.ca/ENG/NEWS/RELEASES/1997/r970311e.htm
[29] Cablecaster, June 1997, p. 26.

Appendix - Broadcast Regulation in Canada

Canada's broadcast regulating body the Canadian Radio – Television and Telecommunications Commission can in part trace its roots back to 1918. That was the year that broadcasting was first regulated in Canada. The Department of Naval Service, under the authority of the *Radiotelegraph Act* of 1913 issued the first experimental broadcasting license. The holder of that first license was a radio station in Montréal, Québec owned by the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada. It operated with the call letters XWA, and would later become CFCF. Public broadcasting in Canada is documented as beginning in May 1920.[1]

Over the years broadcast regulation in Canada was to evolve in response to changes in broadcasting technology as well as changes political, cultural and social priorities. There are three themes that remain central to the Canadian broadcasting regulation experience. The first was fear of American cultural invasion. American cultural invasion has been used numerous times as an argument supporting public broadcasting. And secondly, there has always been a debate in Canada over which should have the more prominent position, commercial broadcasting or public broadcasting[2]. And finally, Canadians have studied broadcasting on several occasions. The studies have taken place when broadcasting technology was beginning to reach large numbers of Canadians, for example when radio television began to proliferate in the late 1920s and early 1930s, in the mid-1950s when television began to spread and in the 1970s as cable television began to grow in popularity. These studies have always stated direction for broadcasting in Canada, but their recommendations have not always been followed because of politics in Ottawa. These studies are part of a cycle in Canada that sees broadcasting regulatory bodies from the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission to the Board of Broadcast Governors and the CRTC come and go because of issues of control by government[3] and because of changes in technology. The CRBC was created after radio had become popular, the BBG after television arrived and the CRTC as cable television was arriving. This paper will also discuss CRTC views and policies concerning community broadcasting, focusing on cable television. Appendices will include a time-line of important Canadian broadcasting regulation events, an appendix identifying key community programming regulation changes in detail, notes on the recent CBC license renewal and a copy of CRTC's decision not regulate the internet.

By 1928 the number of radios in Canada had reached 400,000. Also in this year the first study of broadcasting in Canada was conducted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The report was submitted to the Privy Council and stated that this new communication

---

[1] http://www.crtc.gc.ca/ENG/INFO_SHT/g15e.htm

[2] This debate started with the invention of the radio. In 1915 David Sarnoff who worked for Marconi Wireless Co. said, "I have in mind a plan of development which would make radio a 'household utility' in the same sense as the piano or phonograph. The idea is to bring music into the house by wireless." However Guglielmo Marconi was to say of radio's potential benefits to society, "Communication between people widely separated in space and thought is undoubtedly the greatest weapon against the evils of misunderstanding and jealousy."

[3] It is interesting to note that private broadcasters long pointed to abuse by governments as one reason not to have strong public broadcasting.

tool had already developed into a service demanded by a significant number of Canadians. It sounded an early warning that Canadians having access to U.S. broadcasts often chose American stations. This stemmed from the inadequate coverage provided by Canadian radio stations and the alleged superior quality of programs from the United States. As a solution, the report recommended the establishment of high power radio stations throughout Canada as well as greater expenditures on programming. It closed with a further recommendation that a royal commission be appointed to examine broadcasting in Canada and advise the government on how broadcasting might be administered, managed, controlled and financed.[4]

The Royal Commission on Broadcasting, or the Aird Commission had been impressed with the variety of programmes and absence of commercials of the British Broadcasting Corporation, when they visited in 1929.[5] This contrasted sharply with the shock that committee members John Aird and Dr. Augustin Frigon had in 1928 when they visited NBC and CBS in New York[6] and learned that these stations planned to extend their networks across Canada.[7]

