

The Case for Private Broadcasting

George C. Chandler

The History Of Radio

RADIO goes back to a Scottish mathematician named James Clerk Maxwell. This 19th Century mathematician developed a series of equations which indicated that the radiation of electromagnetic energy was feasible. In the last half of the 19th Century a German professor by the name of Hertz conducted a series of experiments which proved Maxwell's equations. But for some time after Professor Hertz' experiment radio transmission remained largely a classroom novelty. Italy's Guglielmo Marconi was the first man to use these Hertzian waves for inter-continental communication. At the turn of the century Marconi with the assistance of British capital successfully transmitted the letter "S" across the Atlantic. This to most people marks the opening of the radio era.

Subsequent to Marconi's successful test, radio, or "wireless" as they then called it, found its greatest utility as a safety measure for ships at sea. Then came the Titanic disaster. The Titanic disaster demonstrated the need for International regulation of radio. The United States at that time was generally using the Morse code as the code for radio transmission. The rest of the world was generally using the Continental code. The symbols for eleven letters in the two codes are different. The result was that at a time of desperate urgency a number of

nearby vessels were unable to intelligently copy the distress messages from the Titanic. Had these distress messages been correctly understood and copied, it is possible that the loss of life in the Titanic disaster might have been reduced.

Therefore an international conference was called and treaties were established governing the use of radio transmission. Each country then established domestic laws to control the use of radio by its nationals. This led to the licensing of transmitters, and in Canada, the licensing of receivers; both transmitters and receivers being at that time considered as a measure of safety at sea.

The progress of radio like the development of the automobile was slow in its early stages. For example, the 1910 automobile is nowhere on our streets today. Similarly, 1910 equipment for radio has no place in the ether spectrum today. The quality of radio equipment in the early days was so poor that the potential room in the entire ether spectrum appeared to be limited. Mutual interference between transmissions was high.

A CLASSIC example of this high mutual interference occurred during the battle of Jutland. It was found that the German transmissions and the British transmissions jammed each other. Therefore, during the height of the battle an agreement was reached between the commanders of the two fleets whereby the British would have

free use of their transmitters for a period of time while the Germans would have alternate periods of time. The two fleets were not able to transmit simultaneously and they reached the agreement to transmit alternately.

Today, of course, is a far cry from the battle of Jutland; engineers have developed the use of radio so that the ether spectrum is almost unlimited in its scope.

However, there is still need for international treaties to ensure the orderly use of the ether spectrum. In a large portion of the radio spectrum waves know no boundaries. These agreements are necessary therefore in order to reduce mutual interference between stations in different countries. This leads to the necessity for domestic licensing of transmission. It does not appear, however, to justify the licensing of receiving sets, excepting those receiving sets which are vital to safety of life. Receiving sets vital to the safety of life suggest an inspection procedure, and inspection procedure should normally bring about some licensing. This would be the case of receivers for aircraft, receivers for ships at sea. There does not appear to be any justification for the licensing of domestic receivers. However, the licensing authority was contained in the Radio Act at the time that broadcasting developed. It has not since been removed from the Act but has been used as a revenue measure in Canada.

Radio and Mass Communication

RADIO broadcasting during the past quarter century has moved from an experimental stage into a new means of publishing. Radio broadcasting has, in fact, become perhaps the most important form of publishing of all time. The proof lies in the fact that publication is a means of mass communication, and radio broadcasting is the greatest means of mass communication.

Radio broadcasting has taken two courses. The most common course to date is the course of voice radio—that is, aural radio. A new form coming into greater prominence is visual radio. Visual radio generally is known as “facsimile.”

Visual radio enables the transmission of pictures and of the printed word. Facsimile development by itself has been slower than aural broadcasting. But great strides are being made today with a combination of aural and visual broadcasting. The colloquial term of this combination is “television.” It is a wedding of aural radio and visual radio—a marriage of voice radio and facsimile radio. Both types are great methods of mass communication—great methods of publication. Aural radio is a great method of communication and publication; facsimile or visual radio is a potential great method of communication and publication. Television, the combination of the two, is probably the greatest means of mass communication and publication ever known to mankind.

