

*Non-Canadian Publications*

why I have no hesitation in standing here pleading with hon. members to accept these proposals. I am not suggesting that the minister or the ministers responsible have not looked into this matter very thoroughly. What I am saying is that they should look again.

I compare my point vividly with the situation that existed with *Reader's Digest*. I realize there was a problem, but three months ago the government said there was no way it could move, and *Reader's Digest* was out and completely finished. Lo and behold, what happened? We now find the government in its wisdom—and now and again the government does have some wisdom, but not often—came up with a solution, particularly, when faced with the possibility of losing thousands of votes in the province of Quebec.

● (1530)

I do not want to pursue that any further because I pay a compliment to the people in the province of Quebec because they were able to beat the minister, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and everybody else over the head and say that this was wrong. They found a solution. Should not equity and justice prevail? What about trying to save another situation, that in respect of KVOS? It is the same set of circumstances.

**An hon. Member:** But it is not in the interest of Canada.

**Mr. Alexander:** I would not want to say that. But surely someone other than myself may think this is unfair treatment and is discriminatory.

I do not know who the member is across the way who just interjected. What is his riding? I would like to refer to him. If he wants to get into *Hansard* I will see that he does. He is a nice chap. We are all here trying to do our duty. Some of us know where we are going and know what we want, but some others on the other side do not know where they are going or what they want.

I am glad the hon. member mentioned our American friends and not our American enemies, because the way I look at it the government is hell-bent on trying to see how much further it can antagonize, as my friend over there said, our American friends.

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I think I have made the position quite clear for those on the other side who have difficulty in understanding positions. I can understand that these things are technical and difficult, but I ask hon. members to accept the argument the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock has placed before the House, and to accept with some compassion the arguments I have sincerely placed before the House. I hope it will be accepted that these proposals are worthy of consideration to the extent that this particular aspect of the bill should not come into effect.

Once this bill is passed it will be rammed down our throats. Let us at least withdraw the particular clause which applies and re-word it so there can be some sense of equity and relief. Or let us do what many of us over here really think should be done which is to refer the whole bill, in light of the several new matters and concerns; that have come before the House, back to the committee for consideration.

[Mr. Alexander.]

**Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to spend a few moments addressing myself to some of the points made last evening by the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen), in fairly specific terms in reference to the amendments he has put forward.

In the early moments of his speech the hon. member pointed out that the Maclean-Hunter organization, which has come under considerable discussion in this debate with reference to the other parts of the legislation, in fact owns and operates a United States Cable Company, and asked if indeed Canadian Companies can go down to the United States and operate that kind of broadcasting or communications system why do we suggest disincentives for Americans here. Certainly these motions refer to what would be a special deal for an American station to operate from the United States into Canada.

I think the answer is very clear, if the hon. member and his colleagues will listen to it. First of all, the Federal Communications Commission in the United States, which is the counterpart of the Canadian Radio Television Commission in Canada, forbids the owning of broadcast outlets by non-Americans.

When we talk about the specific case of KVOS, to which these amendments apply, we are talking about a broadcast outlet. In the United States you cannot own a broadcast outlet if you are not American. So certainly I think it is a bit of a red herring to get into the cable situation because cable is quite different from an actual broadcast outlet. If, however, one wanted to say there is not that much difference I would simply argue that the FCC is now seriously considering taking action to prohibit ownership in the United States of cable by foreign interests. We may find very soon that Maclean-Hunter is not able to carry on with that operation. In the United States they are thinking exactly the same way we are thinking here. Thus I suggest the first argument of the hon. member simply is not valid.

The hon. member went on to say we should consider the situation of the Detroit-Windsor market place, or in fact one particular radio station operating out of Windsor which beams into the American market place and calls itself a major Detroit station. Again let us tell the whole story, which is that last fall the CRTC asked that station to stop attempting to solicit United States advertising. I must say we have not quite had the FCC doing that on our behalf.

The Canadian Radio Television Commission, having acted in an honest and proper fashion by saying that what is good for the goose is good for the gander, I want to go on to say that we also have a situation where the FCC, the American counterpart of the CRTC, has ruled that the Windsor-Detroit area—Windsor the smaller area with the potential of getting to the Detroit area which is larger—in fact would be classed as a total American market place. As a result we are not allowed to play in Windsor any of the programs we buy from the United States for some \$25 million a year even at the same time as they are played on the Detroit stations. The FCC clearly has acted to protect its own market place while a smaller Canadian market place might otherwise threaten the larger American market place. Do we not have the same situation with Buffalo and Toronto? Of course we do.