

Research Article

From Canada to Brazil: a Model of Society's Participation in Communication Policy Debate?

Edgard Rebouças, Federal University of Espirito Santo (Brazil)¹

Abstract

This study observes and analyses how Canada and Brazil are experiencing similar situations with respect to communications issues. Understanding that public hearings are the ideal *locus* for debating specific public policies, the Royal Commissions of Inquiry targeted at the cultural and media industries sectors were chosen as *corpus* for analysis. The intention here is to do more than merely describe those commissions' activities; instead, it is to explore their unfolding, attempting to identify the interplay of the relations and interests involved. This study adopts the theoretical perspectives of Political Economy of Communications and of Cultural and Media Industries. The article proposal assumes that the Canadian model of public hearings might be applied to Brazil. Its conclusions indicate a crisis in which society in general has no interest in joining debates on media-related issues, reflecting the State's failure to defend the public interest and a strong private lobby to influence those debates results.

Keywords: Canada, Brazil, royal commissions, social actors, communications policies

¹ The author would like to acknowledge the support of the International Council of Canadian Studies (ICCS) and the Research and Postgraduate Office (PRPPG-UFES), as well as the contributions of the professionals of Library and Archives Canada (LAC), in Ottawa.

Introduction

In 1990, professor Marc Raboy published *Missed opportunities: the story of Canada's broadcasting policy*, a book that provides critical insight into not only the history of Canadian communications policies between 1928 and 1988 but also the interplay between public and private interests in that country. The book primarily described how society and government missed a series of opportunities to establish a radio and television system that would have prioritised the public interest. The first advocates of Canadian broadcasting believed that the broadcast media might be used to ensure culture, sovereignty, diversity and identity, particularly in the face of large companies and Canada's large neighbour to the South. In fact, on the occasion of the debate on the first broadcast-media regulation in 1932, the founder of the *Canadian Radio League*, Grahan Spry, commented:

It is a choice between commercial interests and people's interests. It is a choice between the State and the United States (Canada, 1932, p. 46).

In a study entitled *Pressure and interest groups in communications strategies and policies: a case study with social actors in Brazil and Canada* (Rebouças, 2003), Brazil and Canada were observed to have much more in common than not with regard to communications, especially with respect to radio- and television-related policies. This observation can be tested once again, during the discussion of a possible regulatory framework for the Brazilian media. For the first time ever, issues such as the democratisation of communication, social control, ownership concentration, children advertising, internet regulation and media content are gaining traction in the public sphere.

Another possibility is that all these debates and advances toward a possible democratization of the media in Brazil be silent or filed forever. The election of the far-rightist Jair Bolsonaro to the Presidency of the Republic at the end of 2018, as well as a conservative majority for the Brazilian Parliament, may cause the participation of society in the discussions on communications policies to return in history to a similar scenario of the period of the civil-military dictatorship that lasted from 1964 to 1995. In other words: none.

In 2009, the government called society to participate in the 1st National Conference on Communication (Confecom), whose theme was “Communication: a method of building rights and citizenship in the digital age”. After six months of regional discussions, 1,684 delegates representing companies in the sector, civil society and government met in Brasilia for four days of discussions and debates on 6,084 proposals gathered from every part of Brazil. The goal was to define proposals to be presented as public policies to the Executive and the National Congress. Since that time, however, almost none of the 633 final recommendations were taken into account by these authorities.

There was a constant expectation that the Federal Government may reopen discussions on this theme. However, the adoption of a policy of “non-policy” is a matter of concern because the issue involves a number of interests and strong pressure by media groups.

The goal of this study is to observe and understand how Canada experienced situations similar to those occurring in Brazil. Understanding that public hearings are the ideal *locus* for debating specific public policies, the Royal Commissions, which are heirs to the British model created to aid the Executive and/or the Legislature in addressing themes not customary in those bodies’ routine activities, were chosen as the *corpus* for analysis.

More than describing their motivations and activities, the intention here is also to explore their unfolding, attempting to identify the interplay of relations and interests, both explicit and backstage in the public hearings and sectorial meetings of each Royal Commission targeted at the field of communications. To this end, primary sources referring to each of those commissions (available in the Ottawa's *Library and Archives Canada* collection) were consulted along with secondary sources such as scientific articles and books related to committees associated with the sector.

This study’s proposal assumes that the Canadian model for public hearings, with the participation of various social actors, might be applied to Brazil, given the countries’ similar mixed-radio broadcast systems, continental dimensions and cultural diversity. The working dynamics of public hearings and the reports of expert commissions may be structurally effective in Brazil, despite criticism made of the results of some Canadian cases.

The key question of this study is to attempt to ascertain how interventions by different social actors were absorbed by the expert commissions in writing their reports.

The Royal Commission of Inquiry

The British tradition of assigning an expert commission to address a specific theme has its origin in the publication of the *Domesday Book*, in August 1086. In that case, a survey was commissioned by King William I to learn the number and production of rural properties in England with the goal of determining the value of public taxes. Despite the model's perfection over the centuries, the principle has remained the same and has endured in all British colonies.

The first Canadian Royal Commission dates from 1868 to 1870. Its goals were to analyse and propose procedures for public service. The definition most often used by administration scholars is that of John Courtney²:

A royal commission of inquiry is an ad hoc, advisory organisation of one or more commissioners, appointed by the Governor in Council to investigate, study and report upon a matter of immediate concern, that matter having been assigned to it by the Cabinet of the day; the term "royal" has been retained because of the executive nature of the appointment. Such power and authority as is granted to royal commissions for the conduct of their investigation is contained in the Inquiries Act... The government is in no sense bound to enact legislatively any or all of the recommendations presented by a royal commission in its report(s); with the presentation of its final report a royal commission ceases to exist. (cited by Henderson, 1967, p. xi).

John E. Hodgetts, who is considered the father of studies on public administration in Canada, classifies royal commissions into four categories (Hodgetts, 1951, p. 354):

1. *Those that investigate catastrophic incidents;*

² John Courtney (1964), *Canadian Royal Commissions of Inquiry, 1946-1962: an investigation of an executive instrument of inquiry*. (Ph.D. thesis), Duke University, p. 14.

