

Mr. Rogers: I think I share the concern of all broadcasters. I must quickly say this—and I am not spokesman for the CAB—but the CAB is like a political organization. It overly represents the smaller areas, the rural areas, the small stations and so forth.

The Chairman: About which political organization are you speaking now when you make that comparison?

Mr. Rogers: And it speaks for the small broadcasters and small broadcasters today in small markets are greatly frightened and there is no other word for it.

They see regulations that would increase their cost. They see regulations that would reduce their income. They see tax proposals to treat them on the full rate of tax for the first \$35,000 of earnings.

The small broadcasters in this country are, in my view, frightened people, and the CAB presentation to the CRTC may not have been sophisticated and it may not have said the right things but I think it did honestly reflect the membership representation of small stations, of which I am not one and Mr. Bassett is not one. You can resign, if you will, but it is important to understand what the problem is. These people are frightened.

The Chairman: My last question should properly be put to Mr. Lind. However, I will put it to you and I would like you to answer it because of your own background in politics. There is a great deal of discussion and interest about the possibility of television cameras entering the House of Commons and/or the Senate, committees like this, and so on.

With your experience in broadcasting municipal councils in and around Metro, do the politicians perform differently because they are aware of the presence of the camera?

Mr. Rogers: The first couple of days probably the honest answer is "Yes".

The Chairman: Then they learn to live with it.

Mr. Rogers: Then they learn to live with it and cable is broadcast in black and white and we do not need the lighting. Therefore, we are pretty inconspicuous. We have smaller cameras than the big networks so would have no effect at all.

For a meeting such as this we frankly should be here if we are doing our duty, if you would permit us.

Mr. Lind: May I make a comment, Senator?

The Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Lind: We are playing with a format now, we hope to start perhaps by September, with one Council group meeting in Bramalea. That is, that we will telecast the Council meeting live and then they will tape phone-in questions right after the meeting is over.

In other words, this is a real instant response mechanism. Each individual member will be questioned on why he voted that way and why he said that kind of thing. I think this will be pretty exciting political television.

The Chairman: Maybe fewer candidates for election.

Mr. Fortier: Mr. Rogers, in a talk to the Progress Club of Canada in January, you were quoted as saying—and this is a question supplementary to many of the things which have been said in the last half an hour:

"Cable television is Canada's most powerful means of communication and"—I underline the next few words—"of national unity and it is being given away to Americans."

This is in January, 1970, long after the government edict on foreign control of broadcasting and cable companies.

(a) What did you mean when you said that cable television was Canada's most powerful means of national unity and (b) how in January could you have referred to the systems being given away to Americans?

Mr. Rogers: Well, when you give a long speech, that was about 40 minutes on the microwave issue and many other points, they narrow it down and so forth.

I would like to comment on that. It was not quite in context. As a nationalist, a nationalist in this country has to be not really anti-American as pro-Canadian. Surely in cable it is a perfect example of our own temerity and lack of courage to involve ourselves in this new industry. The industry was given away or taken by the Americans and at the time of the speech, and, I think, as of right this moment, the ownership is still with American interests. It is in the process of transferring by forced regulations with which I agree, but I hope that Canadians could be given some incentive in the future, to not have to pass regulations to take back what we should have had the courage to develop in the first place.