The other great means of mass communication in our time is the printing press.

Freedom of Speech

THE earliest form of mass communication was by the voice. A man's ability to publish and communicate his thoughts was at that time limited by the strength of his voice. Early writing was largely for the purpose of maintaining records. It was not intended as a mass form of communication. However, when the printing press was developed, a new means of mass communication became available. It did not communicate the man's voice to greater masses of people but it did give a mechanical means of enabling a man to transmit his thoughts to a greatly enlarged audience.

In the English-speaking world it has taken mankind generations to develop freedom of speech. It is the cardinal freedom of the English-speaking world. This freedom of speech is two-fold; it is the freedom to speak and it is the freedom to listen; it is the freedom to publish and it is the freedom to read. One cannot exist without the other. The freedom to listen is as essential a facet of the freedom of speech as the freedom to speak. It is in reality the freedom to communicate.

When the freedom to speak and the freedom to listen had been established, the

freedom to publish and freedom to read became a logical extension of free speech. This has since become a firm factor in our Western civilization.

Radio broadcasting in any of its forms, however, has not yet obtained the freedom to speak that is recognized in the freedom to write. It is a contradiction of our ideology, a denial of the democratic principle, that the initial freedom, the freedom to speak and listen, is at present suffering from influences similar to those which restricted printing in the early days of printing.

This curtailment of mass communication and mass publication by radio is an off-shoot of a strong 20th Century trend towards socialization. If the Socialists bring about the complete socialization of the business of publishing, that is, the business of mass communication; then general socialization can be brought about very speedily. They who control communications, control the thought of the people.

Radio broadcasting was quickly recognized in its true position as eventually becoming the greatest mass means of communication. It had natural qualities making control easy. This is because of the history of the licensing of the mechanism of radio publication. Any licensing applying to any divisions of the press in our English-speaking world has not been interpreted as a license for controlling what shall be published and communicated by the press. But it is a fact, that today in Canada it would be virtually impossible to publish any daily newspaper of any consequence unless the licensing process had somewhere taken place. The key to the licensing of the press as a means of publication is like the key in the licensing of broadcasting as a means of mass publication, that is in the mechanics, the raw material.

TODAY the raw material for the printed press comes from forest licenses for the manufacture of paper; a license which is granted by the Crown. However, the freedom to print and publish by printing has become so firmly established that no one would dare to use this control of the raw material of printing for controlling

the material which is printed. The material which is printed is controlled by the broad law of the land and not by specific laws aimed at this one means of mass communication.

Had the printing press been a development of the 20th Century, and had timber grants been also a previous development of this century, the following situation in Canada today would be by no means unlikely.

The forces of Socialism would have seen that an extension of the necessary mechanisms for the orderly development of paper from timber grants and timber licenses could be extended as a means of controlling what was printed on the raw material coming from those timber licenses. Had this been a 20th Century development it would have followed the same trend in an attempt to socialize a mass means of communication. Fortunately for our Western democracies the press had established its rights to publish long before timber licenses were generally understood.

Competition in Mass Communication

IN the early days of radio broadcasting it was considered that broadcasting was perhaps a natural monopoly. The engineers had not developed either receivers or transmitters with the degree of perfection which is common today. In fact some people were of the opinion that at one time the ether spectrum would be overcrowded by only one or two hundred broadcasting stations in the North American continent. Thus restriction of wave lengths in the early days encouraged the development of government broadcasting corporations.

The theory apparently was that if it was a monopoly perhaps it should be a public monopoly. This is somewhat similar to the early day theories on power and transportation. But once the government corporations have become entrenched there has been no success in removing them from their fields.

