

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

hard times and instead of continuing to operate an independent station sold out to Ottawa interests and the Cornwall station is now a relay station out of Ottawa. If Cornwall, a great big bustling community on the seaway, cannot support an independently owned station, imagine how Prescott could support an alternative television service in that general region encompassing Gananoque and Napanee.

The report of the Commons broadcasting committee is interesting. I shall pay my respects to that tremendous organization in the course of the debate on the broadcasting bill if I am advised under which clause I shall be able to discuss the broadcasting committee. The report of the broadcasting committee states that it is their opinion that wherever there is a C.B.C. station the second station to be erected should be an independently owned station or that if there is an independently owned station the second station must be a C.B.C. station. In Kingston, Ontario, there is a privately owned station. I wish to quote from the minutes of the standing committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts for the meeting of November 16. Before the committee appeared the Secretary of State on page 55 of the minutes we find the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond saying the following:

● (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wahn is bringing up two points. One has to do with programming and he is concerned that the same type of programs are on both networks at the same time. Then the other point is the extension of the network and the white paper and the broadcasting committee both clearly stated that:

"The committee concurs with the statement on structure appearing in the white paper, particularly with reference to extending coverage to all Canadians and to full network services in both official languages. We recommend further that, wherever practical, in areas now receiving only one Canadian service, if the service is through a private outlet, the alternative should be provided by C.B.C. If C.B.C. is now the sole service, the second service should be private. Where there are serious obstacles to such parallel development, however, these should not prohibit the extension of alternate service by other means, at least on a temporary basis. We urge that the introduction of dual service proceed as rapidly as C.B.C. finances and local market conditions permit."

If I remember correctly, the C.A.B. also agreed with that, too, so it did envisage that in every area in Canada where there are to be two stations, one would be C.B.C. and one would be private.

This means that because there is a privately owned station in Kingston at the present time, any second station that is granted a franchise there will be C.B.C. Why do we

worry about protecting the provision of alternate television service in the Kingston area? Since when did the C.B.C. ever start to worry about money? They simply say: Send us some more over, we are short today, and over it comes. What are we protecting in the Kingston area? The television station will be a C.B.C. one, according to the white paper and the report of the committee of the house if it is adopted.

So in the Kingston area applications for C.A.T.V. service in Prescott, Gananoque and Napanee are being turned down in order to protect a C.B.C. station that may be erected there in the future and which does not need financial protection, because the way money is spent by the C.B.C. they would not know what to do with the limited funds available to them from private sources if they were privately owned.

I move on to another refusal. This is in the same letter:

The board turned down an application by Mr. Claude Lemieux, of Baie St-Paul, Quebec, for a system at Clermont, on grounds it would adversely affect the existing T.V. station there.

Once again we have the cabinet stepping into the breach. Here is a privately owned station. They say the television audience is not to look at any station other than the one they have. It took a considerable number of phone calls to find out what existing T.V. station was being protected. I thought for a while that they were the privately owned stations in Quebec city, but I have in my hand a map of Clermont and found after some research that the station that was objecting to the C.A.T.V. in Clermont is at Rivière-du-Loup and is privately owned. Clermont is 85 miles from Quebec city and only about 40 miles across the St. Lawrence river from Rivière-du-Loup.

When the application came forward from Mr. Claude Lemieux of Baie St-Paul in the year ended March 31, 1967, the owners of the T.V. station in Rivière-du-Loup, having learned that all owners of T.V. stations oppose all applications for C.A.T.V. licences—

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. gentleman again but this time I must advise him that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Lapointe.