

Cont. from p. 4

million is approximately 8-10% of annual revenues for the industry, and falls darn close to the estimated average 10% revenue loss to Canadian broadcasters caused by television "spillover" ads from our southern neighbours. Some experts (e.g. Arthur W. Donner) even place the reduction caused by U.S. "spillover" at close to \$150 million or 15% of Canadian television revenues.

But what are the complaints all about anyway?

First, cable operators are beginning to receive complaints from viewers with stereo-capable television sets when programs transmitted in stereo by U.S. border stations are replaced on cable by mono versions carried on local Canadian stations. Few Canadian television stations are currently equipped to broadcast in stereo and many cable operations cannot yet transmit in stereo. Nevertheless, the new cable regulations may pose an eventual threat to the rights of simultaneous substitution since the Commission may exempt from substitution any signal that contains "subsidiary signals designed to inform or entertain" in cases where the signal that replaces it would not also contain these same subsidiary signals. In the light of this possibility, and also for their own advantage, the CAB is encouraging its members to move to introduce stereo services as quickly as possible and as stereo programming becomes available.

Second, viewers are also noticing that up to two minutes per hour of Canadian-originated U.S. programming is being deleted because CRTC regulations allow Canadian television stations 12 minutes of commercials per hour, whereas most U.S. stations play 10 minutes per hour. This has been a major theme in complaints submitted to the CRTC for years, and although it is somewhat less of an issue now since viewers are generally sensitized to the practice, it remains a potential sore spot for Canadian broadcasters and viewers. But isn't a maximum 4% loss of foreign fare worth the considerable financial gains for Canadian productions and viewers? And

worth the protection of our legally acquired program rights? I think so. Consider the alternatives!

In short, the simultaneous substitution regulation protects the territorial rights to programs that Canadians have purchased and allows them to earn the revenues justly associated with those program rights. Otherwise, those exclusively acquired rights would be practically useless with cable importing U.S. signals beyond their natural reach. This CRTC policy rightly guarantees Canadian broadcasters exclusivity for what they have already paid for and been legally accorded. Moreover, it benefits cable subscribers and all viewers by maintaining the revenues necessary to produce Canadian shows and hence assure real program choice.

Used properly, simultaneous substitution is a winner, but if it is abandoned, we're all a little more likely to be losers.

**Bill Roberts**

Senior Vice-president  
CAB (Television)

## Unchecked Monopoly

A very pernicious and dangerous practice is currently being exercised by a few money grabbing film/video companies in Canada.

These companies, virtually, are black-mailing our schools with threats of high service fees for audio visual materials the schools already possess.

One West Island Montreal school has been slapped with a fee of \$27,219 for past and future use.

Precisely, the companies have gone through school film catalogues to determine what films are being used by the schools and then they buy the rights to these films and retroactively bill the schools outrageously exorbitant user-fees for these same materials.

Legally, these companies have the

law's blessing. In actuality, these companies are taking advantage of Canada's archaic copyright laws which date back to 1924.

Other countries protect their educational systems under specific copyright exemptions. In Canada, greedy companies reap financial benefits at the expense of our students.

Canadian lawyers have advised the educators that their only chance for survival regarding the use of audio visual materials is to change the copyright laws.

Several proposals and amendments have been on the books for years. Nothing has been changed.

It is mandatory that our politicians act immediately to protect our educational systems. If not, our children will suffer. The businessman's avarice should not be allowed to control our schools.

**Lois Siegel**

## Open Letter to Mr. Mel Hoppenheim

Recently, I requested a copy of 'Panavision Canada' Rental Catalogue with the intention of renting some equipment for a film project I am working on. When I received your catalogue, quoting Panavision equipment prices exclusively in U.S. funds, I called to request a version in Canadian funds; I was dismayed to discover that the same is not available.

I would think that, at the very least, the Canadian arm of your company would quote prices of products for sale in Canada, in Canadian funds.

Free trade between Canada and the U.S. may be looming on the horizon, but it was not my impression that this would lead to a common currency. May I be so bold as to suggest that it is not very good public relations for your company to

offer products and services in American currency, in a Canadian market.