Domestically there was no consensus on the path that Canadian broadcasting should take. The pro-public radio side attacked the poor programming and greed of private broadcasters. Graham Spry, one of the men directly responsible for organizing a national public broadcasting system in Canada, was to describe broadcasting in 1931 by saying, "Radio in Canada is broadcasting of the advertiser for the advertisers by the advertisers... The primary consideration of the broadcaster, indeed is not the listener but who hears, but the advertiser who pays."[8] In contrast, advocates of private broadcasting like Arthur Dupont, radio editor of Montreal's *La Presse* station, CKAC, argued that private radio meant better and more popular programs and opportunities for Canadian companies to advertise their products. Dupont claimed that public radio service would be plagued by government meddling and become a propaganda tool.[9] In three months of hearings in twenty-five cities the Aird Commission heard that there was too much American propaganda on the air waves, too many commercials, bad programming, and fears that unregulated private radio would eventually lead to American domination of radio in Canada as had happened with Canadian movie theatres.[10] Indeed in April of 1929 CFRB in Toronto had joined CBS and in November of the same year CFCF – Montreal had joined the NBC network and La Presse's station CKAC had joined CBS.[11] This was a time when eighty per cent of Canadians in 1930 preferred American shows – the fear of American manifest destiny over the airwaves being real and justified.[12]

---

[4] http://www.crtc.gc.ca/ENG/INFO_SHT/g15e.htm
[5] Knowlton Nash, The Microphone Wars, McClelland & Stewart: Toronto, 1994, p. 56.
[6] In the 1920s there was considerable support for public broadcasting in the United States. Secretary of the Navy Joseph Daniels and his assistant secretary Franklin Delano Roosevelt advocated public broadcasting. Herbert Hoover spoke in 1920 against private broadcasting and for public. Nash, p. 36.
[7] Nash, p. 55.
[8] .Nash, p. 76.
[9] Nash, p. 57.
[10] Nash, p. 58.
[11] Nash, p. 62.
[12] Nash, p. 69.

The Aird Commission reported to the government in 1929, recommending some form of public ownership, operation and control of Canadian broadcasting. In 1932, Prime Minister R.B. Bennett appointed a Parliamentary Committee to consider the Aird Commission's report and to develop a new proposal for broadcasting in Canada. It was also directed to report on a suitable agency for implementing a national broadcasting strategy. In 1932, following the recommendations of the Aird Commission, the *Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act* became law. The Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission (CRBC) was created to implement the new national broadcasting strategy and act as its regulator."[13] In the 1920s in Canada nationalism was very popular.[14] Despite the CRBC's Canadian programming efforts, American programs remained the most popular.[15]

In 1951 Massey Commission, undertook a two and a half year analysis of broadcasting and the arts. The Commission was stacked to favour federal funding for culture and public broadcasting over private. Cultural organizations, educators, performers, groups of women, farmers, co-ops, unions, churches all supported strengthening the CBC. Aligned against them were business groups, chambers of commerce, advertisers, private broadcasters, and radio manufacturers – all urging a dilution of CBC powers.[16] The Massey Commission Report stated that, "The CBC is the greatest single agency for national unity, understanding and enlightenment," and that before public broadcasting, "Canada was in real danger of cultural annexation by the United States. The Report also attacked much of private broadcasters local programming as indifferent and inadequate.[17] Private broadcasters were making large profits from popular American dramas, soap operas, sit-coms, a few Canadian variety shows and tame journalism. Commenting on the CBC's coverage of External Affairs Minister Lester Pearson's Suez Crisis activities at the United Nations, in 1950 Leslie Frost, Ontario's premier charged that the CBC was developing, "into a propaganda machine for the party in office in Ottawa."[18]

The Massey Commission also urged that a special study of Canadian television by 1955. The Fowler Commission began studying television in 1950. This commission was not loaded with public broadcasting supporters. Again the debate focused on public versus private broadcasting. Private broadcasters argued that American programs were no threat to Canadian culture and most importantly the establishment of a private network. They argued that the CBC could not function effectively as both a regulator and a broadcaster.[19] The Fowler Commission, made its report in 1957. It criticized the quality of private station programs and praised CBC programming.[20] It recommended that the broadcasting functions of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation be completely separated from its broadcasting regulation duties, and that a separate and independent

---

[13] http://www.crtc.gc.ca/ENG/INFO_SHT/g15e.htm
[14] Nash, p. 19.
[15] Nash, p. 115.
[16] Nash, p. 225.
[17] Nash, p. 226.
[18] Nash, p. 249.
[19] Nash, p. 250.
[20] Nash, p. 252.