2. *Those that analyse matters of national relevance connected to social and cultural issues;*
3. *Those that investigate problems related to the commercial, financial and economic system; and*
4. *Those created to investigate matters related to the government administration itself.*

In the case of commissions linked to the communications sector because of the peculiarities of the media and cultural industries, there are overlapping characteristics that fit three of Hodgetts's categories:

Years	Name	Chairperson	Categories
1917-1920	Commission to inquire into and report upon the manufacture, sale, price and supply of newsprint in Canada	Robert A. Pringle	3 and 2
1928-1929	Royal Commission on radio broadcasting	John Aird	2, 4 and 3
1949-1951	Royal Commission on national development in the arts, letters and sciences	Vincent Massey	2, 4 and 3
1954-1957	Royal Commission on patents, copyright, trademarks and industrial designs	James L. Ilsley	3 and 2
1955-1957	Royal Commission on broadcasting	Robert M. Fowler	3, 2 and 4
1960-1961	Royal Commission on publications	Michael G. O'Leary	3 and 2
1980-1981	Royal Commission on newspapers	Thomas W. Kent	2 and 3
1985-1986	Task Force on broadcasting policy	Gerald L. Caplan & Florian Sauvageau	2, 3 and 4

Royal commissions have the advantage of placing specific themes on the active public agenda, thus at least raising societal awareness that such issues are being discussed. They are a way of democratising themes, which normally would be restricted to deliberations inside of the administration or in the hermetic sessions

of Parliament. Courney & Smith (2010, p. 13) recall that Royal Commissions' public hearings represented society's only voice during a time when referendums were extremely rare in Canada.

However, the excessive power of the prime minister and his cabinet over commissions' deliberations and the fact that some parliamentary activities lost their functions gave rise to criticism; commissions were said to be expensive and used as diversion from other problems (Doern, 1967, p. 417). Another criticism is that there is a measure of favouritism when appointing commissioners and that given the quasi-judicial character of Commissions, aside from the economic implications entailed by their recommendations, most chairpersons are either legal experts or businessmen. The same is observed in the case of the commissions for the communications sector.

Commissions for media and cultural industries

As shown in the preceding box, the Canadian government used the mechanism of specific commissions for matters related to the media and cultural industries eight times, covering the following sectors: press, radio, television, cinema, books and magazines.

This distinction, which treats communications activities as having such vital importance to society that they deserve specific debate in Royal Commissions, shows how seriously Canada has taken the matter throughout its history. Even with all of the potential criticism of how commissions are carried out, merely making the discussion public is a large step forward. In Brazil, for example, the issue of communications as the object of debate is almost taboo, as shown by the delay in calling the 1st National Conference on Communication in 2009, whereas for many years, other issues have enjoyed more open treatment, as has been the case with Healthcare, for which the first conference was held in 1941. Even so, the 1st Confecom was the target of sharp criticism, boycotts and even sabotage by the country's major media groups.

According to Marc Raboy (1990, p. xii), Canada's establishment of commissions specific to the broadcast system, but still applicable to other sectors of media and cultural industry, results from an interaction between:

- 1) Popular pressure for public service;

- 2) Pressure from financial interests to continue broadcasting in the commercial sector; and
- 3) The political project of maintaining “Canada” as an entity distinct from the United States and united against the periodic threat of disintegration posed by Quebec.

In Brazil, except for actions from some pressure groups such as the National Forum for Democratisation of Communications (FNDC) and the Intervozes collective, society is completely passive and uninterested towards the debates on communications system. This is mainly due to the long authoritarian periods that prevented the population from participating in the discussions on public policies, as well as the strong proximity of the media owners of the governments, not allowing any type of regulation for the sector. Brazil is quite similar to Canada with respect to item 2), and the State has almost completely omitted to propose a political project for the sector.

Next, we describe and analyse the interest relations at stake in each Royal Commission created in Canada during the past century. Like most other Commissions, they were named after their chairpersons. This tradition comes from the importance given to the person appointed by the Regent and the prime minister.

Pringle Commission—1917-1920

This commission was created due to a provocation by the *Canadian Newspaper Association*, which on January 24th, 1917, sent a letter to the government regarding an excessive increase in the price of paper by Canadian manufacturers and suppliers. This increase in cost, approximately 71% for city-based and 62% for countryside presses, posed a risk to the continued provision of newspaper service. Publishers claimed that they were forced to increase newspapers’ prices, which might be damaging to a public that was eager for information during wartime³.

The government recognised manufacturers’ high profits and mediated a deal between the parties, but the deal never took effect. Facing a power struggle against and between companies, while

³ Canada played an important role in World War I, fighting in Europe as part of the forces of the British Empire. According to *Statistics Canada*, the number of Canadian casualties was 56,638.

understanding that the significance of the issue was not only commercial but also socially relevant, the Ministry of Finance fixed the prices of newspapers and requested the creation of the *Commission to Inquire into and Report Upon the Manufacture Sale, Price and Supply of News Print Paper Within Canada*. Its goal was to investigate the production of cellulose and paper and to set a fair price for newspapers' main input material.

Attorney Robert Abercrombie Pringle (1855-1922), who had been a Conservative representative between 1900 and 1908 and had no connection to the print paper or newspaper sectors, was invited to chair the commission. Between November 9th, 1917, and March 17th, 1920, 16 public hearings took place, each of which lasted between one and three days. Eleven of the hearings took place in Ottawa, three in Toronto and two in Montreal. Most of the attendees were directors of companies connected to the two sides involved. A portion of the public hearings convened in the capital was also attended by the ministers of Finance, Justice, Public Construction, Immigration and Colonisation.

Pringle also travelled to Washington, where he met with members of the *Federal Trade Commission* because the American market was the largest buyer of Canadian cellulose and paper. One of the arguments made by Canadian paper businessmen was that it would be more advantageous to export to the United States than to supply Canada's newspaper market, which consumed only 10% of national production.

During this period, questionnaires were sent to cellulose and paper producers inquiring about production volume, capital, investments, expenditures, revenue, exports, profit, personnel and so on. In his *Interim Report*⁴ of January 18th, 1918, Pringle wrote that it had initially been difficult to consolidate the responses but that all of the producers had responded. The commissioner also ascertained that Canada had 122 daily newspapers in English and French, three in Hebrew, two in Chinese and one in Japanese; newspapers in languages other than English and French were not included in his analysis. At the time, Canada's daily newspapers consumed approximately 83,000

⁴ The public archives contain no record of the final Pringle report. The *Interim Report* was protocoled in the *House of Commons* on March 20th, 1918, as *Sessional Paper no. 64/1918*, but it was not printed in that year's *Sessional Papers* issue. The document available at the *Library and Archive Canada* is the original 28 page typewritten report.

tons of news print paper; national production was slightly more than 800,000 tons (Pringle, 1918, p. 10).

