

*Broadcasting Act*

In addition, I have discussed this subject with representatives of the private radio stations across Canada who also informed me that this is the first occasion on which this sort of thing has been brought to their attention. They were concerned lest a practice of this sort might cause resentment and build up opposition to the private radio industry. I have had long conversations with several people on this question.

I must say that the editor of the Nelson daily *News* is really a nice little fellow, but he is a Conservative who does not understand the principles of the bill of rights. He has allowed his keen business instincts temporarily to overcome his sense of justice and his understanding of the principles of free enterprise, although when election time comes around he writes some strong editorials inviting the people of Kootenay West to support the representatives of the party that stands for free enterprise as against other persons, and so on. But this, I am sure, is a temporary aberration and I am sure he will see the light as a result of the discussion in the house and the correspondence he receives from other sources.

Naturally, the result of this has been that the hon. member for Kootenay West has received very little mention in the Nelson daily *News* since the introduction of this bill two years ago. As hon. members are aware I am mentioned on frequent occasions in the Ottawa Ontario, papers. I am infrequently mentioned in the Nelson daily *News*. For a long time I received hardly any mention at all. Until recently Your Honour did not consider certain unfortunate events in Kootenay West as a matter of urgent public importance. Constituents wrote and wired me expressing their indignation. I quickly explained Your Honour was interpreting the rule according to the book. I know you do consider affairs in Kootenay West are of urgent public importance.

Then I was stepped on in another direction. Since 1945 I have been in the habit of giving a weekly broadcast over the radio. Suddenly the manager of the radio station decided that I should be heard from only once a month from then on. An arrangement was suggested under which the hon. member for Kootenay East and I would alternate with others. The station now allows me use of the facilities twice a month. I appreciate the courtesy extended to me throughout the years so I can inform the people of Kootenay West objectively of the news and occurrences in this house. Now the hon. member for Kootenay East assists me in this. I thank him for relieving me on some occasions. But there is no Liberal in British Columbia. It was suggested that the hon. member for

[Mr. Herridge.]

Bonavista-Twillingate or the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River go on the station. However these are supposed to be local reports to the people of the area delivered by local members of parliament like the hon. members of Kootenay West and Kootenay East.

I have received many letters from constituents telling me that they look forward to my reports and many have said they miss my weekly broadcasts although they also find the reports of the hon. member for Kootenay East interesting and informative.

The interest in this bill is considerable. I have had requests from over 100 of my constituents for copies of *Hansard* containing the debate on this bill, which shows the sense of responsibility of the people I have the honour to represent. They are indignant at the transgression of the principles of the bill of rights and of responsible free enterprise.

I discussed this matter with a number of members of other parties and have yet to talk to a single member who does not support the purpose of this bill. I have discussed it with trade union members and have their support in this respect. I trust before the debate concludes I will have the support in principle of all hon. members because it is an important question. There is a great principle involved.

The matter was brought to the attention of the special committee on radio broadcasting when representatives of private broadcasters were present. I quote from page 120 of the minutes and proceedings of the committee for Monday, February 27, 1961. The hon. member for Peterborough introduced the matter as follows:

Mr. Pitman: I would like to bring up a particular problem which has caused some amount of concern in the house. This is the problem of a station which is in a position very much like the one Mr. Jamieson was speaking about, where the station has virtually complete control, and where it refuses advertising for what is considered to be competitors.

This happened at Nelson, British Columbia where a radio station refused to accept advertising of a competitor. Let me quote from this letter. This gentleman was starting a newspaper, and the radio station owned a newspaper as well.

That is not quite right. One company, the Nelson news publishing company, owns both CKLN and the paper. I will not quote from the letter. The hon. member for Peterborough went on to say:

What we have here is a situation which, I think, is rather fantastic, where a radio station can refuse advertising of its competitor. How do you feel about that? Should there be a regulation?

Mr. Brown: Are you directing your question to me?

Mr. Pitman: Anyone at all is welcome to pick it up.