body should be established to regulate broadcasting. A system with an overall board that would regulate all broadcasting and supervise the CBC was recommended. Newly elected conservative Prime Minister John Diefenbaker decided two establish two boards, one to regulate private and CBC broadcasting and another to run the CBC. The Liberal appointed members of existing boards were dismissed and the new Board of Broadcasting Governors (BBG) was created.[21] The CBC would retain its statutory broadcasting functions as a crown corporation.[22] The new BBG was created to meet the challenges of the television age, and to give the Diefenbaker administration some control over the Canadian broadcasting system, which they would use to further their beliefs in private business over public ownership. On October 1, 1961 Canada's first private network the Canadian Television Network (CTV) went on the air in Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal and Halifax. CTV's Spence Caldwell, who had worked for CBC Dominion Radio in 1944 said, "Ours is going to be commercial television, an advertiser's network." The CBC's Alphonse Oimet countered with, "The CBC is an instrument of national purpose – the CTV of commercial purpose."[23] Private broadcasters had won a huge victory under the Diefenbaker conservatives, the right to start a private broadcasting network.

In 1964, the Fowler Broadcasting Committee was appointed by the Secretary of State to examine broadcasting, with a particular focus on the dominance of American content in programming. The Fowler Commission reported to Parliament in 1965. From that committee's recommendations came the *Broadcasting Act* of 1968, which saw Pierre Trudeau's newly elected Liberal government create the Canadian Radio Television Commission. Besides the duties inherited from the Board of Broadcast Governors, the Commission was given special responsibilities to ensure that ownership and control of broadcasting remained in Canadian hands, that programming would be of high quality with substantial Canadian content, and that Canadian broadcasting would serve to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the nation of Canada from sea to sea.[24] The CRTC lead by Pierre Juneau and Harry Boyle was activist and interventionist, contrasting sharply with the BBG.[25] It also marked the second time in recent history that a newly elected government had used a government commission to justify wresting control over broadcasting in the country. The CRTC was also created to meet new broadcasting challenges in the forms of satellite distribution as well as cable television and its associated services like Pay-TV. The CRTC was also used by Trudeau to foster Canadian culture.

In 1976 the *Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission Act* was proclaimed and through it the present Commission was established. This Act also called for the transfer of responsibility for regulating the federally chartered telecommunications carriers from the Canadian Transport Commission to the CRTC. In 1991 Parliament revamped the *Broadcasting Act* and in 1993 proclaimed a new *Telecommunications Act*.

---

[21] Nash, p. 268.

[22] http://www.crtc.gc.ca/ENG/INFO_SHT/g15e.htm

[23] Nash, p. 312.

[24] http://www.crtc.gc.ca/ENG/INFO_SHT/g15e.htm

[25] Nash, p. 383.

These legislative initiatives were: a recognition of the need to modernize and consolidate existing legislation in the rapidly changing world of broadcasting and telecommunications.

In the area of broadcasting, the Commission is responsible for implementing the policy outlined in Section 3 of the *Broadcasting Act*. This policy calls for, among other things, a comprehensive national broadcasting system owned and controlled by Canadians, offering a variety of programming of high standard and opportunities for the public to be exposed to differing views on matters of concern. It also states that Canadians are entitled to a range of broadcasting services in English and French, as resources become available. In the area of telecommunications, the Commission's role is to regulate telecommunications in Canada with a view to implementing the policy set out in Section 7 of the *Telecommunications Act* . This involves balancing the interests of consumers and Canadian telecommunications carriers, ensuring that rates, where regulated, are just and reasonable, and that carriers do not unjustly discriminate between customers.[26]

Canada, it seems, is in need of another Royal Commission on broadcasting. If we are to ensure that Canadian expression survives the challenges of how to integrate the Canadian Broadcasting System into a world wide web that is dominated by huge private businesses must be meet. Almost three quarters of the world's internet sites are American. The CRTC may have to evolve or be reincarnated to meet this challenge. Presently, the CRTC has backed off regulating the internet. This will not ensure the protection of Canadian broadcasting in the future. However, we may have to wait until the next election before we see a change in regulatory bodies.

---

[26] http://www.crtc.gc.ca/ENG/INFO_SHT/g15e.htm

Appendix –Broadcasting Timeline

1844 – Samuel Morse sent first telegraph message.

1852 – The first *Telegraph Act* was passed.

1866 – The first permanent transatlantic telegraph link was built, via a submarine cable between Ireland and Newfoundland.

1876 – Alexander Graham Bell, of Brantford, ON, patented the telephone.

