



October 9, 2015

Mr. John Traversy
Secretary General
Canadian Radio-television and
Telecommunications Commission
Ottawa, ON K1A 0N2

Re: *Review of basic telecommunications services, Telecom Notice of Consultation CRTC 2015-134 (“TNC 2015-134”), as amended in Telecom Notice of Consultation CRTC 2015-134-1 – Dwayne Winseck’s (CMCR Project) response to TELUS’ Requests for Further Responses to Requests for Information*

Dear Mr. Traversy:

1. In its most recent request, Telus repeats its request that I and other academics (a) “advise [it] of [our] affiliations, sources of funding, and support”; and (b) “provide copies of [our] curricula vitae” (para 6).
2. Telus does not dispute my response to its first interrogatory that its requests are irrelevant to the Commission’s BSO proceeding. Nor does it offer to meet the standards that it is asking of us, as I invited it to do in my reply to their earlier request in return for a commitment from me to do the same: i.e. to disclose the number of lawyers and hired experts and amount of funds and other resources that it has committed to the Review of the BSO proceeding.
3. Instead, Telus asks several of the public interest-oriented academics who are currently participating in the Commission’s Review of the BSO proceeding to do what it itself is unwilling to do: disclose who is paying what to participate in the review of a vitally important public policy issue.
4. Instead, of standing down after acknowledging the irrelevance of its demand to the task at hand, Telus argues that what really matters in determining the quality of our contribution is our status, affiliations and who is paying the bills (para 8).
5. This is disingenuous. Contributions to the Commission’s proceeding turn on the quality of the evidence, ideas and arguments that *anyone* puts on to the public record, not an intervener’s credentials. The insinuation that academics

might be serving unknown paying is tendentious and unprofessional (see in particular para 13). It reverses the burden of proof by placing the onus on us to prove that our motives are pure and to dispel phantoms of Telus' own making rather than pointing to *any* evidence to support its suspicions.

6. In addition, the line that Telus tries to draw throughout its Request for Further Information between academics as specialist experts on the one hand versus our standing as interested members of the public on the others is artificial and false. All of the academics that are participating in this proceeding that I know are trying to be both, in line with scholars' professional obligation to do their best to further understanding of issues of public importance.
7. Telus also argues that our refusal to concede to its initial request runs afoul of CRTC Rule 26 (amongst others), that requires that the "nature, purpose and scope of intervention" be disclosed (para 12), the inference being that such standards may not have been met. There is no evidence that this is the case. The Canadian academics who have stood forward in this case, as far as I know, have done so only as part and parcel of doing scholarly research in the public interest. This is our job. Telus is on a fishing expedition and, absent any grounds that things are untoward, tries to cast doubts on our integrity by raising suspicion rather than pointing to *any* facts upon which it has based its queries. All of my public and published work, including in this proceeding, flows from solely from my position as a tenured professor at the School of Journalism and Communication, Carleton University. It has also been supported by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council grant since 2012. Where that has not been the case, as when I was hired as an expert witness during the Commission's review of BCE's acquisition of Astral, this has been made crystal clear on the public record.
8. Conceding to Telus' request would deter academics from participating in the Commission's proceedings at a time when it is trying to cultivate more of such participation. Trying to dispel figments of one of the industry's largest player's imagination wastes the time and energy of academics who, before participating in CRTC proceedings, already carry a heavy load of teaching, research, contributing to the administration of their department, mentoring students and, for young scholars especially, including several in the BSO Review, building a dossier that furthers their careers.
9. Granting Telus's request could also deter people in general who might conclude that the Commission's proceedings are a closed affair, limited only to experts, economists and engineers rather than anyone who might have something valuable to say. The line that Telus tries to draw between "Fine Arts" and engineers is invidious and would be without end if accepted. This line of thought also runs counter to recent experience in, for example, the Mobile TV and Bell's Relevant Ads Program (RAP) cases, in which relative newcomers and unknowns seemingly came out of nowhere to trigger

Commission examinations and decisions that have potentially far-reaching implications. Erecting a credentialist gate through which all would-be interveners must pass could choke these vital sources of knowledge and insight just at the moment when they are coming into their own. Perhaps this is Telus' end-game, but the Commission should play no part in countenancing it.

10. The proper time and place to examine the qualifications of intervenors and who did or did not pay them for an intervention is if and when they file for costs out of the Commission's participation fund. At that point in time, since Telus may indeed be required to pay some of the intervenors's costs, as it notes (para 14), it will be entitled to know more about whatever financial support interveners may have already received. Until that time, however, the Commission should ignore its tendentious pleading.

sincerely,

Dwayne Winseck, Ph.D.

Professor, School of Journalism and Communication, Carleton University,
and Director, Canadian Media Concentration Research Project <cmcrp.org>