The partial report concluded that newspaper prices should not remain fixed for long because price-fixing might cause Canadian manufacturers to suffer additional losses relative to their American competitors. The report concluded that the cellulose and paper business should be included in the category of public utility goods. It also concluded that during wartime, newspapers should cut costs.

These procedures and their reports are the first record of the historical international dispute over the newspaper industry that would be fought throughout the 20th century. The conceptual issue linking support and content could never be neglected solely for economic reasons.

In the case of the Pringle Commission, the categories proposed by Hodgetts (1951) are clearly ordered: first is category 3, which investigates problems related to the commercial, financial and economic system because the Commission weighed the interests of print paper manufacturers against those of news companies; a distant second is category 2, which analyses relevant matters connected to social and cultural issues because the Commission's recommendations might have influenced the access to information about the war or other themes, which might have gone unprinted due to the reduced number of newspaper pages.

Aird Commission—1928-1929

The 1920s were very active in terms of communications innovations, the most important of those innovations being the radio. Officially, radio technology had been used since early that century for military purposes, for sending messages and even by groups of friends, but when radio started being used for commercial, entertainment or ideological purposes, it became necessary to discuss regulation.

In Canada, the discussion was triggered in March 1928 when the Ministry of Marine and Fisheries refused to authorise annual requests for license renewal by four radio broadcasters controlled by the *International Bible Students' Association*, which was connected to Jehovah's Witnesses. In his justification, minister Arthur Cardin argued that the content of the broadcasters' transmissions was "unpatriotic and abusive" to other religions (Bird, 1988, p. 37). The

result was a series of protests in the Parliament alleging of censorship, authoritarianism and curtailment of the freedom of expression.

To calm tempers and to guide future actions, liberal prime minister William Lyon Mackenzie King opted to resort to a commission of inquiry and, on December 6th of that year, created the *Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting*, chaired by Sir John Aird (1885-1938), president of the *Canadian Bank of Commerce*. Aird was assisted by the editor of the *Ottawa Citizen* newspaper, Charles A. Bowman, and the director of the *École Polytechnique de Montréal*, Augustin Frigon.

The Commission had three missions in addition to the issue of radio content: 1) to study and make a recommendation regarding the option between a public system, as in Europe, or a commercial one, as in the United States; 2) to take a stand regarding cultural imperialism through radio waves from Canada's large Southern neighbour; and 3) to find a way to safeguard "bilingual" cultural diversity.

The characteristics of the Commission members themselves indicated the interests that would be at stake. Two years earlier, Bowman had been in London with Mackenzie King. The two visited the *British Broadcasting Corporation* (BBC) and returned to Canada as one of the main advocates of the public system (Raboy, 1990, p. 23). Frigon was one of Canada's foremost specialists in radio and represented the interests of Quebec, whereas Aird, due to his career, represented private interests, as illustrated in his favourite literary quote: "Some men worship rank, some worship heroes, some worship power, some worship God and that over these ideals they dispute and cannot unite—but that they all worship money"⁵.

Speaking of money, the Aird Commission was one of the most expensive thus far, spending CAD \$ 41,902.99⁶ (Henderson, 1967, p. 117). To become acquainted with other models, the commissioners travelled to New York and to nine cities in Europe. To give a voice to the Canadian citizen, they conducted public hearings and meetings in 25 cities across the country⁷, received 124 written manifests and

⁵ Excerpt from Mark Twain (*Concerning the Jews*, 1898).

⁶ According to the inflation calculator of the *Bank of Canada*, this amount would correspond to CAD \$ 599,850.41 in 2018.

⁷ British Columbia-6, Alberta-2, Saskatchewan-4, Manitoba-2, Ontario-6, Quebec-4, New Brunswick-2, Nova Scotia-2 and Prince Edward Island-1. These logistics

recorded 164 persons who stated their positions orally. Most of those speeches - 28% - were delivered by representatives of radio broadcasters (commercial, amateur, educational or religious); the next largest group of speeches were delivered by citizens/listeners, with 23%. The remaining representatives at the hearings were from advertisement companies, churches, schools, universities, city halls and people working in the sector.

On September 11th, 1929, after nine months of work, the Commission delivered its final, 28 page report, of which only nine pages contained analyses and recommendations. The other pages consisted of appendices with data about the situation in other countries, an overview of Canada's broadcasting companies in Canada and lists of participants in the public hearings (Aird, 1929).

Out of the 13 recommendations presented in the summary, those that best summarize the Commission's work are the first and the last:

a) That broadcasting should be placed on a basis of public service and that the stations providing a service of this kind should be owned and operated by one national company; that provincial authorities should have full control over the programs of the station or stations in their respective areas;

[...]

m) That the licensing of stations and such other matters prescribed in the Radiotelegraph Act and Regulations issued thereunder for the control of radio stations in general should remain within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; that that authority should continue to be responsible for the collection of license fees and the suppression of inductive interference causing difficulties with radio reception. (Aird, 1929, pp. 12-13)

Since then, all other Commissions that have deliberated on the theme of broadcasting have continually restated the system's basic principle: "it is a public service" (Tremblay, 1986, p. 40). In terms of

permitted opinions to be more democratically heard because there was no concentration in the largest cities of one or two provinces.

management, therefore, there are three models: public/state, private and community.

According to Romanov & Soderlund (1992, p. 131), conservative prime minister Robert B. Bennett understood, as did many other Canadians, that private companies would have no interest in offering their services in commercially unattractive markets or to areas with low population density—which describes most of Canada.

The Aird Commission might fit three types set forth in Hodgetts's (1951) categorisation: (2) because it dealt with radio content and defence of the natural culture; (4) because it suggested that a public body be created for the sector reinforced the government's role as granting authority; and (3) because it interfered with the private system and suggested norms for advertisement.

The Aird Commission's report inspired that which three years later would become the Broadcasting Act; however, between the first published report in 1929, and the second, on May 16th, 1932, Canadians witnessed one of the greatest power struggles between pressure and interest groups in the media and cultural industries. The key issue was the adoption of the public model of radio broadcasting, as recommended by the Aird Report, or the commercial model, which had already been adopted by most broadcasters active at the time. On one side was the newly created *Canadian Radio League*, headed by young journalists Graham Spry & Alan Plaunt; on the other side was the *Canadian Association of Broadcasters* (CAB), founded in 1926 by the private broadcasting companies, which primarily broadcast content from the United States. This public debate—which took place in press articles, Parliament meetings, Justice sessions and pamphlet distribution—owes much to what began in the public hearings of the Aird Commission.

