

Non-Canadian Publications

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): Statistics Canada presents some pertinent facts. The Statistics Canada report of August 31 deals with the after-tax income of private television stations in Canada. There are about 400 privately-owned Canadian television stations, not including CBC-owned stations. We shall also consider the income of three United States stations. Mr. Speaker, the after-tax revenue, or profit, last year of the 400 privately-owned Canadian television stations was \$6.1 million.

Now I turn to a statement made by the authoritative U.S. company, Faulkner, Dawkins and Sullivan. According to the company, estimated net, after-tax income of the two Buffalo stations, WBEN and WGR, and KVOS, was \$4.7 million. So here we have three United States stations making profits equivalent to two-thirds of the total profit of the Canadian industry. About 90 per cent of the KVOS profit comes from this country and about 30 per cent of the WBEN and WGR profit comes from this country. To me, as a Canadian, that makes no sense. Those three stations serve the Canadian public and take our profits. One of them was built primarily for that purpose. One of them makes 90 per cent of its profit from serving Canadians. Put together, the three stations I mentioned make a total profit equal to two-thirds of the entire profit made by the 400 privately-owned Canadian television stations which operate from coast to coast. Where do members of the opposition stand on this issue, or are they adopting their present position in the hope of becoming members of the U.S. Senate? Their arguments would be well received in that august body.

An hon. Member: What about an appointment to the Canadian Senate?

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): The hon. member has little hope of getting there even if he sits in this House for a long time. Let me now refer to something the hon. member for Kootenay West said on February 11 as reported on page 10863 of *Hansard*. He said that KVOS is a Canadian subsidiary and during the period 1964 to the present has contributed some \$76 million to the revenues of Canada. I question that. If it contributed anything, it contributed about \$5 million, not the \$76 million mentioned by the hon. member. The hon. member referred to the Canadian Association of Broadcasters. The Canadian Association of Broadcasters happens to be exactly what its name suggests, Canadian. For that reason we should pay heed to what it says. It represents Canadian broadcasters and hopes Canadian broadcasts will stay Canadian. He suggested that United States cable companies distinguish against Canadian television signals. The hon. member referred to the CAB brief and to a statement made earlier by a member of the NDP.

An hon. Member: That was the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggett).

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): Perhaps it would be best to quote part of the CAB brief. It is clear that CAB said they discriminate against distant signals. The association says, on page 5 of its brief:

Cable TV operators in the United States are required by the FCC to protect local broadcasters in their communities by deleting whole programs, not just the commercials, from the signals of non-local stations brought in by cable.

[Mr. Whittaker.]

The Canadian Radio-Television Commission provides for simultaneous substitution. If a Canadian local station is broadcasting a program and non-local stations (including foreign) broadcast the same program at the same time, the Canadian cable operator substitutes the Canadian local signal on all the cable channels with the same program. The FCC procedure provides for simultaneous and in some instances, non-simultaneous "blackout" on American cable systems to protect the local station.

It is clear that there is discrimination against distant signals, not Canadian signals. I bring that point to the attention of the House. All this was summed up by the chairman of the CRTC, who is Canadian, has always been Canadian and has always devoted his utmost in time and ability to what is good for this country.

An hon. Member: That is just romance.

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): It is not romance; it is fact. He said recently:

We stand in Canada on the threshold of a flowering of our own cultural endeavours. After a continuing struggle our writers and artists are beginning to flourish. Music, books, painting, theatre—by and for Canadians—are beginning to emerge.

Our broadcasting—radio, television and cable systems are beginning to emerge—and they must—and they will, if Canadians recognize that to protect our own against unfair, unwarranted and deleterious actions is a virtue and not a sign of weakness.

There are those who say that our mandate to secure broadcasting as an integral part of Canadian life is chauvinistic. The original Sergeant Chauvin caused himself to be lowered into the grave by knotted tricolours—the flag of France.

That may be a surprise to some who toss the expression around so freely. I say chauvinism is truly the property of an individual such as the good sergeant—but devotion to encouraging a healthy sense of being aware of the circumstances of the country of your choice and your inheritance is a natural and fulfilling role.

It is the role I choose willingly—and if it be labelled nationalistic—then so be it. Four generations of ancestors nurtured and cherished in the soil of western Ontario has had its effect. I want my children and your children to be worthy members of the family of man—but to be so—they must be aware of where they come from. It is not something they will learn if our broadcasting and communications become only mechanical retransmissions of the history and values of those who choose America in place of Canada as a new home.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): One o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Before calling it one o'clock, I must tell the hon. member that his time has expired. I allowed him three or four extra minutes to compensate for interruptions.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would accept a question after lunch.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House must give unanimous consent for the hon. member to reply, as his time has expired. Or does the House consent to allowing the hon. member to put his question now?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is here at two o'clock, perhaps I could ask my question then.

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I have arranged to leave after lunch. Perhaps the hon. member wants to ask his question now.

An hon. Member: No.