

reducing the spacing from the current 10 kHz to 9 kHz, which would allow us to squeeze more stations into the same frequency band, outweigh the operational and financial penalties to existing AM broadcasters, of switching to a new frequency? Based on concern over the impact on existing stations, Canada has favoured retention of 10 kHz spacing. The U.S.A., however, has responded to a demand for new broadcasting stations and has been pressing vigorously for reducing the channel spacing to 9 kHz. It will take sensitive diplomacy by both Canadian and U.S. officials to keep this issue from disrupting the fine tradition of smooth co-ordination of Canada-U.S. spectrum issues.

**Problems of
program content**

Every time it seems compelling to introduce new communications links across the Canada-U.S. border, it is necessary to consider the likely effects these links will have on our existing institutional infrastructure, objectives for service to the public and opportunities for economic growth. The use of Canadian and U.S. satellites for transborder services would supplement, but could theoretically even supplant, our integrated terrestrial telecommunications links. From the Canadian point of view, this challenges us to devise a framework whereby satellite and terrestrial networks can be integrated. However, the exploitation of satellite technology for carriage functions also implicitly raises questions related to content. Specifically, how can we ensure the continuing viability of the Canadian broadcasting system when challenged by the allure and abundance of seductive U.S. programs? This is a problem that has been with us since the earliest days of radio broadcasting. The problem has remained with us in its essential form through every advance in technology. And it poses itself again when we now consider the use of domestic satellites for communications between Canada and the U.S. As always, it demands imaginative solutions which will satisfy both public demand for access to a variety of available programming, as well as the legitimate cultural policy objectives which sustain our sense of nationhood.

**Telidon and
U.S. market**

Last but not least, there is the "bread and butter" issue in Canada-U.S. communications relations of ensuring that Canadian manufacturers and entrepreneurs get their "fair share" of the North American market. Canadian industry, for example, is working with a number of U.S. counterparts to ensure that the Canadian interactive television system, Telidon, gets the major share of the U.S. market.

Even in the various multilateral communications forums, one usually finds that the most crucial issue for Canada has an important Canada-U.S. element. This is true, for example, at ITU conferences where future national requirements for geostationary orbit positions and space frequencies are at stake, or in the OECD where issues such as transborder data flows are being discussed.

With the interaction of all these national and international elements, some of which are still only suspected rather than clearly understood, it is not surprising that each country's communications requirements and policies are unique. You may even say that, in the case of Canada, our policies are "more unique than others". Canadians want every innovation that appears in the U.S.A. and as quickly as it appears there. But, although the Canadian and U.S. political systems are based on the same democratic principles, the U.S. model is not always the best for Canada in the communica-