

inconsistencies, I would refer hon. members to *Hansard* of February 4, page 10641. I asked the minister:

I wonder if the Secretary of State would not agree that if a writer is restricted by regulation as to how he can write, and the publisher is restricted by regulation as to what he can publish, it is not reasonable to suppose that there is a comparable restriction on the free flow of information?

The Secretary of State replied:

If I understood the question, and I am not altogether sure I did, I think I would probably have to agree. But I do not see that that is relevant to Bill C-58 or to the debate.

Yet, just ten minutes previously, as recorded on page 10638 of *Hansard*, the minister said:

Let me reiterate that the government is not seeking in any way to control the freedom of magazine publishers and editors. Nor do we want to impose our will upon the people of Canada and regulate their reading habits. Bill C-58 in no way impinges upon freedom of expression.

I would ask the Secretary of State to please be consistent in what he is saying. On one hand he says he does not want to impinge upon freedom of expression, and on the other he concedes that Bill C-58, if interpreted according to my question, would impinge upon freedom of expression. That, to me, is a blatant inconsistency. If the parliamentary secretary wanted to look for inconsistencies in this bill, let him look at the words of the Secretary of State.

I say, again, that we are asking to have freedom for people in southern British Columbia to enjoy the viewer selection that is theirs today without the injurious restrictions placed upon them by the prejudicial clauses in Bill C-58. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), in the debate on Wednesday, made what I think is a very helpful proposal. He suggested that where matters of broadcasting come into conflict with international relations, when broadcasting crosses the forty-ninth parallel from both sides and creates problems of international communication and tax problems, these matters should be referred to a commission which would adjudicate on them.

I think that is a helpful suggestion, and we have a precedent for this. The International Joint Commission, which has been operating for generations, sits down yearly—almost constantly nowadays—and brings together both sides in an area of dispute and conflict regarding water and fishing rights as they affect our international relations. Those of us from British Columbia are well aware of the IJC discussions recently concerning fishing rights in the gulf waters of British Columbia. There is no other way of handling these matters, because each country has vested interests in fishing rights for its own citizens and the problems of water, rivers, lakes, oceans, sharing coastlines and rivers, can be solved in no other way, with friendship being preserved, unless we have a joint commission adjudicating these matters.

I suggest to hon. members that that is a creative way of dealing with the conflict which we are facing today. I think the hon. member for New Westminster has come up with a creative proposal to get us out of the jam because, as all members of the House know, one of the leading executives of the lumber industry in B.C. this week met the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and told him of the concern that people in B.C. feel as a result of conflicts issuing from this kind of legislation. He told the Prime Minister that if Bill C-58 passes, the U.S. Congress will prepare retaliatory

Non-Canadian Publications

legislation. That is the kind of conflict we are facing, and the tragedy is that this conflict is completely unnecessary. Why should we fight with our best friend, when both sides can find a way of bringing the conflict into the open where it does not have to antagonize and where it can heal rather than create a rift? I commend the suggestion the hon. member for New Westminster made to us, and I suggest that government members present to their caucus the opportunity of resolving the differences which exist between Canada and the United States with regard to communications. That would take care of this and other problems facing Windsor and Toronto people as they watch upper New York stations and Detroit stations.

● (1230)

Certainly it would take care of the prejudicial situation existing in British Columbia. KVOS television is facing an impossible problem of having, if this legislation passes, to grade its production and having to create an inferior kind of production because of the loss of revenue it will face as a result of the legislation. There will also be a compounding of that problem if the deletion of commercials comes into effect. The combination of Bill C-58 and the policy of deletion of commercials would effectively wipe out another television outlet which brings enjoyment and pleasure to thousands of homes in the lower mainland of British Columbia.

I ask hon. members to consider this subamendment. Speaking specifically to the objections the parliamentary secretary raised about the amendments which I presented earlier, I wonder whether this subamendment does not meet his objections and eliminate them. I believe that hon. members on the government side could support this subamendment, give it speedy passage and so continue to provide for the people of British Columbia the kind of viewing they have enjoyed for a generation and want to continue to enjoy.

Mr. C. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, during the past few days we have heard a great deal from the opposition about the broadcasting side of Bill C-58. I wonder how much contact members of the opposition have had with Canadian broadcasters. During the speech of the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen) I was beginning to wonder whether I was listening to a Canadian parliamentarian or a congressman or senator from the United States.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): It is about time we became concerned about Canada and Canadian broadcasters to the extent that they deserve our concern. I happen to have spent 20 years in that business, and I am concerned and broadcasters are concerned with regard to what is happening over Bill C-58. What will happen to Bill C-58 and communications in the broadcasting industry in this country if the amendments which have been proposed by members of the opposition are allowed to come into effect? No matter how hon. members opposite describe it, they are asking us to allow an American broadcasting station to become a Canadian broadcasting station without receiving a licence; it is as simple as that.

Mr. Wenman: Have you been to Vancouver?