

Radio and Television

go on to complete the idea expressed by the former leader of the opposition:

That was the intention of the C.B.C. in relation to radio broadcasting. If the same principle is carried forward, then surely the whole purpose of the C.B.C. in relation to television should be to let the private stations, without public expense, broadcast the television broadcasts in the great areas of concentrated population where that is financially possible, and for the C.B.C. to provide the television broadcasts in those areas where the ordinary financial returns will not justify private investment.

Is this to be the policy of the government? I think the house has a right to know, and to ask the government what its policy is, and that is what the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition seeks to do. Is the policy of the government to be based on the principles laid down by the late Lord Bennett? Is the policy of the government to be based upon the principles held by the former leader of the opposition which I have just quoted. Or are the recommendations of the Fowler commission to be carried out.

Now may I turn to another subject, and that is the matter of new stations in areas now being served. Thus far the so-called single channel policy has been applied to the development of television in Canada. Following the report of the Massey commission in 1952 the policy of granting one television licence in each of the main geographical areas of Canada was adopted. After television stations were established in Toronto and Montreal, the C.B.C. began the construction and operation of stations in Vancouver, Winnipeg, and Halifax. No two stations were to be licensed to serve the same area. And then, at page 226 of the royal commission report, the former minister of national revenue, who was responsible for the policy of television and for the C.B.C., is reported as saying:

The principle of one station to an area is to apply only until an adequate national television system is developed. At the rate that applications for stations are now being received it may not be long before there is a sufficient degree of national coverage to justify the government and the C.B.C. giving consideration to permitting two or perhaps in some cases more than two stations in certain areas. It is anticipated that, in due course, private stations will be permitted in areas covered by C.B.C. stations, and the C.B.C. may establish stations in some areas originally covered by private stations.

There is today, as the house knows, a strong public demand for the granting of licences for second stations, and I ask: what is the policy of the government with respect to that? The Fowler commission at page 233 asks three questions which, I am sure, the Minister of National Revenue has carefully studied and they are as follows:

(1) When should the "single channel" policy be abandoned?

[Mr. Chevrier.]

(2) To whom should second licences be granted?
(3) On what terms should second licences be granted?

The answers are discussed at some length and I think we on this side of the house are entitled to know what the policy will be in reference to those single channel stations.

Next I should like to say something about the French language stations in Canada. The report of the royal commission deals with that matter in a full chapter. I believe the report deals with it in an understanding and sympathetic manner, and I commend the reading of this chapter of the report which will be found at page 237 *et sequentia*. It is stated in that chapter that there are several principles governing the operation and control of French language stations in Canada. There have been demands by a number of inhabitants of Canada who are not in receipt of any broadcasting facilities whatsoever, or from those in areas where the programs, though available, are untimely or of inadequate quality. One of these groups is in the maritime provinces. In the centre of New Brunswick, in western Nova Scotia and on Cape Breton island there are important groups of French-speaking Canadians out of range of any service at all, whether of radio or television, in their own language. I submit that the C.B.C. should examine this question and see if it is not possible to bring its French language radio service to these groups in the maritime provinces. Consideration should be given to the establishment of a television station at Moncton, which is an important cultural and educational centre of that province. I am sure my colleagues from the maritime provinces on this side of the house, if they take part in this debate, will want to deal with that subject and probably will deal with it more effectively than I can.

There are four French language television stations in the prairie provinces, at St. Boniface, Edmonton, Saskatoon and Gravelbourg. They are not commercial stations in any sense of the word. They are rendering a public service and have received assistance from the three prairie provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta as well as by substantial contributions from the province of Quebec. These four stations are operating under extremely difficult and trying circumstances. The question is how long will they be able to continue? They need assistance. I say respectfully that the government should not allow these stations to disappear. It should study in what manner it can best assist them.

And now I turn with great satisfaction to a statement which I find in the chapter referred to earlier, that section of the report