In North America, with the general practice of the competitive system of broadcasting, engineers have developed tech-

niques where broadcasting is not a monopoly; in fact broadcasting throughout North America is most highly competitive. It is far more competitive than any other means of mass communication or publication. In 1941 at the time the first North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement came into effect there were some 1200 stations in North America on the standard broadcasting band. In 1950, when the last North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement was signed there were almost 3,000 stations in the official list. Since the war the number of stations in the United States has expanded from less than 1,000 to nearly 2,300. These are the stations in the standard broadcasting band. In addition thereto in the United States there are some 700 frequency modulated broadcasting stations and there is room with present day engineering techniques for at least 3,000 more frequency modulated stations. The United States appears to have reached virtual saturation in broadcasting but it is a saturation brought about by competition and not a saturation brought about by technical limitations.

In Canada similar conditions exist. There are far more privately owned broadcasting stations operating in Canada than there are daily newspapers. For example, in the City of Vancouver there are four privately-owned and one publicly-owned broadcasting station, and there are at present only two companies controlling newspapers, The Vancouver Sun which in turn has stock control in The News Herald, and the Vancouver Daily Province. In the City of Toronto there are at present four privately-owned broadcasting stations and effectively only two publishers, The Globe and Mail and the Telegram under common ownership, and The Toronto Star. An examination, city by city, in both Canada and the United States, makes it evident that there are more broadcasting stations than there are daily newspapers and the competition is much keener in the broadcasting field. In fact the number of amalgamations of newspapers in the last few years has developed a monopolistic trend in the press field, leaving radio broadcasting as the only true competitive

method of mass communication and mass publication in operation.

The proponents of public ownership and public operation of broadcasting like to place before people the suggestion that anyone, if he chooses to do so, can publish a newspaper. These same people state that not everyone or not any one can operate a radio broadcasting station. They point to the limit of available technical facilities for starting new broadcasting stations. The evidence of the past has indicated that this is untrue. The fact is that in the past ten years a great number of new broadcasting stations have been started in North America and a great number of newspapers have ceased publication. Virtually no new newspapers have appeared in the field.

THE suggestion that anyone can publish a daily newspaper is a ridiculous one. One of the first requisites for such an undertaking would be adequate capital. An enormous amount of capital is required. It would also be necessary to have assurance of obtaining a franchise from a news agency. Evidence in the past indicates that such a franchise is both difficult and expensive to obtain. If a news agency service can be obtained and the capital is available, the next problem would be to obtain adequate newsprint. Newsprint is at present so scarce (and it is becoming increasingly scarce) that it would be virtually impossible for a new publisher to obtain newsprint. To obtain this print this new publisher might find himself in the position of being obliged to purchase a papermill and with that papermill obtain timber licenses for the raw material for his paper.

It is infinitely easier for anyone in Canada who desires to operate a broadcasting station to do so. It is difficult, but it is much easier than starting a newspaper.

Since radio broadcasting is today one of the most truly competitive means of mass communication it is desirable in the interests of freedom of speech that the media be unhampered by state restrictions.

Proponents of public operation of radio broadcasting suggest that it is even more necessary that the medium of television

be most tightly controlled by a publicly owned corporation. They assert that the monopoly aspects of television are greater than the monopoly aspects of radio broadcasting. This just is not true. The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission in the United States forecasts that within ten years there will be over 2000 television broadcasting stations in the United States. That is, it is expected that in the next ten years, television will expand to the same total number of stations in the United States that it has required broadcasting a quarter century to develop. This suggestion of greater monopoly in television does not stand up either; it just is not true.

THE Massey Commission in its Report suggests that control of radio broadcasting in Canada should continue as in the past. That means that the controlling authority should be the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, a Crown corporation. The Commission supports the present method whereby this Crown corporation is operating with public revenue derived from the licensing of radio receiving sets and from the license fees paid by radio broadcast stations. The Corporation has great powers to restrain competition. The Massey Commission recommends continuance of this power. The Corporation has already restrained competition to a high degree. The Corporation, while it is by law in the position of having the control of network broadcasting, has interpreted this control as being in fact, a monopoly *in* network broadcasting. Therefore, by applying these powers over network operation it has effectively restrained competition in the national advertising field.

