

Again I come back to the understanding of the market by the investment community.

The Chairman: How about with your radio stations? I am thinking of announcers for example.

Mr. Campbell: Well, we are not in any of the markets there...

The Chairman: There are no comparable markets?

Mr. Campbell: Well, there is no city or town in which we have a radio station and which there is a cable system, among Maclean-Hunter's associated...

The Chairman: I was thinking of...

Mr. MacGregor: Other than Toronto.

The Chairman: Well, I wasn't thinking of Toronto but that is a good example. I was thinking of Orillia.

Mr. Campbell: Well, we really have nothing to do with the Orillia situation.

The Chairman: Well, you own half its cable and radio?

Mr. Campbell: It is a pure investment in the radio which we are attempting to divest ourselves of or dispose of.

Mr. Switzer: Senator, there is a kind of technical field in which Cable TV in general, and the broadcast industry in general will cooperate to the general public benefit and that is in the field of UHF Broadcasting. UHF had traditionally been looked on by broadcasters as a kind of second-rate broadcasting service. It has never been considered that the use of UHF channels were attractive to broadcasters. But where cable television has got any kind of reasonable saturation or coverage—as far as the subscriber is concerned it is all the same to him whether he gets UHF or VHF—in many situations the presence of a healthy cable system is going to make the use of UHF television channel economically viable; whereas if there were not cable, it would probably delay considerably the use of UHF spectrum in Canada.

Mr. Fortier: Which may be used to reach the rural communities whereof you spoke?

Mr. Switzer: The presence of a cable system in a dense urban area makes the use of the UHF channel economically practical and the side benefit is that you are covered to rural areas.

Senator Prowse: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: There is one supplementary question from Senator Prowse and is yours a supplementary question, Senator Bourque, or is it a new question?

Senator Bourque: It is a new subject.

The Chairman: Well, then, Senator Prowse.

Senator Prowse: Mr. Switzer, I know the UHF comes after Channel 13 on the dial. When you are down in the States, you have to play around with the dial—would you mind explaining to me what the difference is between UHF and VHF?

Mr. Switzer: It is comparable, Senator, to the difference between standard broadcast waves and short waves.

The UHF channels have a higher frequency and much shorter wave lengths. They, in a technical nature, behave much similar to microwaves—they don't propagate as far, they don't go past the horizon nearly as easily. The main difference really is not a shortcoming in the waves themselves because they are not so drastically different from the VHF.

I would take the personal technical view that the principal disability in the use of UHF is not really the fault of the UHF waves themselves but the shortcomings in the ordinary home receiver.

All of the receivers sold in Canada up until about a year ago had no facilities to receive them without a converter.

Senator Prowse: Yes.

Mr. Switzer: Where a receiver is provided that has a good quality UHF facility in it, which both works well technically and is very easy to use, the FCC in the United States in their tests—large scale tests in New York City—showed fairly conclusively that UHF television stations can achieve satisfactory coverage.

In a strictly technical sense it is a minor shortcoming but the major shortcoming is in the television set in the home.

Senator Prowse: Let me put it in a way that maybe we could all understand. Do you have to have a little bit more direct reception to get UHF than the other?

Mr. Switzer: Well, I am trying to recall the details of this FCC report which has been