

Even more than that, Mr. Speaker, the motions moved by the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock indicate that there is a need to give some credence and acceptance to the needs of the consumer vis-à-vis the province of British Columbia. What is wrong with that type of approach, particularly when the CRTC has ruled that commercial deletion regarding cable and television is something we will have to get used to in the future? As I understand it, such a policy will not be implemented until such time as the whole matter which affects not only border stations but the viewing audiences in Hamilton, Toronto, etc. can be solved equitably.

● (1520)

We have seen an equitable solution supposedly in respect of *Reader's Digest*, even though it was made through the back door. At least this shows there can and must be flexibility in respect of Bill C-58. All we are asking in this particular regard is a reassessment or a review of the government's position in order that it does not tread, run, or jump hastily into a very precarious situation.

We are talking about a good corporate citizen, and I will not go into the reasons why I can make that statement. It is most unfair for a government to move in such a disastrous way that will unquestionably mean the end of this particular broadcasting station. Surely that is not the way we should operate, particularly after the station has been around for a significant number of years making a solid contribution to the development of our national economy.

We must pause and ask ourselves if there is some possibility of negotiation or arrangement. We must ask whether there is the possibility of a solution being found regarding the particular situation in which we find ourselves, and that is Canadian nationalism versus United States parent companies. I suggest there is a possibility, in that the government found one in respect of *Reader's Digest*. What I am saying, in other words, is that we should not let this bill preclude the possibility of any plan which may benefit Canada and the Canadian broadcasting system. We are calling for flexibility and I know it can be found because the precedent has been set.

What is the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock trying to do? He has put before this House for the edification of the Canadian people three proposals which are the same in substance and principle but which vary because of the particular circumstances we may confront. His first motion is No. 7 in which he calls for a written agreement, once a plan has been approved by the CRTC and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen), providing compensatory payment by the allocation of funds to enhance Canadian television. Is that not what we are seeking? If that could be accomplished you would then enhance Canadian broadcasting and television, as the case may be, at the same time giving relief to stations such as KVOS.

Motion No. 8 is in the same vein. In the event that the first motion is not acceptable it calls for a written agreement by a particular subsidiary, one similar to KVOS, with not less than 75 per cent of the voting shares being held by Canadians and directing a percentage of the gross revenues, to be determined by the company and the CRTC, to be allocated for the benefit of Canadian television. Is that not a solution worthy of some consideration?

Non-Canadian Publications

I am looking at the minister responsible for the Treasury Board.

An hon. Member: He has already got problems.

Mr. Alexander: Perhaps he has enough problems, but with the power he holds sitting in that particular portfolio I wish he would look seriously at Motions Nos. 7, 8 and 9. I am sure he would come to the conclusion in a minute that these proposals make sense in terms of equity.

If motion No. 8 is not acceptable to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) and that elite group which sits in the front benches maybe No. 9 is attractive. Motion No. 9 is in the same vein. It also calls for a written agreement in respect of approximately 25 per cent of the gross revenue of a particular subsidiary being directed for the benefit of Canadian television, with the utilization of such amount to be determined by the CRTC and approved by the Minister of National Revenue.

The most important aspect of these motions is that the scheme or proposal will be under the direct supervision and control of the CRTC and the Minister of National Revenue. They will set the guidelines and the percentage, and will determine how the distribution is to be made.

I think it is significant to note the problems we have in respect of the acceptability of U.S. television programs in Canada. I should like to quote from the Vancouver *Sun* of August 28, 1975, from an article by James Nelson under the headline "Why does Canada Buy U.S. TV Shows? It pays!" Bill C-58 is not going to stop that. It will not stop the CTV and CBC from buying U.S. programs, and let there be no misunderstanding in that regard. This article states:

The most popular U.S. television shows imported by the CBC and CTV television network last season cost \$2,000 to \$4,000 for each episode and yielded the networks \$24,000 to \$46,000 each.

By contrast, all major Canadian-produced shows were heavy money-losers, of as much as \$49,000 a week.

Later in the article it is stated:

But the figures that were revealed showed the disproportionately high revenues from the airing of American TV shows on the Canadian networks compared with their costs, and the high cost of Canadian shows in relation to the revenues they brought in.

The last part of that sentence is important, "in relation to the revenues they brought in". The proposal of the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock would provide that a percentage of the gross profits, less advertising expenses, etc., would be directed by the CRTC and the Minister of National Revenue toward reducing those deficits. Surely that is a step in the right direction. Is this not the type of arrangement we are seeking?

I know that hon. members opposite realize the government is wrong in the direction it is moving, trying to kick out, without ceremony, a station that has been operated for years within the guidelines of the law in Canada. Does it not make sense to try to reach some sort of an agreement?

If one of the proposals of the hon. member were accepted this would assist Canadian television program production; it would assist the extension of Canadian television services; it would assist in the development of Canadian talent; it would assist in the furtherance of educational TV, and it would assist in respect of any other broadcasting objectives for the benefit of Canada and Canadians. This is