Massey Commission—1949-1951

Twenty years after the first Royal Commission was created to debate matters related to radio broadcasting, a new, more powerful, soon-to-arrive technology demanded the definition of clear policies for the sector. Television was a much greater threat than radio to cultural identity and sovereignty. Although World War II had delayed its accelerated development, post-war American society was breeding a true *tele boom*, which had a direct effect on Canadians, the majority of

whom lived along the border and were susceptible to the direct reception of signals broadcast from United States.

In addition to the fear of cultural invasion through content, there was a need to again discuss the model of television management—whether public or private—and its method of distribution to cover the vast Canadian territory. Liberal prime minister Louis St. Laurent, however, opted to broaden the discussion to cover other themes that also were related to the concern over cultural identity. Accordingly, on April 8th, 1949, the *Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences* came into being. The preamble of a report delivered two years later summarises the Commission's objectives quite well:

That it is desirable that the Canadian people should know as much as possible about their country, its history and traditions; and about their national life and common achievements; that it is in the national interest to give encouragement to institutions that express national feeling, promote common understanding and adopt the variety and richness of Canadian life, rural as well as urban (Massey, 1951, p. 4).

The Commission had a very daring scope because it was to cover themes connected to radio, television, cinema, press, music, theatre, dance, painting, sculpture, literature, publishing, architecture, urban planning, folklore, craftsmanship, indigenous arts, galleries, museums, libraries, public archives, historical sites, universities, academic scholarships and scientific research, along with Canada's relationship with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) and Canada's international projection into the cultural field.

To head this endeavour, entrepreneur and diplomat Vincent Massey⁸ (1887-1967) was appointed chairman; he was assisted by Montreal's civil engineer Arthur Surveyer, professor and dean of the *University of British Columbia* Norman Mackenzie, Dominican priest

⁸ Vincent Massey, heir and former president of the *Massey-Harris* (later *Massey-Ferguson*) farming machinery manufacturing company, represented Canada in the Washington and London embassies between 1926 and 1946, went to college with prime minister Mackenzie King and was the first general-governor of Canada (1952-1959) born in the country.

and founder of the School of Social Sciences of the *Université Laval* Georges-Henri Lévesque⁹ and educator and historian Hilda Neatby.

Although the Aird Commission had been considered expensive in its time, the Massey Commission cost the public treasury CAD \$ 287,101.00¹⁰, having conducted public hearings in 16 cities between August 3rd, 1949, and July 8th, 1950: commissioners met 224 times (114 times in public sessions), received 263 manifests, commissioned 37 studies and had approximately 1,200 people participate in their activities.

Due to the number of interests involved in the themes addressed by the Royal Commission, there was a large diversity of pressure groups in the public hearings, and the oral or written manifests did not receive much further attention. However, television was one of the most discussed issues, primarily due to the presence in the sessions of a large number of private broadcasters along with the almost constant presence of representatives from the *Canadian Association of Broadcasters* (CAB). The counterpoint in defence of the public interest was made by entities such as the *Canadian Association for Adult Education*, the *Federated Women's Institutes of Canada* and the *Confédération des travailleurs catholiques du Canada*.

The final 517 page report, accompanied by a volume of more than 430 pages, which contained 28 studies conducted especially for the Commission, was delivered on July 1st, 1951, to the *House of Commons*. Its primary recommendations on issues connected to the communications sector included the following:

- Radio—Retained its prevalence in the public system, but recognised the importance of having the private sector act at a nation-wide level.
- Television—Even without comprehending the importance television would come to have, the report concluded that the American commercial model failed to meet Canada's needs and that the system for concessions and control of television would be similar to the one for radio.
- Cinema—Strengthened the role of the *National Film Board* in producing films and documentaries of public interest, provided

⁹ Due to the importance of the role he played in this period, some authors refer to the "Massey-Lévesque" Commission.

¹⁰ CAD \$ 2,711,329.63 in 2018.

room for experimentation and collaboration with the private movie industry without, however, providing financing.

- Newspapers and magazines—The Commission opted not to make specific recommendations for this sector, but expressed concern about the number of American publications circulating in the country.
- Books—There were no recommendations for this sector either, but the editorial market's manifesto regarding production costs—which made them less competitive against imported editions—was noted.
- Music—Special attention was given to national production, which should be fostered by increasing the number of concerts and festivals and by featuring Canadian bands in radio and television programs broadcast by the *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation* (CBC). The Commission also recognised the hardships faced by Canadian record companies as a consequence of the large number of albums imported from the United States and England.

One noteworthy detail was the fact that a member of the Royal Commission requested that his “reservations and observations” regarding the final report be published. Over the course of 18 pages, engineer Arthur Surveyer expressed his support for the Canadian Association of Broadcasters’ (CAB) demands for the creation of an “independent body of regulation” for private broadcasting because he understood that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation’s (CBC) *Board of Governors* was partial and favoured the public sector.

The Massey Commission fits into three of the categories suggested by John Hodgetts (1951): (2) because it addressed a number of themes connected to national culture; (4) because it strengthened the role of State bodies in controlling the communication and culture system; and (3) because it took a stand on the issue of the market, maintaining policies in the public interest.

Ilsley Commission—1954-1960

Market dynamics evolved intensely in the post-war period and one point deserving of renewed attention was that of intellectual property. Canada already had intellectual property regulations beginning in the 1920s, but they were outdated. Because the subject implied a great deal of complexity and detail, state secretary John W. Pickersgill opted to convene a Royal Commission on June 10th, 1954.

James Lorimer Ilsley (1903-1967), who was a former liberal congressman, a former Minister of Justice and a former Attorney-General of Canada, was appointed as chairman, assisted by Guy Favreau and W.W. Buchanan. The Commission conducted 40 public hearings between November 15th, 1954, and December 1st, 1955, all of them in Ottawa; in addition, the Commission met with experts in London, The Hague, Paris, Bern and Washington. The total cost of the Commission's work was CAD \$ 42,172.00¹¹.

The goal of the Ilsley Commission was to question how existing legislation on copyright, brands, patent and industrial design incentivised creativity, research and the development of artistic and literary talent, along with how to guarantee Canadians access to scientific, technologic, literary and artistic creations.

