

in this area, people have been deprived of the only good television coverage they receive. I am speaking now of the quality of the signal, rather than of programming.

It is an obvious fact that CBC's purpose is, first of all, public service rather than to show a profit, and these people being Canadian citizens, being taxpayers and contributing to the annual budget of the CBC, should have the right to CBC coverage. Petitions in the area have been drawn up—I think we are at number three both for French and English CBC television coverage—in an effort to bring to them Canadian coverage which is taken for granted in Canada's metropolitan areas—and not only coverage which is added through cable and through the other networks. People in that area, myself included, approached the CBC asking them to start telecasting in that area under the accelerated coverage plan, or ACP. After a number of petitions and a lot of good work from the CBC, the only thing that the CBC has now told us they will do is make an application to CRTC some time in 1978. No one knows when that application will be approved, much less does anyone know when we could expect CBC coverage in that area if the application is approved.

I want to express to the minister, in very clear terms, the effects of Canada's cable policy and of Bill C-58 in a small area, one might say, but nonetheless, an important one. Surely Canadians there are entitled to the same coverage by CBC as any other Canadian in other areas of Canada. For example, we see great expansion under ACP in northern Canada; there is no argument about it. But I find it somewhat difficult to understand, when an area is 60 miles away from a large metropolitan centre like Winnipeg, that we should have to wait until 1978 before an application is made by CBC, much less a decision reached. The lack of coverage is partly due to the fact that we have lost one television station which was giving us a quality signal. Whether or not we want to talk about nationalism, it behooves the ministers responsible to take a look at situations brought before the House by members. We have brought forward these cases in letters, also. I am trying to be difficult about the situation, but I believe our concerns are real.

If the effects of the government's decision were fully understood by the minister, and a clear decision and commitment was made, there would be a lot less opposition to the provisions of Bill C-58. Regarding television coverage at present, all I have seen in my area is a negative result. We have not received the commitments which the people in my constituency deserve as Canadians.

I feel that three things are needed. Possibly they are not that startling, but I believe they bear repeating. First of all, a national broadcasting policy is needed in areas such as I have mentioned. People in these areas will then feel they are part of the national broadcasting network, that they are not second-class, and that they should not have to wait until 1980 before they might get signals when other areas in Canada have had them since the early 1950s. We are speaking about a time lapse of 30 years. Surely that is not acceptable. Second, I hope that the various ministers will use their influence to get the cable matter decided once and for all.

The decisions that are pending before the CRTC, where individual companies, with the support of the residents in

#### *Non-Canadian Publications*

various areas, want to expand cable, should be made as soon as possible. I do not think we should simply say that the urban areas should have cable and that the rural areas are not entitled to it. If there are private entrepreneurs and subscribers who want to pay for that service, the area should have it. We have spent much time on this question, and I think that in order to resolve this matter, officials of both the Canadian and the U.S. government should meet. I know that one meeting has taken place. They should meet to discuss the problem of border television on both sides in a mutually co-operative fashion in an effort to solve this problem so that we can move forward.

● (1640)

**Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie):** Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to prolong the debate, but I want to correct some erroneous impressions put forward by hon. members of the opposition in the Conservative party, and particularly by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) about what good corporate citizens KVOS and other border stations are.

Let us quickly look at the history of KVOS and how it hopes to benefit from the amendment before us. The KVOS television station first began broadcasting in June, 1953, and its market was Bellingham, in the state of Washington, and northwest Washington. However, after a year of operation it became apparent that this television company would not be able to make a grand profit or a booming success based on that very limited market. So in 1954, KVOS moved its transmitter to Orcas Island so that it could beam more clearly into the Vancouver area. The interesting thing is that it made that move with the approval of the FCC, the American equivalent of our CRTC. The FCC, that same agency, now deletes not just commercials but whole programs from coming into American areas in order to protect local stations.

The FCC realized that to make a television station a success, a certain market had to be guaranteed, and boundaries are set up to prevent competitors from entering that market to the point where neither television station can survive on the limited commercial revenues there. The FCC accepts that principle. It is realistic and understands the logistics of television advertising revenue, so the FCC does not allow non-local stations to beam into an area which has been licensed to another station. Yet here we are talking about a serious problem for Canadian stations which face the problem of American signals in their areas, which is allowed under international convention.

At the same time that we allow American signals to come in, we allow Canadian advertisers to advertise on these foreign stations and get an income tax deductibility privilege which was designed primarily only for Canadian stations. All this bill seeks to do is end that anomaly and the unfair competition Canadian stations now face.

I heard the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway lauding KVOS for setting up a branch plant in Canada and for doing wonderful things for Canada. The way she was extolling this company gave me visions of thousands of jobs, and hundreds for Canadians. Let us examine a little more carefully the nature of KVOS. In British Columbia it employs a grand total of 30 people. As of 1974, Canawest, its film subsidiary, employed a grand total of 18 people. Let