

and the freedom of choice; it is an approach which must be fully debated in this House, not as part of a bill such as the one before us which deals primarily with the publishing industry, but as an important issue in its own right.

I would say the best expression of the need for this part of the legislation to be deferred is the intervention of the minister herself. The hon. member for Ahuntsic (Mrs. Sauvé) will, I think, be a good minister. I believe she has the competence and the ability to be a good minister, given time. I think she has the competence to make fair, equitable, and just decisions, but how can anyone expect her to make decisions on the basis of the little time and information she has had since assuming her portfolio? I think we are crippling her by imposing this legislation upon her at the present time. Instead, we should give her an opportunity to bring her ideas to bear on her department, to bring her proposals on broadcasting to the House, refer them to committee and there have a full and fair discussion. This opportunity will not be afforded her. If it were to take place after this legislation is passed it would mean we would have to bring this bill back in order to wipe out this particular clause. It would be necessary for us to start all over again.

The minister said her greatest concern was that Canadians might never have the value of truly Canadian productions made with Canadian funds, by Canadian workers, and under Canadian producers. This indicates her complete lack of awareness. I do not believe the hon. lady has been west of Ottawa. If she has I would be surprised. She obviously has not been to British Columbia; she obviously has not been to KVOS-TV; she obviously has not been to Canawest Films.

I want to say to the minister: this will destroy, not create more. In 1974 there were 173 employees with Canawest Films, part-time, full-time and free lance. Who were these 173 employees? Were they some villainous Americans from the south coming to corrupt Canada? No, these were just the kind of people to whom she was referring. They were Canadian workers and producers. They were engaged in a Canadian production, even made with Canadian funds. They exported Canadian culture throughout Canada, the United States and the world.

● (1630)

What will happen to these 173 people? If you dry up the source of revenue that is subsidizing them, obviously they will cease to operate, or their operations will be considerably reduced. Is this desirable? Hardly. Ask the employees of Canawest who are writers, artists, and producers working in western Canada. Ask the would-be employees who are now hired part time. If the government would but give KVOS an opportunity to be heard by the CRTC, this would mean the potential employment of 200 additional Canadian writers and employees during the next year, with more to follow. In other words there would be massive expansion. If we pass this bill obviously this cannot happen because we have dried up the source of revenue flowing from Canadian advertising. The very thing we are trying to do is to get Canadian advertising dollars flowing to Canadian producers and writers.

As I make these points and throw them across the way, if hon. members have been listening I just do not understand

Non-Canadian Publications

how they cannot see their simple logic. The only alternatives that seem to be in place are rather unpleasant ones. What else is the government trying to do? Sometimes I feel that the government is more interested in a mini-confrontation with the United States, in trying to slap the United States in the face, than it is in our own Canadian interests, such as jobs, Canadian culture, and, the development of Canadian writers and producers. I would ask the parliamentary secretary through you, Madam Speaker, whether he has been to KVOS-TV and seen the facilities there. Has he seen what the situation is? Has he been to Canawest and talked to Canadian writers, artists, producers, film makers? He cannot even shake his head to indicate the answer is no.

Mr. Fleming: Madam Speaker, on a point of order I simply want to make it clear that nodding my head in any direction is not going to be recorded in *Hansard*. If I choose to indicate my views on any subject I shall do so properly by taking the floor.

Mr. Wenman: Madam Speaker, if the hon. member does not get a chance to answer when I am finished, I hope he will answer that one to the press. I think he is destroying something that he has not seen, that he does not know anything about, that he does not even care about. He is like the minister who said "We stand on what we do, no matter what retaliation may come, and we accept that". No matter what happens, the government does not care about writers and producers and that kind of programming. She might as well have added "We don't care what may come or what the negative results may be for British Columbia".

This is sheer arrogance. It is why we have a big delegation of ministers visiting British Columbia. The government refuses to listen and understand and the west is getting sick and tired of it. We asked the government to make a minor amendment, yet it does not even look at it and find out what it does. As a western representative it is very tiring to have this arrogant bouncing back and forth and to listen to statements like "We don't care what happens". We do care in British Columbia, as do many of the government's own backbenchers; and it is about time the government started to listen to them.

The parliamentary secretary said that one of the reasons why this bill is so appropriate, just, and fair, is that the majority of the members of the committee were from British Columbia.

An hon Member: No, that is not so.

Mr. Wenman: Well, certainly there were a lot of members from British Columbia on the committee. However, Madam Speaker, having sat through the committee hearings as one member from British Columbia I can assure you that I was not given my full opportunity to speak and to ask questions, but was cut off time and time again, as were members on the government's own backbenches. I want it recorded in *Hansard* that my time was limited, restricted, and cut off; that there was no just and fair hearing.

Hon. members talk about BC-TV, and here we have agreement. Perhaps I can just mention some of the matters upon which we are agreed. I want to see British Columbia television grow. I want to support British Columbia televi-