This restraint of competition has worked to the great advantage of American firms and of firms in Canada of American ownership. It has enabled and encouraged these firms to compete by importation of advertising into Canada and transmitting such advertising across Canada on a Government-subsidized advertising corporation.

Talent and Broadcasting

IN spite of all contentions to the contrary, by maintaining this network monopoly the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has effectively discouraged the development of Canadian talent. They have created a situation whereby there is virtually no competition for talent. The talent either must work within the terms established by the CBC or have no field in nation-wide Canadian broadcasting.

The Massey Report reiterates the snide remarks that are constantly being hurled at the privately owned broadcasting stations, and which claim that private stations do little to develop talent.

The problem is purely and simply one of economics. There has been a continuous effort within Canada to force privately owned stations to use and employ live talent. This talent, were it of the calibre deserving public acceptance, and were the price within economic reason, would have no problem finding employment. The situation would be no different from that of a writer writing in newspaper fields. If the writer has the talent and the ability, and the price is right, the writer is employed. But no one suggests that the newspaper be forced to throw out feature writers just to give to some would-be writer, who has neither ability nor talent, an opportunity of having his name in print. Such a publisher would soon be out of business.

The Canadian broadcasting station must compete for listening acceptance with network radio. A network program carried across Canada is reaching a potential market of some fourteen million people. A program carried by a local station, if it is in the City of Vancouver, has a potential number of people whom it might reach, of about half a million; in other cities a smaller number. If the program is an importation from the United States then the cost is spread over some hundred and seventy million people. Yet the broadcaster in Vancouver attempting to put on a live talent program must have talent that is equally as acceptable to his audience as that appearing on the network production.

It is not economically feasible. In a market of half a million people it is just not possible to be able to program with the same costs as one would program to reach a market of fourteen million people.

Broadcasting should not be forced to subsidize those who desire to become artists but who have not the talent or ability, any more than any other industry should be obliged to subsidize people. If the talent is good and the price is right, the talent obviously will find a market.

CBC has used its powers of control to a great extent to try and develop a monopoly. Its regulations governing use of live talent generally select those periods where local stations are compelled to do live programming at times when the peak programs are being carried on the CBC's networks. This naturally puts the local station at a tremendous competitive disadvantage. It means that little if any advertising can be sold at that period. It means that the station must, out of its own revenue, employ this talent for non-productive purposes. This is certainly not in the public interest, nor is it probably in the interest of the talent. It really is an entirely new form of feather bedding with the connivance of a regulating body. Purely competitive network broadcasting would be the greatest boon possible for Canadian talent. It would create competition for talent. The talent would then have not just one buyer for its wares, but a minimum always of two buyers for its wares. Similarly, it would make the use of talent economically feasible because of the distribution of the cost of this talent over the population of the nation instead of just the population reached by a local station.

CERTAINLY it would be considered as the greatest breach of the freedom of the press if some law were passed compelling newspapers to employ writers to write to the public just because these people thought somebody should employ them as writers. Yet this is what is being done by current regulations governing radio in Canada. With one exception the Massey Commission seems to support this thesis. It is a means of encouraging

people to look for employment where there is no economic field for their individual employment. The point is, if their talent is good and the price is marketable they will find employment; if their talent is not good and the price is not marketable, then they should not be encouraged to believe that there is any place for them. This merely encourages people to believe that the world owes them a living.