1880 – The Bell Telephone Company of Canada was incorporated by a special act of Parliament.

1893 – An amendment to Bell Canada's charter now required it to obtain the permission of the Governor in Council before increasing rates.

1895 – Marconi sent wireless signals more than one mile.

1899 – Three British warships exchanged wireless messages at sea over 75 miles.

1901 – The first wireless (radiotelegraph) trans-atlantic signals were sent from Cornwall, England to St. John's, Newfoundland.

1902 – Canada's first wireless station was established in Glace Bay, Nova Scotia.

1905 – The first Canadian legislation, the *Wireless Telegraph Act*, on wireless telegraph was passed.

1913 – The Radiotelegraph Act encompassed the radiotelephone sector.

1918 – The Department of Naval Service, under the authority of the Radiotelegraph Act (1913), issued the first experimental broadcasting license to a radio station – XWA – in Montreal, Quebec. XWA, which was owned by the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, later became CFCF.

1919 – XWA/Montreal was the first radio station to broadcast regular programming.

1923 – Canadian National Railways (CN) installed radio equipment of trains.

1928 – The government of Canada formed a royal commission chaired by Sir John Aird, to study the state of broadcasting in the country and make recommendations on its administration, management and monitoring, and to assess its financial needs. The Commission recommended the creation of a Canadian broadcasting network, to be supervised by an independent federal agency. Three years go by (1932) before the Government acted on the Aird Commission's Report. An Act was passed to create the

Department of Transport, which included the Department of Naval Service, the Department of Railways and Canals as well as the Civil Aviation Branch of the Department of National Defense. From now on, telecommunications were primarily the responsibility of the Department of Transport. Beginning in 1938, the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada regulated federally chartered telecommunications companies, called common carriers.

1931- The first Canadian television station, VE9EC, began broadcasting in Montreal. VE9EC was owned jointly by radio station CKAC and the newspaper, *La Presse.*

1932 – The first trans–Canada telephone system was completed (the Copper Highway). In response to the Aird Commission's Report, Parliament set up a special committee on broadcasting and acted on its recommendations through the *Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act.* This legislation, amended in 1936, created the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission (CRBC). The CRBC was to regulate and control all broadcasting in Canada and to provide a national broadcasting service. This entailed determining the number, location and power of radio stations as well as the time that should be devoted to nation and local programming.

1933 – The CRBC extended its reach and expanded its programming. It also acquired CN's facilities.

1936 – Amendments to the 1932 Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act created a Crown corporation: the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC). The CBC is now responsible for providing a national radio service in Canada. The Corporation produced, broadcast and regulated programming. The CBC replaced the CRBC and took over the Commission's staff and facilities (8 public stations, 14 private stations).

1937 – Through the Minister of Transport, the CBC organized the Havana Conference attended by the governments of a number of countries in the Americas, including the United States, Mexico and Cuba. They reached an agreement, called the Havana Agreement, on the allocation of frequencies. This will reduce interference. Under the Havana Agreement, Canada obtained six unoccupied frequencies. These new acquisitions enabled Canada to introduce more powerful transmitters and expanded its network. With new transmitters in Toronto and Montreal, public radio now reached 76 percent of the population (up from 49 percent).

1939 – A team of announcers and technicians accompanied the Canadian Armed Forces First Division to England, where they set up Radio Canada's overseas service. Developments in telecommunications were mobilized for the war effort.

1941 – Canadian Broadcasting Corporation News Service was created. Special broadcasts included Sir Winston Churchill's speech to the House of Commons in Ottawa.

1942 – The Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB) called on the Association of Canadian Advertisers (ACA) and the Canadian Association of Advertising Agencies to

develop a system to determine the price of advertising air time. This lead to the creation of the Bureau of Broadcast Measurement (BBM).

1944 – The CBC created a third public network (across Canada) known as Dominion, to provide a second choice of English-language programs.

1949 – The CBC acquired the facilities of the Broadcasting Corporation of Newfoundland when the province entered Confederation.

1950 – Nationalization of Cable & Wireless Limited and the Canadian Marconi Company resulted in the creation of a Crown corporation, the Canadian Overseas Telecommunications Corporation (COTC), which became Teleglobe in 1975.

1951 – The Massey – Lévesque Commission entrenched the CBC's regulatory role.