The Ilsley Commission's work was carried out separately for each area, with copyright studies given a place of privilege. The themes discussed by the Royal Commission (other than rights over literary works, plays, musicals and the visual arts) included collective works in radio, television and cinema, along with their retransmission.

The Ilsley Commission's reports were delivered as each part was completed; specifically, the report on Copyright was presented to the *House of Commons* on June 10, 1958, the report on Industrial Design was presented on August 8th, 1958, and the report on Patent of Inventions was presented on April 4th, 1960.

Barbara A. Ringer (1958, p. 217) wrote that the Ilsley Commission collaborated to further the discussion of conflicting issues related to copyright, specifically, "the theory that copyright is a 'natural right' of property, and the opposing theory that copyright is a privilege conferred by a state to encourage creation".

Among Hodgetts's (1951) categories, the work of the Ilsley Commission would be classified under the following items: (3), for dealing foremost with issues connected to the payment of rights and public financing of works; and (2) because the Commission's work indirectly incentivises more authors to pursue artistic or scientific careers.

¹¹ CAD \$ 388,854.01 in 2017.

Fowler Commission—1955-1957

The television-related tensions remaining after the Massey Commission were aggravated during the 1950s, when they gained strength within society, primarily by the influence of events in the United States. To properly address points that had been left wanting by the previous Royal Commission, on December 2nd, 1955, liberal prime minister Louis St. Laurent appointed the *Royal Commission on Broadcasting*.

The president of the *Canadian Pulp and Paper Association*, Robert MacLaren Fowler (1906-1980), was appointed to coordinate the Commission, assisted by the president of the *Canadian Bank of Commerce*, James Stewart, and by journalist and diplomat Edmond Turcotte, who was Canada's delegate to UNESCO. The Commission also consulted with Dallas Smythe, who offered his ten years of experience as an economist at the (U.S.) *Federal Communications Commission* (FCC) and as a research director at the (U.S.) *National Association of Educational Broadcasters*.

This time, the goals were quite focused on establishing CBC policies, specifically, on analyses and proposals related to how the CBC should be financed and managed, its programming and its signal distribution. There was also a specific point regarding the private sector model of concessions and control. In most of the meetings, the issue of how to finance the system received the greatest amount of attention.

The public hearings took place in 12 cities (Ottawa, Winnipeg, Regina, Vancouver, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Toronto, Halifax, Charlottetown, Fredericton, Quebec City and Montreal) between April 30th and October 12th, 1956. The Commission also received 274 written commentaries. According to George Henderson (1967, p. 162), despite the fact that this Commission lasted only 15 and one-half months, the government spent CAD \$ 328,509.00¹² on its work.

Once again, the social actors most prominent in the discussions were radio and television businessmen. Their main point of concern was the definition of an independent regulatory body. Voices in defence of the public interest also remained the same: the *Canadian Labour Congress* and the *Canadian Association for Adults Education*

¹² CAD \$ 2,867,521.86 in 2017.

were particularly noteworthy. Additionally, many oral and written manifests were presented by the citizenry.

The final report of the Fowler Commission, supplemented with the special study by Dallas Smythe¹³, was submitted to the *House of Commons* in March 28th, 1957. The report emphasised financial problems, which sparked the following commentary by Marc Raboy (1990, p. 127) on the pervasiveness of broadcasting:

The Aird commission had observed this as threefold: "education in the broad sense... providing entertainment and... informing the public the public on questions of national interest". The Massey commission had expressed the function of broadcasting in similar terms: "Radio in any democratic country has three main functions: to inform, to educate and to entertain". Fowler revised this formulation significantly, adding a fourth function: to sell goods.

In the opinion of Romanov and Soderlund (1992, p. 140), the final report essentially stated that the private sector had succumbed to market pressures and the convenience of importing. It was much more profitable to retransmit American programs than to produce Canadian content.

However, the Fowler Commission's primary recommendation was to create another regulatory body in addition to the one bound to the CBC, the latter of which would continue to exist. This proposal refers to the *Board of Broadcast Governors* (BBG), bound to Parliament, which has power over the entire system. The final report served as the basis for many points addressed in the 1958 *Broadcasting Act*, and in 1965, entrepreneur Robert Fowler was invited to resume work on the theme and coordinate a Consultative Committee with Parliament. That Committee did not have the power of a Royal Commission, but it did gather written and oral manifests from several entities. The primary final proposal led not only to the creation of the *Canadian Radio-Television Commission* (CRTC) in 1968 but also to the passage of a new *Broadcasting Act*.

The Fowler Commission fits within three of the categories proposed by Hodgetts (1951): (3) because it dedicated itself almost

¹³ Smythe, D. W. (1957). *Basic tables: television and radio programmes analysis* [Ottawa, Queen' Printer] xiv, 257 xii.

exclusively to the issue of financing the broadcasting system; (2) because it covered themes such as radio and television programming contents; and (4) because it involved State deliberation in the creation of a regulatory body for the sector, aside from suggesting management alternatives to the CBC.

O’Leary Commission—1960-1961

Another theme that was explored by the Massey Commission but deserved greater attention was that of printed publications - i.e., newspapers, magazines and books. At the beginning of the 1950s, a warning had been given that Canada’s editorial market was being invaded by material from the United States; the industry continued to lose ground in the following years. The foremost concern was economic because Canadian publishers could not compete with the prices of its large Southern neighbour, and advertisers were routing their marketing budgets to American magazines sold to the Canadian public. However, there was also a cultural aspect because printed publications’ informational and fictional contents were related to another country.

In this context, on September 16th, 1960, the progressive-conservative government of John Diefenbaker created the *Royal Commission on Publications*. The president of the *Ottawa Journal*, Michael Grattan O’Leary (1889-1976), who had experience with newspapers and magazines in Canada, the United States and England, was invited to be its chairman. Other members of the commission included John George Johnston, representing the *Canadian Community Newspaper Association*, and Claude P. Beaubien, vice-president of Public Relations and Marketing of the *Aluminum Company of Canada* (Alcan).

The main focus of the Commission was on magazines, with the goal of analysing the competition from foreign publications and making recommendations on appropriate measures that would guarantee the local market’s self-sufficiency, strengthening national identity and the national interest without interfering with the freedom of the press or creating a Canadian monopoly.

