

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

some information. I asked this question during meetings of the committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts. I was assured by another minister that the information was readily available and I would be supplied with it in a couple of days. Two and a half months passed and I still did not have the information. I finally made the comment that I was not particularly anxious to get the information and suggested I would refer to the fact I could not get it when speaking in the House of Commons. The other day I received the letter dated December 13 which was addressed "Dear Ralph" and was signed "Judy". I should like to read this letter because it relates to the freedom of expression. It does not contain any comment about the freedom to hear. It states:

During the hearings of the broadcasting committee on Bill C-163, you asked for detailed information in regard to the seven C.A.T.V. applications turned down by the Board of Broadcast Governors as noted in its last annual report.

I have been in touch with the board on the matter and the information is as follows:

Perhaps I should deal with this paragraph by paragraph, always bearing in mind that we are discussing clause two of Bill C-163. The letter then states:

Two applications—one by David R. Graham of Ottawa and the other by Murray L. Sweigman of Toronto—for the establishment of a new C.A.T.V. system at Pembroke, Ontario, were rejected on grounds they would adversely affect the economic position of the existing T.V. station in that community.

Since when did the government of Canada adopt the attitude that it has to guarantee a profit to a T.V. station in what we are told is a competitive market? I wonder how many members in the house this afternoon recall the tremendous applause we received when we set up the department of consumer affairs which would see that prices go down? I can still hear the phrase to the effect that "the free play of the market place" will knock the prices down because the market is going to reverse itself and we will be living in paradise. The fact of the matter is that as long as monopolies continue the prices on the market place will be exactly those the people want to charge for the products they want to sell.

Why should the cabinet refuse to give licenses for C.A.T.V. stations on the basis that such a station might adversely affect the economic position of a television station in existence, particularly when we are told we are living in a free economy where people can participate in free enterprise? It seems to me that we are moving into a state-controlled

democracy, under terms which will require limitation in respect of various private enterprises, particularly C.A.T.V. stations.

• (4:10 p.m.)

However, the interesting thing about Pembroke is the fact that these two applications were turned down on the ground that they would adversely affect the economic position of the existing television station in this community. This letter is dated December 13 and refers to the year ended March 31, 1967. I made inquiries and learned they were rejected on the ground that they would adversely affect the economic position of the existing television station. I should like to advise you, Mr. Chairman, that since March 31 the Department of Transport has granted a C.A.T.V. licence in Pembroke. Well, if they were not going to grant a licence in Pembroke because it would adversely affect the economic position of the existing television station, why have they now granted permission to an applicant to establish a C.A.T.V. system in Pembroke?

The other day I spoke about duplicity. Do I have to repeat myself? I hope my remarks do not need to be repeated but if it is necessary I can repeat them. These licences were not granted because they would adversely affect the economic position of the existing television station, but then I find that an applicant has been given a permit and that the installation work is now 93 per cent completed. This applicant should be able to take signals out of the air and distribute them to the individual homes of his subscribers by March 1. Why could all three applicants not have been granted licences? Why could they not all have been allowed to go in there and let the best man win, somewhat like the situation in Ottawa where there are two stations which are not competitive, or like the situation in Hamilton where there were three stations which were competitive? In Hamilton they certainly let the three of them go to it. If these other applicants want to get into Pembroke, give them the right under the competitive economy in which we are supposed to be living rather than turn them down and then grant a licence to a third applicant. To move on, the next paragraph of this interesting letter, referring to the right of freedom of expression but evidently not to the right of freedom to hear, states that three applications by John Albut of Ottawa for C.A.T.V. systems at Prescott, Gananoque and Napanee were turned down on the ground that they would inhibit the