1952 – Canadian television (CBC) was launched. Canada's first urban cablevision facility opened in London, ON.

1955 – The first television broadcast of the opening of Parliament took place. CBC television was now accessible to 66 percent of Canadians. A Royal Commission on broadcasting, chaired by Robert Fowler, was created.

1957 – The Fowler Commission recommended that responsibility for regulating broadcasting be removed from the CBC. The lack of restrictions on foreign ownership prompted the Commission to recommend that forth coming legislation on broadcasting include a provision prohibiting the direct or indirect acquisition of over 20 percent interest in any Canadian radio or television station by non-Canadians.

1958 – The first television program was broadcast live from Nova Scotia to British Columbia. The CBC's microwave network was now the longest television network in the world. The CBC created its Northern Service (radio). The Government created a new regulatory body to replace the CBC. From now on, the Board of Broadcast Governors (BBG) regulated Canadian broadcasting, including the CBC and private broadcasters. The BBG was empowered to establish regulations designed to promote Canadian talent by broadcasting stations.

1960 – The Board of Broadcast Governors (BBG) invited private television stations to submit applications to establish networks.

1961 – The Canadian Television Network (CTV) was launched. The CBC submitted recommendations on satellite telecommunications in Canada. The transatlantic telephone system was officially launched with a call from Queen Elizabeth II to Prime Minister John Diefenbaker.

1962 – The Alouette satellite was launched. Canada became the third country in the world to have a satellite in orbit.

1963 – The Government made a decision to have the private sector develop Canada's aerospace industry (this was the ISIS satellite program).

1964 – A new committee on broadcasting was formed, the Fowler Committee. The Committee urged the Government to identify its expectations for the broadcasting system as well as set specific objectives for both the public and private broadcasting sectors in Canada. The Committee also recommended replacing the BBG with a new regulatory and licensing agency.

1965 – The Canadian government announced its policy on colour television.

1966 – A white paper on broadcasting was published. The Government set out its broadcasting policy: Canadians would maintain control over new electronic communications technologies in order to preserve and strengthen Canada's social and economic structures. Colour television broadcasts began in Canada.

1967 – The Chapman Report recommended that Canadian research on space technology focus on communications and remote sensing. The Report also suggested that Canada capitalize on its expertise in the international market. This Report lead to the creation of the Department of Communications and Telesat Canada in 1969.

1968 – A white paper on satellite telecommunications was released. The first joint televised debate by leaders of political parties took place. The *Broadcasting Act* was adopted. The Act did the following:
- confirmed the CBC's mandate as a national broadcaster
- strengthened restrictions on foreign ownership
- required the predominant use of Canadian creators and talent
- reaffirmed a vision of the broadcasting system as a means of strengthening Canada's cultural, social and economic structures
- created the Canadian Radio – Television Commission (CRTC), a new regulatory agency that became the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission in 1976.

1970 – The *Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission Act* expanded the CRTC's jurisdiction to include federally regulated common carriers.

1972 – Global TV system begun broadcast.

1991 – Parliament amended the *Broadcasting Act*.

1993 – Parliament passes a new *Telecommunications Act*.

(Sources: www.crtc.gc.ca/ENG/BACKGRND/Brochures/B19903e.htm
Nash, Knowlton <u>The Microphone Wars)</u>

Appendix -- Broadcasting and Cable Statistics

Newspapers
- 1872 – 24.5 million newspapers mailed, 1899- 100 million[1]
- 1999 – Southam / Hollinger controls 40.7 % of daily circulation, Quebecor / Sun Media, 21.7 %, Torstar 14.2 % and Power 5.7 %.[2]

Radio
- 1928 – Number of radios in Canada[3]
- 1930 – 80% of Canadians were listening to American radio programming.[4]

Television
- 1955 – 2 million television sets, 38 stations[5]
- 1976 – BBM Fall 1976 Survey, Local Programming Hours: CTV 6.9%, CBC 2.9%, TVA 11%, Radio-Canada, 1.92%. (Local Programming consisted almost entirely of local news and information programs with the exception of CTV and TVA, which registered some viewing of locally-produced entertainment programs.[6]