There is today a great deal of confusion between avocation and vocation. When the market is such that people cannot make a livelihood at the work of their choice they frequently do some of this work of their choice as an avocation. They earn their livelihood by the choice of another vocation. The vocation which they choose whether it be first choice or second choice is the one which performs the greatest public service. It is the one that is marketable and is useful to other people. It is a disservice to a person to suggest that some means should be made artificially of employing him at some work which from the viewpoint of marketability should only be considered as an avocation. Yet there are suggestions that both private industry and government funds should be diverted to develop and encourage people to make their livelihood at these non-marketable occupations. These thoughts seem to apply particularly to writers, singers, musicians and artists. It has been suggested that a writer cannot make a livelihood from the sale of a book in Canada. This, however, should not stop an author from writing a book. The author should treat the writing not as his primary vocation but as an avocation. There is no equity to the taxpayer to divert taxpayers' funds so that some people can turn their avocations into vocations. Similarly, there is no equity in attempting to saddle one industry, the radio broadcasting industry, with the job of encouraging people to make vocations from music where their talents and the market are such that they can only treat it as an avocation.

THE Massey Commission has picked up and repeated phrases that have been bandied about for years by the proponents of the socialization of broadcasting. One

such phrase suggests that the national system is essential in order to give Canadian radio coverage to outlying districts. Later on the same Massey Commission Report has reiterated a similar group of the sayings of these proponents of socialized radio which state that if there were competitive networks then there would be some areas served only by private stations where important national CBC programs would not be heard because there would be no available outlet, since only private outlets were in such areas. Obviously, both of these statements cannot be true. Either the CBC is necessary to give coverage to these outlying areas or the private stations are giving coverage in these outlying areas. The actual fact of the matter is that the CBC placed its greatest emphasis on early construction by building transmitters in those areas already best served with radio by Canadian Broadcasting stations then operating. For example, the early CBC construction consisted of two stations in Toronto, two in Montreal, one in Quebec, and one in Vancouver. Private enterprise served the outlying districts. It is still private enterprise which principally serves the outlying districts. The CBC was not interested in reaching the outlying districts but was interested in reaching major centres of population and it was interested in placing the burden on the private operator to retransmit their program to the outlying areas.

PRESENT Government policy, at present CBC policy, which is supported by the Massey Commission, does not encourage the CBC to supply television programming in those areas where it is difficult to reach. On the contrary it is encouraging them to establish programming of television in the very markets in Canada where private enterprise would most likely be successful in bringing television to the public. If there is any sincerity in this loud determination to reach the outlying districts the CBC would logically devote its first funds for television in placing television in those areas where private enterprise was least likely to be successful. Supporters of the cur-

rent system of Government-operated radio in Canada talk one way but they encourage action in another way.

If competitive radio network operations were established perhaps it would be reasonable to allow these networks to compete for the time on the station located in the remote areas. No Crown-subsidized corporation would be in a bad position in such competition because they would have some access to taxpayers' money that a privately operated network would not have access to. In any event if the programs are of national need the private operator would in all probability be glad to select the program of national need.

Radio and Education

EDUCATION has generally been recognized as a matter of provincial rights and provincial responsibility. The CBC has taken upon itself the dissemination of educational programs. Many of these are carried on in cooperation with provincial educational bodies. The CBC network using its own stations and using time contributed at no cost by privately-owned affiliated stations transmits a number of programs into schoolrooms. Broadcasting is a mechanism of reaching by voice a large number of schoolrooms simultaneously. The mechanism of receiving is a radio receiving set and in most schools these receiving sets have facilities for reproducing records. It would be far more practical to conduct this type of school education by means of transcriptions; be these transcriptions either the tape recorded variety or the large disc variety. Programs could be then fitted into the curriculum of the school into periods that suited the teacher. There would be no need for fixed study times being devoted to aural education by voice. Both the transmitting of the school programs by record directly to the school and the transmission by talking films should be most thoroughly examined. It performs the same function at no substantial difference in cost for the schools. It makes it more flexible. And it leaves the use of radio broadcasting stations available for the adult public at times when it is now transmitting into schools.

The real field in education of radio broadcasting is the field of extra-curricular adult education. If there is a need for using radio for this mass adult education, and if the need is sufficiently great, it should be subsidized by the taxpayer. Or better still some form of subscription radio should be used for performing that function. That is, placing the burden on the user.