Trusting that you will take the above comments in good faith and due consideration, I remain,

**ATTILA BERTALAN**

Filmmaker

## Appalled by Harkness

I was appalled by John Harkness's recent review of *John and the Missus* (March 1987) for several reasons. First, Harkness had very little to say about the film. An illuminating and intelligent review of *John and the Missus* the article was not. What it *was* was an insipid recounting of all of the films which Harkness felt had anything at all in common with Pinsent's film. His generalizations about the films produced by Peter O'Brian are just one example of the highly specious nature of Harkness's article.

What appalled me most about the review was its tone. Harkness writes in a flip and supercilious style that absolutely undercuts anything perceptive he may have had to say. Harkness is at his most insulting when he suggests that no fool in his right mind would want to save "a tiny village at the ass-end of an economically-depressed province" as the film's protagonist tries to do. According to Harkness, "just because your kin are buried there, it's no reason to jump into the grave with them". Such insensitivity to the regard held by many people for their communities is unforgivable.

Finally, I find the editorial choice by *Cinema Canada* to print this review in the first place disappointing. There are a great number of talented reviewers out there. John Harkness is clearly not one of them.

**Penny McCann**

## BOOKSHELF

A wide-ranging survey, *World Cinema Since 1945* presents a comprehensive, informed perspective on film production in 30 countries. Written by specialized scholars and knowledgeably edited by William Luhr, it discusses leading creative personalities, current artistic trends, technical achievements and the evolution of national tastes and politics (*Ungar, NYC, \$59.50*).

The 12-tome encyclopedia *Motion Picture Guide* constitutes a major reference source covering some 50,000 English-language theatrical features from the silents through 1984, with yearly volumes planned to update the original set. Each entry includes full production data, cast-&-credits and plot outlines, augmented by a feature unique

to this compilation - detailed essays on each film's social, historic and technical aspects. Expertly edited by Jay Robert Nash and Stanley Ralph Ross, this is an invaluable contribution to film research (*CineBooks, Chicago; Bowker, distr., NYC, \$75/ea., \$750/set*).

In *Alec Guinness: The Films*, Kenneth Von Gudden offers a well-researched and engrossing study of the screen work of an accomplished performer. Abundantly illustrated, this volume includes an insightful biography, a detailed analysis of the actor's 43 movies, and a complete filmography (*McFarland, Jefferson, NC, \$25.95*).

Michael Powell, a towering figure in the British film industry, evokes in his compelling autobiography, *A Life In Movies*, the historic progress of Britain's

cinema and his own crucial participation in its unfolding. Covering both personal and business matters, this fascinating insider's account is written with impressive authority, fluid style and delightful wit (*Knopf, NYC, \$24.95*).

The late Melvin Douglas's autobiography *See You at the Movies* (co-authored by Tom Arthur) traces a notable 60-year acting career that paired Douglas, in sophisticated comedies and serious dramas, with Hollywood's top stars. His liberal political views and activities, and their effect on his career, are discussed with frankness and humor (*University Press of America, Lanham, MD, \$9.75*).

Among recently published screenplays, we find Woody Allen's Oscar-winning *Hannah and Her Sisters*, a sensi-

tive look at modern family problems (*Vintage/Random House, NYC, \$5.95*); Kurt Luedtke's script of last year's Oscar recipient *Out of Africa*, supplemented by director Sidney Pollack's annotations clarifying the script-to-screen transition process (*Newmarket, NYC, \$16.95/8.95*); and Akira Kurosawa's 1950 classic *Rashomon*, followed by Donald Richie's comments on the film's style, Audie E. Bock's essay on Kurosawa's life and art, plus assorted press reviews (*Rutgers U. Press, New Brunswick, NJ, \$28/13*).

In *That Bowling Alley on the Tiber*, Michelangelo Antonioni assembles a series of 35 "imagistic nuclei," concisely worded sketches for possible use in future films (*Oxford U. Press, NYC, \$7.95*).