Peterborough					
Top 20 TV Shows – Adults 18+					
BBM Fall 1998 TV Sweep[7]			BBM Spring 1999 TV Sweep[8]		
Rank	Program	Station	Rank	Program Station	Station
1	Wheel of Fortune	CFTO	1	Hockey – NHL	CHEX
2	Jeopardy	CFTO	2	Friends	CIII
3	Newswatch	CHEX	3	Hockey – NHL	CHEX
3	Football – Grey Cup	CHEX	4	Grammy Awards	CFTO
3	Friends	CIII	5	CFTO News at 6	CFTO
4	CFTO News at 6	CFTO	5	ER	CFTO
5	Frasier	CIII	5	Frasier	CIII
5	NYPD Blue	CIII	5	Futurama	CIII
5	Beverly Hills	CIII	5	Jeopardy	CFTO
5	ER	CFTO	5	Newswatch	CHEX
6	Frasier	CIII	5	Wheel of Fortune	CFTO
6	CFTO News at 6	CFTO	12	X-Files	CIII
6	Global News 5:30	CIII	13	60 Minutes	CIII
6	Young & Restless	CIII	13	CFTO News at 6	CFTO
6	Hockey – NHL	CHEX	13	Frasier	CIII
6	Party of Five	CIII	13	World Skating Championships	CFTO

---

[1] Paul Rutherford, A Victorian Authority: The Daily Press in Late 19th Century Canada, Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1982.

[2] http://media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/indown.htm

[3] http://www.crtc.gc.ca/ENG/INFO_SHT/g15e.htm

[4] Knowlton Nash, The Microphone Wars: A History of Triumph and Betrayal at the CBC, Toronto: McClelland and Steward, 1994. P. 69.

[5] Nash, p. 250.

[6] CRTC, Television in Canada: What Canadians Choose to Watch, 1977. P. 11.

[7] http://www.bbm.ca/Get_Data/TV_Data_Tidbits/TV_Fall_98/Peterborough/body_peterborough.html

[8] http://www.bbm.ca/Get_Data/TV_Data_Tidbits/TV_Spring_1999/Peterborough/body_peterborough_sp99.html

6	Air Farce	CHEX	17	Global News 5:30	CIII
7	Melrose Place	CFTO	17	Jesse	CIII
7	Santa Claus Parade	CIII	17	Law & Order	CFTO
7	Sunlife Skate	CFTO	17	Party of Five	

1997 – Average hours per week of television viewing[9]					
	Total Population	Children 2-11	Teens 12-17	Men 18 and over	Women 18 and over
	Hours per week				
Canada	22.7	17.9	16.9	21.7	26.5

1998

- CRTC reported that 79 % of English Canadians named an American programme as their favourite.
- 68 % surveyed Canadians told the CRTC that they would be "very interested" (30%) or "somewhat interested" (38%) in having access to a greater number of programs featuring Canadian stories.[10]

Cable

Cable Television Industry Statistics								
Year	# of Cos.	# of operating systems	# of subscribers	Operating Revenue	Program Origination Expenses	Expenses	Program Origination as % of Expenses	Program Origination as % of Operating Revenue
1967		314	408853	22114690				
1968		377	555275	31285513				
1969			722767	37379909				
1970			899854	54940255	672209	45549453	1.48%	1.22%
1971	261	326	1082379	66620132	1258967	53242921	2.36%	1.89%
1972		344	1689335	82464223	2513792	65982674	3.81%	3.05%
1973		362	2115866	106972590	3395714	83925486	4.05%	3.17%
1974		375	2560787	133432640	4593991	104632500	4.39%	3.44%
1975		388	2860937	162272857	6247383	132380704	4.72%	3.85%
1976		403	3143315	199214978	10169015	165464332	6.15%	5.10%
1977		427	3417223	232957559	13539480	189789087	7.13%	5.81%
1978		463	3775633	273223436	16380639	225162611	7.28%	6.00%
1979		482	4084198	313747167	20430418	266826297	7.66%	6.51%
1980		505	4339268	352171503	22113502	300789472	7.35%	6.28%
1981		524	4700643	405023609	30480908	371835128	8.20%	7.53%
1982		564	4933589	472343767	37739174	441714269	8.54%	7.99%
1983		651	5140262	534839404	36423288	473801562	7.69%	6.81%
1984		747	5389627	595056743	38237288	527706149	7.25%	6.43%
1985	573	827	5672561	672136249	41618770	581036865	7.16%	6.19%
1986		921	6004680	767039278	44345968	637421264	6.96%	5.78%
1987		1004	6309689	870624984	51574900	738033553	6.99%	5.92%
1988		1310	6558778	989508392	55920446	805471800	6.94%	5.65%
1989			6886212	1153586430	54413863	934960424	5.82%	4.72%
1990	605	1747	7122513	1356621540	61368902	1173567031	5.23%	4.52%
1991	567	1817	7286417	1477609448	63269202	1298423114	4.87%	4.28%