CBC with its sustaining programs is undoubtedly doing an excellent job in serving the minority groups within Canada. The ideal method of support would be to have some form of toll or subscription method of payment of broadcasting. That is, the payment for broadcasting of this nature. In this way the listener who did not like commercial broadcasts and the listener who likes specific cultural programs of minority appeal would by payment of a fee be enabled to tune in to those specific programs, but without payment of a fee he should have available, of course, all of the programs transmitted on commercial radio. The mechanism of such a method would be unusually difficult. If such a method of collection could be developed it would, however, be a tremendous stimulus to CBC or to any other form of radio that was devoted entirely to cultural programs. They would have to render a tremendous public service in order to encourage those people desiring those programs to pay toll for them. If this system operated entirely self-sustained in that manner it would undoubtedly be rendering its greatest public service. That is, the indication of how much people wanted the thing would be determined by how much they paid for it. The same sort of basis upon which one buys a suit of clothes or buys a meal. Some such method as this should be looked forward to as the ultimate method of financing the CBC. As an interim method, however, it might be financed by a grant by Parliament each year. Then its operation would be examined annually and our representatives in Ottawa would be able to determine annually whether the luxury of a culturally operated radio would justify its support or not. And if justified, to what extent it would be justified financially.

JUST so long as the CBC has the power to control private broadcasting stations it is in its interests, in its interest of survival, that it use these regulations in a manner so that privately operated broadcasting cannot look too good in relation to the CBC. Therefore, the performance of private broadcasting is bound to be braked by the CBC. Yet there is need for some regulation in order that there shall be orderly assignment of frequencies and orderly use of these. This entails some regulatory body. This regulatory body might properly be empowered to regulate both CBC and privately operated stations. Its regulations should be as few as are absolutely essential. Its regulations should have no aim at curtailing freedom. No aim at curtailing freedom of speech or freedom of expression or freedom of use.

A Re-Examination of the Massey Report

IN Chapter III on page 24 of the Massey Commission's Report it is stated as follows:

"Advertising was becoming increasingly strident, most of the programs came from sources outside of Canada, and broadcasting stations were concentrated in urban centres leaving other large areas unserved."

This quotation was part of a section dealing with the Aird Commission. I would flatly deny the first part of the quotation, that is, that advertising was becoming increasingly strident. The second portion of the statement that most of the programs came from sources outside Canada is quite inaccurate. In 1929 there were four stations within Canada importing programs from the United States; perhaps there were five, but there were definitely these four—CFRB Toronto, CKGW Toronto, CFCF and CKAC Montreal, and the fifth was perhaps CKOK (later CKLW) in Windsor. This same paragraph then states there were then 62 stations in Canada; 57 stations had no direct connection with the United States networks and they were rarely, if ever, supplied by any programs from the United States networks. Therefore, the statement above quoted is palpably and completely incorrect. In the last part

of this sentence wherein it states "broadcasting stations were concentrated in urban centres leaving other large areas unserved", it is interesting to note that when the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission and its successor the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation first came into operation their first activities were to take over stations in major centres of population. The Canadian National Railways at that time had a few stations; they had one in Vancouver and they had one in the Maritimes. Also, they had one in Ottawa. The Crown corporation to operate broadcasting when it was formed took over these Canadian National Railways broadcasting stations. They immediately closed down the one that was for the purpose of serving rural areas; that was the Canadian National Railway broadcast station in the Maritimes. Their initial expansion did not go to rural areas but their initial expansion concentrated on the large centres of Montreal and Toronto already adequately served. Private enterprise expanded into the hinterland and private enterprise was already substantially in the hinterland. It is unfortunate that statements which are so completely contrary to the facts of the case are being constantly repeated until in the minds of a great number of people they seem to have some semblance of truth.