In its editorial column, *L’Action nationale* magazine presented survey data from the *Financial Post*¹⁴ on the asymmetric relationship

¹⁴*Financial Post*, November 19th, 1960, p. 1.

between the two countries in the case of the magazine market and noted several issues:

The numbers tell a great deal about the importance of the cultural colonisation of Canada by the United States. In 1959, American magazines sold almost 163 million copies, whereas Canadian magazines sold only 46 million. Of every five magazines sold in Canada, four are American. In 1959, the total circulation of American business magazines and journals was 1,220,000 copies, representing 1,500 different publications. What can poor Canadian magazines do? How can they respond to reduced-price subscriptions offered by American magazines? It is difficult to deny that there is a cultural offensive by the United States when we know that Washington's secretary-general of the Postal Service has advocated the exportation of magazines and newspapers to Canada at a lower price than what is charged in the United States, as follows: "We must encourage the press to enter the global market because the press diffuses American culture, its facts and ideas, abroad". Approximately 75% of American print publications that are exported arrive in Canada. Consequently, the Canadian mail handles eight tons of American publications for each ton of Canadian publications (L'Action Nationale, 1960, p. 403-404).

To address this complexity, the Commission conducted hearings in Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, Halifax, Winnipeg, Regina and Quebec. There were 188 written manifests and 300 oral ones. Most of the people heard were representatives of publishers, business associations or workers connected to the magazine and advertisement sectors. The only testimony heard from the civil society was from *The Catholic Women's League of Canada*, the *Canadian Labour Congress* and the *Canadian Institute of Adult Education*. According to a survey by Henderson (1967, p. 169), CAD \$ 136,121.00¹⁵ was spent by the Commission until its conclusion on May 25th, 1961.

The recommendations of the O'Leary Commission filled 22 pages of its 267 page final report and were divided into three categories: advertisement, circulation and special remarks. To summarise the Commission's advertisement recommendations, it was suggested that Canadian products and services be advertised only in

¹⁵ CAD \$ 1,135,209.98 in 2017.

domestic publications and that ad content be national instead of merely republishing advertisements produced abroad. It was also recommended that publishing houses and agencies should belong to or be operated by Canadian citizens and that they should employ professionals who reside in Canada. With respect to circulation, tax incentive measures were suggested to favour companies with facilities in Canada; additionally, different postage costs for Canadian and foreign magazines were suggested.

In its special remarks, the O’Leary Report recalled that the measures suggested therein, aimed at levelling the field in the editorial market, should in no way be mistaken for the creation of a “mediocrity haven”. It also clarified that advocating for a “Canadian point-of-view” was unrelated to editorial control, censorship or an attack on foreign publications’ freedom of speech. Finally, it stressed that neither anti-Americanism nor ultranationalism was being preached.

The O’Leary Commission also collaborated on a key point, which would become the formal study of cultural industries slightly more than a decade later:

During the course of its work, the Commission was urged to found its inquiry on purely economic grounds. This has not been possible because although many of the problems faced by Canadian periodicals are economic, the nature of modern communication is such that its effects carry enormous social, political and economic, implications. Like the two sides of a coin, the “cultural” and the economic are virtually inseparable, and neither can provide a complete perspective by itself. The Commission therefore, has considered both points of view (O’Leary, 1961, p. 3).

The order of importance in Hodgetts’s (1951) categorisation for this specific Commission would presumably be, foremost, number 2 (for social and cultural reasons), followed by number 3 (for commercial and economical reasons); in reality, however, it was the other way around. The greater concern throughout the process was not the contents of publications, but publishers’ profits.

Kent Commission—1980-1981

One of the oldest sectors in cultural and media industries, newspapers, had already been the object of a Royal Commission discussion between

1917 and 1920. However, at that time, the main theme was the price of input material—paper—that could affect the sector and influence content. By the end of the 1960s and during the 1970s, the issue resurfaced, only this time it related to the concentration of property and how that concentration affected the disappearance of historic publications.

In 1969, liberal senator Keith Davey formed a Special Committee in Parliament to investigate the issue of media concentration. That committee ultimately gave special attention to newspapers because the radio and television sectors already had the CRTC regulatory body. Davey's proposal was to create a *Press Ownership Review Board* with the function of analysing the creation, purchase/sale and fusion of printed media. The Davey Report was strongly criticised by a large number of newspapers, which claimed that it curtailed the freedom of the press. The Trudeau administration shelved the Davey Report's results.

Ten years later, with a wave of newspaper closures, including those of the *Montréal-Matin* and *Montreal Star* in Quebec, *L'Action* and the *Chronicle-Telegraph* in Montreal, the *Tribune* in Winnipeg and the *Journal* in Ottawa, plus the fusion between the centennial *Victoria Daily Times* and the *British Colonialist* in Victoria (Jackson, 1999, p. 4), Prime Minister Trudeau was left with no choice but to create the *Royal Commission on Newspapers*, which he did on December 3rd, 1980. That Commission's goal was to investigate the issue of property concentration and the then-recent closing of historical newspapers. In particular, the Commission was required to analyse how newspaper closures affected the role of the press for its readers; the effects that newspaper closings had on the citizenry; economical, political, social and intellectual implications; and the measures that might be proposed to minimise the effects of the phenomenon.

English journalist Thomas Kent (1922-2011), who had worked in the editing departments of *The Guardian*, *The Economist* and the *Winnipeg Free Press* and who had also been assistant to liberal prime minister Lester Pearson in the 1960s, was invited to be chairman of the Commission. Other members were Laurent Picard, professor at the *McGill University* and former president of the CBC, and Borden Spears, editor of *Maclean's* magazine and a former editor and *ombudsman* of the *Toronto Star*. According to Paul Audley (1983, p. 18), the Kent Commission had strong support from all political parties and reflected

a general concern about how the press was working and being controlled.

The public hearings took place between December 8th, 1980, and April 16th, 1981, in Winnipeg, Ottawa, Victoria, Vancouver, London, Toronto, Thunder Bay, Montreal, Edmonton, Saint John, Halifax and Quebec. Societal participation included 245 manifests by individuals or entities, plus 339 written manifests. Most came from companies in the sector, both large and small, along with readers, but there were also some from journalists and advertising professionals, political parties and representatives of the *Canadian Labour Congress* and the *Consumers Association of Canada*.

The Kent Commission sent its final report to Governor-General Edward Schreyer on July 1st, 1981. Its recommendations included limiting the number of newspapers that could be owned by any individual to five, eliminating regional monopolies, avoiding cross-ownership of newspapers and radio or television broadcasters in a single location, ensuring editorial independence from owners, offering tax reductions to start-up newspapers and creating an independent regulatory body, the *Press Rights Panel*, answerable to Parliament.

