

Non-Canadian Publications

Canadian artists and artisans. It is merely sane realism on our part, and not anti-Americanism, despite what some hon. members opposite may say. We opted for this bill, not as an anti-American gesture but because we have to protect our own interests. Moreover, the very principle of the provision providing exemptions is debatable, for it creates a special tax status for the advertisers of a given area which may not necessarily be granted in others. The very principle of some of those amendments is quite agreeable.

● (2120)

Moreover, the proposed amendments transfer the responsibility for the application of the legislation from the House to the CRTC or the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen). Now, in my opinion, Parliament alone has the authority to confer a special status to a foreign television station. Only Parliament can do that. Do hon. members realize that the CRTC only has the responsibility to deliver Canadian licences and to administer Canadian affairs? How could it administer what hon. members propose? This would create such a delicate situation for the CRTC that I think it would be unable to carry out its mandate with regard to the Broadcasting Act without facing many conflicts. I therefore think there is no reason whatsoever to believe that exemptions such as those proposed would be of any advantage to the Canadian broadcasting system, and that is precisely what we are talking about, advantages for the Canadian broadcasting system. Obviously, hon. members are forgetting that.

[English]

Mr. Brisco: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the minister has referred to the fact that the CRTC cannot accept responsibility for managing or being involved in any way with KVOS.

Mr. Roy (Timmins): What is your point of order?

Mr. Brisco: Don't get excited. I should like to ask the minister how she relates that statement to the fact that KVOS is now paying \$75 million in taxation to the Department of National Revenue. I will now sit down and let the rabble on the other side continue.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, again I say there is no ground at all to believe that deductions would help the Canadian broadcasting system. But there are many reasons to think and to believe that if American broadcasting stations bearing their signal toward our markets were given a stronger status, then our industry would be affected and get a blow with everlasting consequences. This is why it is urgent to indicate immediately to hon. members on the other side of the House that we will not second this amendment because we on this side want to protect our Canadian broadcasting and television industry at any cost.

[English]

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I suppose some members will ask why I, a member from Ontario, am concerned about this matter since the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen) is primarily interested in a station in British Columbia, KVOS. At least the action is in the province of B.C.

[Mrs. Sauvé.]

I must say I listened to the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé) in utter amazement and misbelief. She conveniently forgot to indicate to the House what a good corporate citizen KVOS has been and will continue to be. Then she started to talk about special status, conveniently forgetting that just a couple of days ago the government brought about a particular type of special status for *Reader's Digest*. She then has the nerve to say that we on this side are talking about special status. It was the government that introduced special status as a result of its decision on *Digest*.

I want to know what is the rush here. Unless I am mistaken, Mr. Speaker, commercial deletions will not come into effect in the immediate future, until such time as an arrangement has been made between the CRTC and the FCC. What we are talking about here is the removal of some \$20 million of revenue spent on advertising through U.S. stations. The Americans at the border stations are in an uproar about it, and as a result of that uproar the government has indicated that it will search for some solutions.

All the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock is trying to do in his three amendments is to ask the House to hold tight for a minute and try to arrive at a solution in order to save a good corporate citizen. This organization has been in existence, I understand from listening to the debate this evening, for some 20 years and has proven itself. It is paying taxes, it has invested in Canada, it has employees in Canada, and it has an unblemished record in regard to Canadian interests. There is a question of principle here involving Canadian nationalism versus a good corporate citizen which happens to be a subsidiary of a U.S. corporation.

I think it is time we took stock of what is going on in Canada. I had no intention of getting into this debate and I said that yesterday. I am not even prepared. But looking down the road the government is travelling in terms of Canadian nationalism, I am becoming a little scared and so are a lot of other members, mostly on the other side. It is our job to put forward constructive criticism, but when three or four Liberal backbenchers stand up and join in the debate there must surely be something wrong with the direction the government is taking.

What I see in this debate is a very dramatic attempt to save a good corporate citizen. After hearing the reasoned arguments of the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock, for the life of me I cannot understand why this matter cannot be held in abeyance. This corporation has been of some significant benefit to Canada and Canadians, yet with one stroke of the pen we are trying to destroy it. With the implementation of Bill C-58 and commercial deletions, station KVOS goes down the drain. Is this what we want to do, Mr. Speaker? Let me also put this to hon. members; I do not want to go too far.

An hon. Member: You never do.