

the CBC, with a much larger market, it is \$70.00. As Mr. Knight indicated, this is discounted on the basis of frequency of use and if the performer is required to work more often, he is guaranteed a certain continuing contract for 13 weeks or 26 weeks and so on, then these rates are discounted.

I merely wish to place on the record, sir, that our opinion is that our rates are not only fair, but they are below standard in many ways.

Mr. Fortier: Have you any evidence, given these answers, which appear to be very clear, have you any evidence that Canadian broadcasters could afford to do more original programming?

Mr. Knight: Well, I think it is probably a question of the whole organization of the private broadcasters. Most of the arguments that they have been presenting to the CRTC, are based on the propositions that each broadcaster has to fend for himself; each broadcaster has to supply all of his own programming which of course, is probably not the truth. A program which can demand a reasonable audience in Winnipeg, so long as it is not an entirely parochial program, can certainly get an audience in Vancouver, Toronto, Montreal, and in Halifax. What has not been looked at is any means of introducing the independent producer into the situation; the producers who will produce independently as an individual and then distribute his program around the broadcast community. This has been done quite frequently which is a perfectly good example, and there are others in the field. Broadcasters themselves have frequently created a program for their own station then distributed them amongst other broadcasters. Most of the arguments that the private broadcasters have been presenting, both to the CRTC and—I don't know what they have been saying here but they probably have been saying something of the same kind of idea—are based on the proposition that each station has to program for itself which is clearly not true. They have never done it with the importation of American programs—you know, they are independent and they pay only their share of the cost of that program; not for the whole part of the program, I think that is something that needs to be looked at very carefully.

The CTV is a perfectly good example. The CTV as we understand it—now, perhaps we are wrong since we haven't really been able to look at the public structure of the CTV—

but the way we understand CTV is that it is, in fact, a co-operative of a number of stations whose function is to provide those stations with programming. There is nothing on that basis that would require CTV to do any better than break even. Since it is a co-operative of the stations, the stations themselves are paying for the cost of CTV. This is a perfectly good example of the type of institution that has to be considered and perhaps looked at and not necessarily through a network, but through some means of strengthening the resources of the broadcasters together in order to provide for their collective program needs. I don't think this aspect of it has been closely looked at at all.

The Chairman: Senator Bourque?

Senator Bourque: I should have spoken before because I would have had more to say but you have just answered one of the questions about the fact that a French artist can go into Vancouver or anywhere. Do you have control over the Province of Quebec?

Mr. Knight: Not it all. No. We have an office, as a matter of fact I live in Montreal myself and we have an office in Montreal, but we are only concerned with English broadcast in Montreal, not the French.

Senator Bourque: Not the French?

Mr. Knight: No. The Union des Artistes is responsible for the French network, both private and public.

Senator Bourque: Well, as you know we have many French weeklies and there are two or three that are devoted to the stage and music. I have been reading these for a long time and I was going to ask a lot of questions along this but there is no use if you don't have any control over the French artists.

Mr. Knight: I am afraid not.

Senator Bourque: Thank you.

The Chairman: May I ask you one question about a piece of rhetoric that is in your brief. At the end of Paragraph 2.3 you are talking about the differences between the United States and Canada and you say:

"There are many differences. There are differences of origin, of language, of culture, of government, of law, of economic organization, of aspiration, differences that have become painfully obvious to