THE Canadian Broadcasting Corporation became the first great importer of United States programs. It not only depends on United States network programs as the basic programming source for its transmitters in Montreal and Toronto, but it also distributes these programs through wide areas of Canada. Therefore it has greatly expanded the importation of programs from outside sources. It is not suggested that this is wrong—a number of programs *should* be imported and distributed across Canada. But let us get our facts straight. The Massey Report on page 26 in referring to privately-owned broadcasting stations, says:

"And they are a possible outlet for local talent which should be developed but which may not be suitable for network broadcasting."

Only talent which is acceptable for network broadcasting is acceptable to the listening public. That should be obvious. The listening public just will not listen to immature talent which is not suitable and which is not competitive with what they can hear from the network. An operator who attempted to put talent not of network calibre on the air on a station would be unsound in business judgment. He would not encourage listening to the broadcasting station and continuance of such policy too long would inevitably result in failure. Furthermore, the public is entitled to a better fare than unsuitable, immature talent.

ON page 33 of the Massey Report there is the following statement:

"The benefit of a national broadcast to the morale of an artist, it is said, is as important to him as his fee."

Yet the monopoly position of the CBC reduces the field for exploitation of such talent. Presently the CBC is the only means an artist has for having the morale uplift of national network broadcasting. It cannot be argued that this is of benefit to the artist. Nor can it be argued that it is of benefit to the public. It is a thing that is only of benefit to those exponents of bureaucratic control of mass communication. A large portion of the Massey Commission Report on broadcasting and television is concentrated on damning the private industry in broadcasting. Yet the fact of the matter is that public acceptance of the private industry is infinitely greater than it is of the government segment of the industry. Listener statistics throughout Canada show definite public preference for privately-operated broadcasting stations. The CBC fails to recruit substantial numbers of listeners except on imported American commercial programs and some Canadian commercial programs. These commercial programs are not creations of the CBC; the CBC is merely the mechanical vehicle which carries them. Yet these are the only programs which do recruit substantial listening for the CBC. Listening to programs of its own creation is concentrated among very small minority

groups. The evidence of listening is that the public does not damn private broadcasting; it is the minority groups which damn private broadcasting. Unfortunately, some of these minority groups are the most vocal.

ON page 283 of the Massey Commission Report under Chapter XVIII—Radio Broadcasting—the following statement is made:

“This general representation of ninety-three associated stations was supported by operators of twenty stations who appeared individually. Seven other private radio broadcasters supported the present system and advocated no change in principle, one of them remarking, ‘I am less afraid of the C.B.C. as it exists today than of an unbridled radio—much less.’”

It is most remarkable that in a benevolent autocracy such as the one conducted by the CBC in broadcasting only seven broadcasting stations supported the present system. Certainly many more than seven have been in receipt of great favours from the CBC under this system. The unity of the broadcasting industry in this matter is astonishing. It is surprising that 20 stations had the courage of their convictions, in face of the tremendous powers of the CBC, to present strong briefs urging that the CBC’s powers of regulating competing broadcasting stations be removed from them. Under the existing legislation any broadcaster who appeared making such a statement was taking his business life in his hands. Yet, not only as an association did they take their business lives in their hands to plead a case but 20 of them focussed attention on themselves individually by pleading the case.

ON page 283 of the Massey Commission Report the following two paragraphs appear:

“The principal grievance of the private broadcaster is based, it seems to us, on the false assumption that broadcasting in Canada is an industry.”

“But that they enjoy any vested right to engage in broadcasting as an industry, or that they have any status except as part of the National Broadcasting System, is to us inadmissible.”

On the same page it was said further:

“They have no civil right to broadcast or any property rights in broadcasting.”

With these three quotations the Massey Commission, at least the majority of the Massey Commission rejected the whole case of the private broadcasting industry. In fact by the very use of the term “industry” it would seem that each of us in the broadcasting business is practically thrown out of court. I examined in Webster’s dictionary the definition of the word “industry”. The only definition which I can find which relates to the work of people that could possibly apply to broadcasting is the following:

“Industry: Any department of productive activity; particularly, a distinct established business or trade; as, the mining industry; the iron industry.”