Apparently anticipating the reaction the Report would cause, the members of the Commission wrote the following analysis of newspapers' dual character of delivering a public service and serving commercial ends:

It is notorious that the press, which assumes a licence to criticise every other institution, is the least open of any institution to criticism of its own performance. It controls the principal channel through which criticism can be expressed and heard. It is singularly reluctant not only to accept criticism and acknowledge error but also to justify its own conduct when it believes itself to be in the right (Kent, 1981, p. 175).

Like the Davey Report, the conclusions drawn by the Kent Commission were harshly criticised by the major media and consequently were shelved. One of the Commission's consultants, journalist Peter Desbarats (1996), believes a mistake was made when it turned out to be impossible to answer whether the monopolistic or competitive model was better for informing the public.

The closest the government ever came to putting the recommendations into practice involved a measure adopted by the CRTC from 1982 to deny all new concessions or renovations for radio or television to companies that owned journals in the same market segment. However, in May 1985, during the administration of conservative governor Brian Mulroney, this norm was revoked by decree.

The Kent Commission fits Hodgetts's (1951) categories 2 and 3. It was foremost concerned with the social and cultural effects of regional press monopolies and secondarily concerned with the economic implications of monopolies for small-sized newspapers that were being bought or were vanishing.

Caplan-Sauvageau Task Force—1985-1986

The last large public debate on Canada's media policies took place between 1985 and 1986, with the Task Force called by Minister of Communications Marcel Masse on April 9th, 1985. By opting for a Task Force instead of a Royal Commission, the government aimed to have a provisional group conduct studies and meetings with experts and entities connected to the broadcasting sector. The key goals were to find methods of cutting government expenditures on the CBC and to make more room for private initiatives, including foreign investments¹⁶.

At the time, Gaëtan Tremblay (1986, p. 48) said that the government was in contradiction because while it was creating a commission to propose directives for the sector it was removing the CTRC's power with respect to cross-ownership.

Historian Gerald Caplan, who had been director of the *New Democratic Party's* national campaign in the 1984 elections, and Florian Sauvageau, professor at the *Université Laval* and a journalist with experience at the CBC and *Le Soleil* newspaper, were invited to take part in the Task Force and were primarily responsible for its

¹⁶ In June 2018, the Canadian Government created a "Panel of External Experts" with the mission of review the *Broadcasting Act* and the *Telecommunications Act*, with the objective of updating the legislative framework in a balanced way that takes into account the realities of Canadian consumers and businesses, and artists, artisans and broadcasters without increasing the cost of services to Canadians (Canadian Heritage, 2018).

activities. The group also included Felix Frases, director and producer of educational programs, Francine Côté, an attorney connected to radio and TV companies, Mimi Fullerton, the general director of *TV Ontario*, J. Conrad Lavigne, a pioneer in Canada's television private sector and president of a consultancy company for the broadcasting sector, and Finlay MacDonald Jr., a former reporter and owner of subscription TV companies.

Although a task force does not have the same power as a Royal Commission, its recommendations may be adopted by the government as indicative of policies for a specific sector. What happened to this task force was that despite the fact that the minister had not specified that public hearings should be held, pressure groups induced the task force to convene such hearings using the euphemism of "public meetings". Thus, between August 14th and November 12th, 1985, open meetings took place in Ottawa, Vancouver, Edmonton, Regina, Halifax, Winnipeg, St. John's, Moncton, Charlottetown, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Yellowknife, Whitehorse and Frobisher Bay, at which 268 manifests were heard from individuals, governments, parties, companies and social movements.

In addition, 243 written manifests were received, and private meetings were held with 166 representatives from companies, governments and social entities in 15 cities. The Task Force also relied on 56 studies by broadcasting experts.

The recommendations in the final report did not go so far as to use the term "media democratisation", but they did propose giving native, community and provincial voices—along with the voices of racial and ethnic minorities—the means to communicate. There were also recommendations to create a new broadcasting law, which occurred in 1991; for greater transparency in the CRTC's actions, for example, conducting public hearings before authorising, suspending or revoking concessions; about the characteristics and peculiarities of the French language system; about public communication, even proposing a greater approximation between the *National Film Board* and the CBC. Additionally, the report made proposals related to subscription TV, so that it would not transmit so much American programming.

Buzzwords *en vogue* in Europe at the time, such as "privatisation" and "deregulation", were left out. According to Marc

Raboy, in his essay *Two steps forward, three steps back: Canadian broadcasting policy from Caplan-Sauvageau to Bill C-136*,

The most interesting thing about the Task Force Report was its implicit undermining of the myth that Canadian culture could only be promoted by strong central agencies under the exclusive control of Ottawa. This did not attract as much attention as its call for “Canadianisation”, but the idea that the sociocultural objectives of Canadian broadcasting could be met by multiplying the points of entry to the system was the most significant, and surely the most progressive and innovative, aspect of the report (Raboy, 1989, p. 73).

In applying the categorisation of Royal Commissions by Hodgetts (1951), the *Task Force on Broadcasting Policy* fits points 2, 3 and 4. Even with the allegedly neoliberal goals set by minister Marcel Masse, what prevailed were social and cultural issues, followed by matters related to economic aspects that favoured the private sector, concluding with proposals that required State intervention.

Conclusions

The simple fact that themes connected to communications have been debated in public represents a large step forward for those who advocate media democratisation and freedom of expression. In the case of Canada, that is not to say that private groups would not prefer a state of affairs guaranteeing to leave their interests untouched, but those groups are at least open to discussion, which is very uncommon in Brazil.

The call for freedom of speech and against censorship (Rebouças, 2006) is a horn that has been blown for a long time, but more strongly in recent years, when the issues of media and cultural industries began to be broached by the government and interest groups connected to civil society, including the following: National Council of Social Communication; the digital television system, National Agency of Film and Audiovisual; Federal Council of Journalism; rating sex and violence content on TV programs; the reformulation of the 1962 Brazilian Telecommunications Code; regulation of the advertisement of alcoholic beverage, drugs and food targeted at children; and more recently, the requirement of the inclusion of national content in pay TV.

Some common traits can be found in both countries' business logic, namely, that of privileged access by decision-makers, the use of media to one-sidedly divulge their position, and the constant claim of rights, while denying all obligations.

