

Canadians, like Americans, believe in freedom of opportunity, the right for a fair chance to shape one's prosperity by the dint of one's effort and talent and brains. To ensure freedom from economic aggression, so that small businesses may grow into large ones, the United States has enacted anti-trust legislation, and Canada, anti-combine. In both countries there is a shared belief that minorities, that the underprivileged, that women, should be given special consideration on their road to equal opportunity.

Canadians, like Americans, believe in freedom from fear and want. For without these freedoms, there would be no right to withdraw one's labour, no right to fail, and thus freedom of expression would have no meaning, freedom of opportunity would become a hollow phrase.

Canadians, like Americans, expect their government to assure that these freedoms exist. And though government actions may take varied forms in the two countries — Canadians have not yet considered busing to equalize minority opportunity; the United States has not yet felt the need to bilingualize its civil service — citizens of both countries know that without government action, these freedoms would cease to exist.

If freedom of expression, freedom of opportunity, freedom from want and fear, vigorously sustained by a vigilant government, have formed the basis of North American prosperity, then perhaps the same principles applied to the global scene will help assure the prosperity of other nations. Freedom of expression at the national level means the freedom to develop a national culture. Freedom of opportunity could be translated into each country's right to prosper, without being faced with economic aggression from any other country. Government action to maintain these national rights is no more scandalous, nor less desirable, nor more unfair, than domestic government action to protect small business, or minorities, from an intolerant marketplace at home. In fact, it is in all our interests that our trading partners prosper.

#### Freedom of access

Indeed, the ways in which Canada somewhat differs from the United States in its approach to information policy stem from the different circumstances it must overcome in the pursuit of common ideals. For instance, freedom of access has come to mean something very different in Canada than it does in the United States. Canadians, for instance, take for granted their right to watch American programs on television, to see American movies, to read American magazines, newspapers and books and, to a lesser but no less important extent, to consult American data banks. Anyone who has visited Canada, switched on a hotel television set, or visited a news-stand, knows the extent to which this principle of freedom of access is respected, not only in theory but in practice. The variety of foreign material is staggering. In a most recent innovation, a daily selection from the three television networks in France is now available on Quebec cable systems, and will soon be extended throughout much of Canada *via* the *Anik B* satellite. And Canadians pay for their right to freedom of access. Last year, for example, they spent between \$70 and \$80 million importing American television programs. The problem — to focus on this critical sector — is that faced with an ever-increasing choice of the world's television, Canadian program producers are finding the cost of pleasing has risen to the point where the Canadian viewer is effectively