

three a week, plus news and news specials. This is not all. It is just a smattering of what B.C. citizens want to view.

These amendments seem to be well-founded. I see no reason why we in British Columbia should not have an opportunity to watch the kind of television we want to watch.

We are having other difficulties there. Somebody in government or one of the agents of government, the CBC or CRTC, have plans for the viewing edification of people on the west coast which are extremely unpopular.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired.

● (1740)

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself specifically to the amendment to Bill C-58 concerning television I find myself obliged to address myself to the speech made last evening by the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé).

I must say I listened with stunned amazement to the words of the minister. I felt there was only one course of action I could take, and that was to seek an opportunity such as I now have to respond to the some of the specious and shallow arguments she presented—I feel, by the way, that I am dealing with her remarks in a most generous manner.

Perhaps it would be best to deal with her address piece by piece. I begin by referring to her words in the first paragraph—"all these amendments aim, more or less, at granting special status to a foreign radio station." Apart from the fact that the word foreign is used to constitute a minor but insidious put-down—and I think this has all been very carefully orchestrated—let us talk about what KVOS has done with reference to taxation. If any special status was granted, why was the federal Department of National Revenue so pleased to participate in arrangements for such special status?

Why was the treasury so keen to obtain some of the revenue which was generated, funds which could just as easily have gone to the United States? No. KVOS is a Canadian subsidiary and during the period from 1964, I think it was, to date, it has contributed some \$76 million to the revenue of Canada. I would say, Madam Speaker, that this particular station granted a special status to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen). There was an arrangement worked out between the Canadian revenue department and the United States revenue service. And that is special status! Other examples of a similar kind could be cited.

The minister then went on to say:

All the measures which are included in each of these amendments make possible the exploitation of the Canadian market by an American station—and this is precisely what is happening in the situation we are now discussing: American stations are coming here to exploit the Canadian market.

Well, really! If we are going to talk about exploitation I suggest that the hon. member for York West (Mr. Fleming) address himself to certain facts which he was careful to avoid mentioning in his speech today, and advise the House of just how much money the CBC has taken out of

Non-Canadian Publications

the United States through its radio station facilities in Windsor. If we are going to talk about exploitation, I would say that \$5 million is exploitation. That is a pretty fair chunk of money. But the hon. member was very careful to avoid mentioning that.

Mr. Fleming: The owner agrees not to do it any longer.

Mr. Brisco: If the parliamentary secretary wishes to speak he will have an opportunity to do so. I am calling attention to something he failed to mention. Later on in her speech the minister said that the measures proposed by members of the opposition would certainly be contrary to the purposes of the Broadcasting Act. Madam Speaker, as late as last week the provision of the Broadcasting Act were infringed upon at a hearing of the CRTC in Vancouver. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

We also saw last week an application by the CBC to establish a television station in Vancouver. That government body, the CBC, violated the regulations, violated the Criminal Code, and violated the Broadcasting Act by erecting a tower three months in advance of that hearing without ever applying to the CRTC. If we are talking about violations of the Broadcasting Act, let us consider the whole scheme of things. The CRTC violates its own regulations every day, and so does the CBC. The trouble is that members on the other side never bother to notice these things.

Look at pages 14 to 17 of the information presented to those members who are interested in what happens to KVOS. Consider the responsibilities of this station with reference to codes of ethics, the amount of advertising allowed during children's programs, and so on. This is the big, corporate, rip-off giant, this foreign company to which the minister referred.

Immediately upon receipt of information that Canadian-based stations would be under new regulations to program less commercials per hour in programs aimed primarily at children, KVOS-TV (B.C.) Ltd officials advised the CRTC in writing that the station would voluntarily adhere to these regulations . . . We are now programming under those guidelines.

Hon. members opposite may say: so what? Well, they could have acted quite differently.

KVOS-TV has for 20 years voluntarily followed all restrictions that Canadian-based stations have in the broadcast treatment of Canadian elections and election news.

Now, with regard to the wording of commercials.

When writing for and/or filming commercials for Canadian or Canadian-distributed products or services, both federal and provincial laws, regulations and codes are adhered to.

The station adheres to the stricter of Canadian or United States codes. For example, it schedules a minimum of two minutes less commercials per hour in the 6 p.m. to 11 p.m. period than do Canadian privately-owned stations. This is the nasty menace which has been referred to by the Minister of Communications. The hon. lady then went on to refer to tolerance. She said:

In practice, because of our tolerance, those TV stations operate in a country where, we must admit, they are not even licensed.

I ask; what tolerance? Tolerance to KVOS? Perhaps we should set the record straight. This afternoon the hon. member for York West made some high-sounding statements which do not stand up under close scrutiny. He said