One can also observe a relative weakness in the representation of civil society in these debates. In Canada, there has been participation by the *Canadian Radio League*, the *Association nationale des téléspectateurs et des téléspectatrices* and the *Friends of Canadian Broadcasting*, the latter of which is the only group that is still active. In Brazil, the most significant entities are the National Forum for Democratisation of Communications (FNDC), the Intervozes Collective and the Alana Institute. However, even under the illusion that there is a symmetry in public hearings, the fact is that even in their absence, forces defending the public interest must make themselves heard.

One pressure group present before most of the 20th century Canadian commissions is the *Canadian Labour Congress*, an entity uniting workers from almost every field of activity in the country. In Brazil, the participation of the Unified Workers' Central (CUT) has been more significant in recent debates, and it currently coordinates the executive board of the FNDC.

One of the main points of the Royal Commissions is the requirement that in addition to holding public hearings and private meetings, market and academic experts must be consulted. However, the report by the Caplan-Sauvageau Commission reminds us that although Canada may have made great progress in the study of communication technologies and methodologies, it neglects areas related to the analysis and development of broadcasting and cultural industry policies:

It is impossible to formulate broadcasting policy without solid research; and if policy is to be continually updated, access to current information about the system and its evolution is needed (Caplan & Sauvageau, 1986, p. 183).

One shortcoming observed while analysing the public hearings is the lack of debate between the social actors involved. In general, each person or entity presents one perspective and that position is not confronted.

The mechanism of the Royal Commissions is not perfect. The commissions are subject to countless sources of pressure, interference and interests; they are very expensive; in some cases, they only serve as a “democratic” façade for decisions that have already been made; they are headed by persons directly connected to political and/or business interests; or they have their reports completely ignored by the Government. This may be an explanation for the non-adoption of a Royal Commission, but a “Task Force” in 1985-1986, as well as the recent creation in June 2018 of a “Panel of External Experts” to review the Telecommunications and Broadcasting Acts. However, even with all of these negative points, the fact that the commissions host debate on issues of national interest, and in particular that they do so in several cities, causes a minimal democratisation process to take place.

It remains to be learned whether the Canadian government will adopt the Royal Commissions model again to discuss more broadly current themes in the media and cultural industry and when Brazil will stop treating as taboo the debate on communications. The theme is of such major importance that an increasing number of opportunities are being missed, and society remains a mere spectator, hindered in its freedom of expression.

References

Aird, J. (1929). *Report of the Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting*. Ottawa: King's Printer.

Audley, P. (1983). *Canada's cultural industries: broadcasting, publishing, records and film*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.

Bird, Roger. A. (Ed.). (1988). *Documents of Canadian Broadcasting*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Canada, House of Commons. (1932). *Special Committee on Radio Broadcasting: minutes and proceedings of evidence*. Ottawa: F. A. Acland.

Canadian Heritage. (2018, June 5). Government of Canada launches review of Telecommunications and Broadcasting Acts. Retrieved from <https://www.canada.ca/en/canadianheritage/news/2018/06/government-of-canada-launches-review-of-telecommunications-and-broadcasting-acts.html>.

Caplan, G. L., & Sauvageau, F.. (1986). *Report of the task force on broadcasting policy*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

Courtney, J. C., & Smith, D. E. (Eds). (2010). *The Oxford handbook of Canadian politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Desbarats, P. (1996). *Guide to Canadian news media* (2nd ed.). Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Canada.

Doern, B. (1967, December). The role of Royal Commissions in the general policy process and in federal-provincial relations. *Canadian Public Administration*, 10(4), 417-433.

Henderson, G. F. (1967). *Federal Royal Commissions in Canada – 1869-1966: a checklist*. Toronto: Univ. Toronto Press.

Hodgetts, J. E. (1951). The role of Royal Commissions in Canadian Government. In: Philip Clark (Ed.), *Proceedings of 1951 Annual Conference of the Institute of Public Administrations of Canada*. Toronto: IPAC.

Ilsley, J. L. (1957). *Royal Commission on patents, copyright, trade marks and industrial design: report on copyright*. Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P., Queen's Printer and Controller Stationery.

Jackson, J. (1999, December 17). *Newspaper ownership in Canada: an overview of the Davey Committee and Kent Commission Studies*. Parliamentary Research Branch – Political and Social Affairs Division [PRB 99-35E]. Retrieved from <http://publications.gc.ca/Collection-R/LoPBdP/BP/prb9935-e.htm>.

Kent, T. W. (1981). *Royal Commission on Newspapers*. Hull: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

L'Action Nationale. (1961, January). Éditorial: La Commission royale d'enquête sur les publications. *L'Action nationale*, L (5), Montréal, pp. 401-408.

Massey, V. (1951). *Report of the Royal Commission on national development in the arts, letters and sciences, 1949-1951*. Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P., Printed to the King's Most Excellent Majesty.

O'Leary, M. G. (1961). *Report. Royal Commission on Publications*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for the Royal Commission on Publications.

Osler, A. (2000). The beginnings of communication studies in Canada: royal commissions, journalism, and communication studies. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 25(1). Retrieved from www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1143/1062 .

Pringle, R. A. (1918, January 18). *Inquiry into the Manufacture, Sale, Price and Supply of Newsprint in Canada: interim report*, Ottawa.

Raboy, M. (1989). Two steps forward, three steps back: canadian broadcasting policy from Caplan-Sauvageau to Bill C-136. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 14(1), pp. 70-75.

Raboy, M. (1990). *Missed opportunities: the story of Canada's broadcasting policy*. Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Raboy, M. (1995). *Accès inégal: les canaux d'influence en radiodiffusion*. Sainte-Foy: PUQ.

Rebouças, E. (2003). *Grupos de pressão e de interesse nas políticas e estratégias de comunicações: um estudo de caso dos atores sociais no Brasil e no Canadá*. (Doctoral Thesis), Universidade Metodista de São Paulo, Brazil.

Rebouças, E. (2006, June). Estratégia retórica dos "donos" da mídia como escudo ao controle social. *Líbero*, 17, pp. 41-49.

Ringer, B. A. (1958). The Canadian Royal Commission's Report on Copyright. *Bulletin*, 5 (4), The Copyright Society of the USA, New York.

Romanov, W. L., & Soderlund, W. C. (1992). *Media Canada: an introductory analysis*. Mississauga (ON): Copp Clark Pitman.

Tremblay, G. (1986). Développement des industries culturelles et transformation de la radiodiffusion canadienne. *Cahiers de recherche sociologique*, 4(2), pp. 39-62.

Tremblay, G. (1990). *Les industries de la culture et de la communication au Québec et au Canada*. Québec: PUQ.