[9] http://www.statscan.ca/english/Pgdb/People/Culture/arts23.htm
[10] http://media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usoftv.htm

1992	540	1927	7463486	1588093916	68388980	1342858130	5.09%	4.31%
1993	531	1951	7656820	1680976041	75145411	1497558745	5.02%	4.47%
1994	520	1978	7833191	1759125564	80196860	1535035427	5.22%	4.56%
1995			7791000	1846052000	85384000	1795346000	4.76%	4.63%
1996			7867000	1903555000	85541000	1926974000	4.44%	4.49%
1997			7957000	1967920000	85236000	2041315000	4.18%	4.33%
1998			8254000	2008990000	83496000	2218676000	3.76%	4.16%

Notes:
i) Program origination expenses include payments for non-staff talent, material and supplies, other production costs, theatrical and short film, package shows, program services, other non-production costs, and remuneration
ii) Program origination was denoted community programming starting in 1992 (for StatsCan purposes)
iii) Operating revenue does not include discretionary services like pay-TV.

Sources:
1967-8 Community Antenna Television, Dominion Bureau of Statistics
1971-94 Cable Television, Statistics Canada
http://www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/Economy/Communications/trade25.htm
http://www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/People/Culture/arts.htm

1970 – 27.5 % of Canada's 4 000 000 urban households were linked to cable television systems[11]

1999[12]
- Television Homes: 11 485 000
- Homes Passed By Cable: 10 285 576
- Cable Television Subscriptions: 8 286 775
- Percentage of Homes Passed by Cable: 89.6
- Percentage of Cable Subscriptions: 72.2
- Percentage of Homes Passed by Cable with Cable Subscriptions: 80.1

Community Programming
- 1972 – A Survey of community programmers revealed that 26 % of community programming was Community Video, 6 % Community Audio Only, 3 % Non – Community Programming and 65 % Locally Originated Programming. [13]

Community Programming Telephone Survey[14]								
Have you ever watched the community channel?								
	Total	Yes	No	Never	Once	Occasionally	Frequently	Always	No Cable
Peterborough	29	1	9	2	-	11	5	-	1
Total	1273	49	159	56	78	771	102	11	14
		Yes %	No %	Never %	Once %	Occasionally %	Frequently %	Always %	No Cable %
Peterborough		3.4	31.0	6.9	-	37.9	17.2	-	3.4
Total		3.9	12.5	4.3	6.1	60.6	8.0	0.9	1.1

[11] CRTC, Cable Television in Canada, January 1971. P. 5.
[12] http://media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usoftv.htm
[13] CRTC, Cable Television: Survey of the Community Channel, March 1979, p. 5.
[14] Dorothy Forbes, What's Going On? A Community Channel Experience, Maclean – Hunter, 1982., p 367.

1982[15] – Do you think it is important for people to have the opportunity to make their own programs and tell their own stories or share their own interests on television?			
	Yes	No	Percentage Yes
Peterborough	24	29	82.8
Total	1026	1242	82.6

- These findings were the result of a study done by the Friends of Canadian Broadcasting and based on an analysis of the Winnipeg and Vancouver markets.
- Local and regional programming, excluding news shows, has declined 38 per cent over the past 10 years.
- In Winnipeg, local and regional programming now accounts for only 16.3 per cent of all conventional programming in Winnipeg, down from 21.2 per cent a decade ago.
- Over 22 per cent of the television shows watched in Winnipeg last fall were produced in Manitoba.[16]

