of political-economic terms in his discussions of culture—and other expressions of the mega-trend sort. They do not contribute to understanding Innis; they are neither wild nor breathtaking.

Most regrettable is the absence of references to the commentary on Innis published over the 20 years, e.g., James Carey and others whose works have proven useful in "explaining" and contextualizing Innis for undergraduates and specialists alike. A critical bibliography or bibliographical essay along with Innis' text would have been more genuinely helpful than the sort of pseudo-Annotated Alice that this edition of *Empire and Communications* has become. It is shameful that the University of Toronto Press did not value Innis' work more highly, and that readers of Innis must now live with Godfrey's threat that "thanks to the latest in digital and laser technology...it will NEVER be out of print again."

Reviewed by: Alison Beale
Simon Fraser University
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*History and Present Status of Community Radio in Québec*
Mark Stiles and Jacques Lachance, Stiles Associates Inc. Toronto: Ministry of Culture and Communications, 1988

*Community Radio in Ontario: A Dynamic Resource - An Uncertain Future*
Kealy Wilkinson and Associates Toronto: Ministry of Culture and Communications, 1988

These two reports on the status of community radio in Ontario and Québec were commissioned by the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture as a research base from which to launch a community radio policy. This initiative will be welcomed by practitioners, policy makers and scholars in the field of third sector media in Canada. The studies are similar in scope, though dealing with quite different provincial policy environments. Both review existing provincial and federal policy on community media, describe the development of community radio in each province, compile a current statistical picture of the size and budgets of operating stations, present case studies of representative stations and outline present provincial and federal funding programs. This material is organised primarily around questions of funding and administration with less emphasis on programming or on community radio's social and cultural impact.
The assumption upon which the studies are based is that, with about 70 stations each in Ontario and Québec, community radio represents a significant cultural need in a variety of rural, urban, native and non-native communities. The desire to meet this need with adequate policy positions and funding programs is part of an effort to institutionalize some of the social and cultural innovations of the seventies. Community radio has emerged in the last two decades as a viable third sector of broadcasting in Canada, responding to needs that neither privately-owned commercial radio nor the national public service can adequately address. These reports reveal that while the socio-cultural milieux within which community radio stations operate are diverse, they face many of the same economic and administrative hurdles. The implication, if not the explicit conclusions of the consultants’ reports, is that the financial structure of community radio and provincial funding policies will determine its future survival as a unique participatory, non-commercial and culturally responsive medium.

Since native community radio developed in the northern regions of Quebec and Ontario with the support of programs administered by the Secretary of State, the reports deal with it separately. Wilkinson describes the pattern of cooperative funding that has emerged for native community radio in Ontario, the federal government providing the majority of the funds complemented by some local fundraising and a predominantly volunteer staff. In Québec a similar pattern is evident, but some of the gaps between federal programs and local support are filled by the provincial Ministry of Communication through the Programme d’aide au développement des communications en milieu autochtone (PADCMA). This fund provides subsidies for operating stations and grants to launch new native community stations. Native community radio in both provinces operates on inadequate funding especially in southern communities which are ineligible for some federal programs. The reports emphasize that local funds for native community radio are limited by the marginal economic position of native people in Canada, yet the need to develop community media that sustain native language and culture is a pressing one. Both studies recommend increased provincial support for native community radio.

The development of non-native community radio has followed different paths in Québec and Ontario. The provincial government in Québec has been much more actively involved in promoting cultural and nationalist goals through community media. As the Stiles case studies illustrate, these goals have resulted in a diverse and relatively sophisticated community radio sector. Québec’s Programme d’aide à la radio communautaire (PARC) and its predecessors have provided operating and development funds for 23 remote, regional and urban community stations. Québec also funds a representative organisation, the Association des radiodiffuseurs communautaires du Québec (ARCQ), to coordinate lobbying and services for its member stations. Recent community media policy in Quebec has been more
coherent and comprehensive than Ontario’s, focusing particularly on radio and streamlining assistance programs. The Stiles report is critical of Quebec’s emphasis on self-financing for community radio. Citing the ARCQ position, the report suggests that many communities that need community radio service cannot afford to finance it locally. An increased dependence on advertising is unrealistic given CRTC restrictions and commercial competition and reliance on advertising support might undermine the social and cultural goals of community radio. Assessing the strengths and weaknesses of Québec’s policy agenda, the report raises crucial questions about the role of volunteers, making funding programs more accountable and available to specific communities, providing adequate training and implementing some means of formal policy evaluation.

Ontario’s community media policy has been somewhat more ad hoc. The bulk of non-native community stations in Ontario are associated with universities or colleges, with the exception of an urban station in Kitchener and two ‘minority official language community stations’ in Hearst and Penetanguishene. Campus stations (broadcast, cable or closed circuit) are generally supported by the educational institution or its students. The Kitchener station draws its revenue from program sponsorships, fundraising and memberships and employs no paid staff. The minority official language stations are supported in part by a specific Secretary of State program and by provincial and local contributions. The Wilkinson report reviews the status of these stations and makes suggestions for expanding Ontario’s support to urban ethnic communities and to aboriginal broadcasters. It also suggests the need for a representative voice for campus/community stations similar to ARCQ and for the integration of federal and provincial policy initiatives.

A comparative reading of these two studies is instructive. The Stiles report is especially comprehensive and provides a provocative summary of the lessons to be learned from Quebec’s funding programs. In both cases, the emphasis on financial aspects of community media obscures the need to examine, clarify and support its social and cultural objectives. While such questions are clearly beyond the mandate of these preliminary studies, the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture needs to incorporate them into the policy process. Determining the mix of federal, provincial and local funding for community radio depends on the priority given to cultural needs that may not be commercially viable at the local level.
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