Surely, the majority of the members of the Massey Commission have not been so far removed from the field of commerce as to believe seriously that radio broadcasting does not fulfil this definition of industry. Rejecting the definition of broadcasting as an industry, they suggest that broadcasting is not an industry but a public service. This again shows far removal from the fields of commerce. No industry can long survive without subsidization, either private or public, unless that industry is rendering a public service. The public just will not buy it. The most excellent gauge of the measure of public service by business would be an examination of the relative subsidy given to business. The Massey Commission is unstinting in its condemnation of the lack of culture in the programs of privately-operated broadcasting stations. However, they do have a belief that the public gets exactly what the public wants in the other means of mass communication, newspapers. On page 62 they state:

“The limited prominence which it gives to educational, scientific, and cultural matters is no doubt a reflection of the attitude of the reading public of Canada.”

This has reference to the daily press. It recognizes it as right and proper in the publication of a newspaper that the newspaper should cater to the public by giving

the public what it wants. Why then is this wrong in radio? The Massey Commission recognizes the similarity in these two means of mass communication, that is, publication by radio broadcasting and publication by the printed word. For example, in referring to the function of news, discussion, etc., on page 61 they state as follows:

“In recent years this function has been shared with the radio.”

On page 63 in reference to the publishers and facsimile, that is the publishers of newspapers, they state as follows:

“We can also readily understand the apprehension of newspaper men at the thought that this new means of newspaper publication should be subject to the legislation and to the regulations now governing radio broadcasting which, we agree, might not be reconcilable with our traditions of the freedom of the press.”

Then in the recommendations governing radio broadcasting in recommendation No. (j) they state:

“That in any development of newspaper facsimile broadcasting in Canada, government control be limited to the technical control necessary to ensure that broadcasting channels for this purpose are equitably and efficiently assigned.”

These transmissions of course continue to use the Hertzian or ether waves, and like radio broadcasting, facsimile is another mechanism of publishing. Apparently the Massey Commission considers that the citizens in Canada who undertake broadcasting by voice or broadcasting by combination of voice and visual, that is, television, are not responsible citizens, but that the people who undertake broadcasting in Canada by visual means only, are responsible citizens. In fact this is the most shallow currying of favour of the press. That it is recognized for just what it is by the press is evidenced by the almost universal editorial opinion opposing the adoption of the Massey Commission's recommendations on broadcasting. Some

publishers of newspapers are operating broadcasting stations, that is, these same people have means of publishing both by voice on radio and by printed word in newspapers. Yet this same group of people are evidently highly responsible citizens (according to the Massey Commission's Report) when they publish newspapers, but they are apparently irresponsible citizens, requiring tight regulation, when they publish by radio broadcasting. This is not merely contradictory, it is unjust and untrue.

THIS continued, subtle suggestion that the operators of radio broadcasting stations are not responsible citizens; the suggestion that they are not as responsible as the civil servant who is a bureaucrat operating government corporations, is a false concept and a rank injustice. The private broadcaster, according to this prejudiced view, cannot meet the competitive, workaday, business world and perform the functions of the civil servant counterpart and remain a responsible citizen. This is an outrageous and undemocratic philosophy. It certainly is not a philosophy which could possibly have emanated from any people who have made the operation of commerce in all its varied phases a substantial part of their life. It is a theory typical of the socialist state.

The Massey Commission in its Report makes a strong point of the need for Crown-operated network monopoly so as to develop Canadian unity. The Massey Commission ignores the sound commercial fact that is understood by people in the commercial world that the soundest method that business can use to expand its market is to develop and encourage widespread unity of thought.

Competitive, privately-operated network broadcasting, if it is to survive, can become the most powerful individual force in developing national unity. It is the aural parallel of the press, often referred to as the “watchdog of freedom” and a unifying force in any free nation.