The Internet
1999
- 71 % of all web sites are American.
- 5 % of content on the Internet is Canadian
- 5 % of Internet content is French
- 150 million people are connected to the Internet (one half are Americans)
- It is estimated that by 2001, approximately 40 % of households will have access to the Internet (approximately 5 million households), double the number from 1998.[17]
- Sixty-three per cent of Canadians' online dollars are spent at US web sites.[18]
- After conducting an online survey, Sympatico, has concluded that Canadians who regularly surf the Internet are spending less time using other media like TV, magazines and radio.
  - Fifty-five per cent of respondents said they are watching less television.
  - Twenty-two per cent are reading fewer newspapers.
  - Nineteen per cent are reading fewer magazines.
  - Thirteen percent are listening less to radio.[19]

- An October Angus Reid/Sympatico study asked visitors to the Sympatico site to identify their personal Internet activities: Email 96 %, Search Engines 88 %, downloading files and software, 77 %, search using web guides or indexes 73 %, read current news, 72 %, searching for phone numbers, 62 %, weather, 57 %, health information, 56 %, local information (restaurants, movies) 49 % and maps (46%)[20]

- Teens use the Internet an average of 8.5 hours a week for chatting and e-mailing, and only 1.8 hours a week for school work.

---

[15] Forbes, p. 440.

[16] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/contv.htm#The Decline of Local Programming

[17] http://www.crtc.gc.ca/ENG/NEWS/RELEASES/1999/1990517e2.htm

[18] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usenet.htm

[19] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usenet.htm

[20] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usenet.htm

- Right now, between two to three per cent of people use cable for their Internet connection.
- This number is expected to rise to 20 per cent by the end of 1999.
- Twenty-nine per cent of Canadians over the age of 18 "personally access the Internet." This May 1997 figure represents an increase of seven points in seven months, from the 22 per cent cited by ACNielsen in October 1996.
- The number of Canadians over the age of 12 who use the Internet is almost eight million, or more than 30 per cent of the population.
- Nineteen per cent of Canadians define themselves as *regular* Internet users.
- Females are joining the traditionally male-dominated community of Internet users in greater numbers. The percentage of male users dropped slightly from 57 per cent in October 1996 to 55 per cent in May 1997.
- Thirty-six per cent of Canadians access the Internet, up from 23 per cent in 1996.
- Provincially, B.C. leads with 42 per cent (up from 26% in 1996), followed by Ontario with 40 per cent (up from 24%); Atlantic Canada with 37 per cent (25%); the Prairies with 35 per cent (24%); and Quebec with 29 per cent access (up from 18% last year).
- Canadian Internet users usually spend between five and nine hours online per week.
- Nearly one in three (36 per cent) Canadian households, or 4.2 million, had a computer in 1997, up from 30 per cent a year earlier.
- However, only 13 per cent of Canadian households (1.5 million) actually accessed the Internet from home (almost double the 1996 rate of 7 per cent).
- Some 40 per cent of households with modem-equipped computers don't yet use them to access the Internet.
- Fewer than 30 per cent of Internet users use it for entertainment; the primary online activity is searching for information.
- Among those with a computer, education level is a stronger predictor of Internet use than income. Twenty-six per cent of households with high incomes surfed the Net, while only five per cent of households with low incomes did. (That 5:1 ratio is unchanged from 1996.)
- Five per cent of all web sites world wide are Canadian, and Canadians are second only to the U.S. in per capita Internet use. [21]

Computer Literacy in High-Income Homes[22]	
Household Income	% To Use Computers (1994)
Under $20,000	28
$20,000-$29,999	38
$30,000-$39,999	52
$40,000-$49,999	60
$50,000-$59,999	72
$60,000-$79,999	79
$80,000-$99,999	82
$100,000 and over	86

[20] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usenet.htm
[22] http://www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usenet.htm

General

Availability of Technology[23]					
% of Total Households					
Item	1984	1989	1994	1996	1997
Telephone	98.6	98.7	99.0	98.7	98.6
Radio	98.9	98.9	98.9	98.7	98.7
Colour Television	88.5	96.1	98.2	98.5	98.7
VCRs	12.6	58.8	79.2	83.5	84.7
CD Player	--	11.6	40.8	53.4	58.1
Personal Computer	10.4	12.6	25.0	31.6	36.0
Modem	--	--	8.4	15.5	21.5
Internet Access	--	--	--	7.4	13.0
Cellular Telephone	--	--	--	14.4	18.6

---

[23] http://www.media-a wareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/usetv.htm#Canadian Cable Television Statistics – 1997