

*Non-Canadian Publications*

represent whose freedom of choice this bill and other government action threaten.

● (1550)

It is easy to speak about a national policy. But I ask why, just because it is nation-wide, is it nation wise? It takes an eastern problem and transfers the problem and the solution to the west. The problems and solutions are totally different. I think it is essential that we, as parliamentarians, understand that there are different regional problems in the various areas which must be approached on a regional basis.

We are attempting to have the government explore the optimum method of meeting the objectives of the Broadcasting Act. All these amendments say is that if a plan submitted by a border station is good for Canada then these punitive effects of Bill C-58 should not take effect until Canadians have an opportunity to explain the alternatives. What in the world is wrong with that? In the case of British Columbia the circumstances are different from those in eastern Canada. Everything is different. No one from the east will take the time to realize that what is good for Ontario and Quebec is not necessarily always good for British Columbia and Alberta.

Let us examine the practical results of Bill C-58 in British Columbia and Alberta rather than in Ontario. In order to survive KVOS-TV will have to cut its rates probably by 50 per cent to meet this tax bill. This would result in a loss situation for several years while the market grows. Be that as it may, that station will remain on the air. Its revenue will be cut by over \$3 million. This money will not be available to Canadian stations or for the Canadian broadcasting objectives. Instead of that \$3 million plus being lost to broadcasting let us do what mature neighbours should do; let us work out a compromise whereby everybody benefits.

Let us put \$2 million a year into a non-profit society with a board of directors of distinguished B.C. citizens. This board, not KVOS, would spend the money in any way worth-while in order to further our broadcasting objectives. Some suggested possibilities include sharing costs with Canadian stations in extension of the Canadian station services into such places as Skeena, Prince Rupert, upper Vancouver Island, and the Kootenays. They would also include the building of a major production centre in British Columbia with the cost sharing funds that would bring in other money from the United Kingdom and the United States.

While Canada's major production facilities are in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, why do we attempt to deny the province of British Columbia the opportunity to build a comparable production empire operated and staffed by Canadians with funds from Canadian advertising? We could set up training centres on the Vancouver mainland, on Vancouver Island and in the Okanagan for the training of Canadian writers, directors, actors, and the development of the other skills needed in production. There are no skills of this type in B.C. This plan is a positive one. We have always said we are interested in exploring alternative ways of achieving the results we want.

Bill C-58 would accomplish nothing in B.C. The plan submitted by KVOS-TV (BC) Ltd. is good for the citizens

[Mr. Elzinga.]

of B.C. and is just plain good business. I say again that all these amendments do is permit the exploration of plans such as this. If they are better for Canada than Bill C-58 why should we stop Canada benefiting?

The hon. member for Bruce-Grey this morning brought up some good points in his speech. As you can probably tell, Madam Speaker, by the many speeches of B.C. members from this side of the House we have been closely analysing the TV picture in B.C. We sincerely believe the western problems are not the same as eastern problems. The television side of Bill C-58 is not simplistic. It is complicated in many ways.

The hon. member for Bruce-Grey said that he had spoken to numbers of TV stations and that they all said this bill is good for all Canadian broadcasters. The Institute of Canadian Advertisers submitted a brief on this subject. That institute presents a different type of background. It gives a good outlook on this topic. It is very different to the view expressed by the hon. member for Bruce-Grey. In summary may I say that this is not a simplistic problem. It involves dangerous economic effects. We need to study this broadcast section so that we are all in agreement that we are doing the best job for Canada and for the Canadian businessmen and Canadian viewers. I believe that this bill will be a bad influence over-all on our broadcasting outlets. I urge the members of the House to support the amendment presently before us.

On this note I should like to quote from the brief we received from the Institute of Canadian Advertising. That institute states:

—we ask ourselves what would happen to various groups if advertising expenditures by Canadian advertisers on U.S. border stations were made a non-deductible business expense:

Madam Speaker, I see it is four o'clock.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** It being four o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, notices of motions, private bills.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

### HOLIDAYS ACT

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL HERITAGE DAY

**Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville)** moved that Bill C-208, respecting Heritage Day, be read the third time and do pass.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Carried!

**Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser):** Madam Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate I must say I am somewhat surprised that the sponsor of this bill did not take the first opportunity to express his reasons for wishing this motion to pass today. In fact I do not even see the sponsor of the bill in the Chamber. I am sorry, he is present.