

government is coming in by the back door wanting to control broadcasting but not through a revision, an updating, or an amendment to the Broadcasting Act, but rather an amendment to the Income Tax Act. As one hon. member mentioned this afternoon, this is a case of trying to exercise control over cultural policy by tax policy. That seems to me to be inconsistent and not the way to handle this.

If anything exemplifies the confusion that has been perpetrated on the people of Canada as a result of the fusion of the two issues, namely, cable policy and Bill C-58, it is a little brochure that came to us a day or two ago from the Canadian Association of Broadcasters. I submit to you that this is a very reputable organization. I believe it is a good organization whose purpose it is to further the aims and goals of Canadian broadcasters.

There are several areas I will be discussing in this brochure to illustrate the confusion that has been brought about by this legislation. I might interject just at this point that all legislation ought to have some universal qualities about it. It should affect all people equally and not create undue hardship on anyone.

The fact of life in Canada is that there are regional differences. Everyone in this House has spoken of these regional differences at some time or another. This is certainly true in the area of broadcasting. It strikes me that one of the over-riding pieces of confusion in this literature, as well as in the public's mind, is the contention that there is essentially no difference between the Ontario experience in broadcasting and the west coast experience in broadcasting. That is where the error lies.

There can be really no prolonged argument that New York border stations have done well by Canadian broadcasting. They are reaching a high impact area with very little investment, or at least no extra investment. They have a ready market which probably has been highly developed by the Canadian broadcasting systems. There is minimal investment in Canada. Certainly there is little return to Canada. So, no one in that sense can argue that the United States stations in New York which are broadcasting into Canada have not been doing very well, thank you. But there is a great difference which exists in Canada which this legislation does not recognize.

● (2020)

I have introduced several amendments, and I confess I introduced some of these at the committee stage, but because of the way in which the committee was structured and handled there was no hope of them receiving full study and attention let alone passage. As I have already indicated there are differences in Canada. The amendments I have submitted are designed to alleviate the hardship created by this legislation if those differences are not recognized.

I refer again to motion No. 7, the first motion I have submitted in this group, which is designed to show the difference between the situation on the west coast and that which exists in Ontario. What strikes me forcefully is that when these amendments and this whole matter were before the committee two members from British Columbia at times were notably silent about the interest that should have been near to their hearts. I refer to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) and the hon. member

Non-Canadian Publications

for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Raines), both of whose constituents are very greatly affected by this legislation.

They both refused to give these amendments adequate study and voted against them with the government. I simply want their constituents to know to what degree those two members have at heart the needs and desires of their constituents.

I should like to refer to this brochure I have mentioned to show the inequity is increased because of the confusion which exists in the public mind. The first question is:

Why are Buffalo stations threatening to jam their signals to Toronto and Hamilton?

I suggest that is a cablevision problem. The answer given here is:

Because the Buffalo broadcasters stand to make less profit if their commercials are deleted by cable TV companies in the Toronto area.

Then the question is asked:

Why has the American TV station, KVOS-TV in Bellingham, been lobbying so hard against Bill C-58?

Because the Canadian government is taking action to prevent stations, that are not licensed to serve Canadians, from making money in Canada. This threatens to reduce the profits of these American stations. KVOS derives about 90 per cent of its revenues from the Vancouver area, and Buffalo stations about 30 per cent from Toronto-Hamilton.

Is that why the Buffalo stations are threatening to jam their signals to Toronto and Hamilton? I suggest this merely perpetuates the confusion which exists in the public mind.

Then I would refer to question No. 9 which reads:

Do American border television stations receive any special protection against Canadian stations?

The answer is:

Yes. For example, American programme producers regard Detroit and Windsor, Ontario, as one 'market'. The end result of that attitude is that neither the CBC, nor CTV, nor Global, nor any Canadian television station can broadcast in the Windsor area any program broadcast by a Detroit station.

They forget to mention that the CBC does very well from the advertising it takes in from the Detroit area. The next paragraph states:

If Canadian broadcasters buy these programmes, it is on the express condition that they not be shown in Windsor if Detroit has them already. This means that Windsor residents, Canadian citizens, cannot see the full Global or CBC schedule, or previously the CTV schedule, when CTV had a Windsor affiliate.

Now I ask what that has to do with the problem which faces KVOS television on the west coast. There is confusion in the public mind, and there is the inequity with which this legislation fails to deal. If this legislation were to pass, the immediate consequence would be the depreciation of programming on KVOS television in Bellingham. If we compound that problem with commercial deletion and that were to become a policy, the combination of Bill C-58 plus commercial deletion would totally destroy KVOS television in Bellingham.

I suggest to hon. members there is at least an element of a moral problem involved. KVOS television developed the market when there were few television sets around in British Columbia and when no Canadian entrepreneur was ready or willing to gamble on the market and wait for the long term profits. I remember those days when the boob-