

*Non-Canadian Publications*

corporate Canadian businessmen, at the same time should we not expect the same kind of justice to be given to United States corporate citizens who have demonstrated their capacity to make a contribution? The contribution they have made is that of promoting Canadian culture. They have established a major firm in Canada for the production of films. This firm is called Canawest. Canawest will be affected by this bill. Since a contribution has been made to our Canadian culture, I respectfully suggest that we should reconsider the matter of "The Ugly Canadian" in relation to the good corporate citizen in America.

Unfortunately, the point was missed by the good member for Bruce-Grey when he claimed the bill would not do certain things. He failed to tell us what good the passage of this bill will do for Canada. Unfortunately, it will do no good. The whole principle of this bill and the amendment is to increase the flow of advertising dollars to the news media. It has been shown that this will not increase the flow of advertising dollars to the news media. If this purpose is not accomplished, I ask what we will have accomplished other than injury to existing Canadian cultural facilities, and I include Canawest as a promoter of Canadian culture and identity.

I have a message for the minister which I hope will be passed on to her by the minister listening on her behalf. I would suggest to the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé), our fair Portia, that the quality of mercy is not strained should she provide the option of the right to be heard to KVOS-TV and other broadcasters in the same situation, because really what we seek is an element of time. The option to delete this amendment during the next parliament obviously would be open to the government, and in the meantime we would be providing, through this amendment, a period of time in which the government could hear representations from the broadcasting industry.

The most we would be doing would be allowing one more year, or the period of time between now and the next parliament when this entire bill could be presented or when this amendment could be changed if it proved to be unsatisfactory. Surely that is not too much to ask. It is unfortunate that one should be reduced to the position of having to ask for mercy, but I do not hesitate. Although our land might well be disallowed full justice, let this amendment show how mercy can reason justice. If the government continues not only to deny justice but also mercy, the people will have justice more than thou desirest at the next election; because, make no mistake, the members of parliament from this region of Canada have spoken up time and time again. All members have spoken, not once but twice and three or four times in an attempt to get the message across.

● (1440)

Vancouver is not Toronto, just as Toronto is not Vancouver. There are special problems there to which this amendment relates. If it cannot understand what these special problems are, I suggest the government should listen to its own backbench members from British Columbia. The only one who spoke was the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway who made an impassioned speech urging that not only this amendment but that amendments she had put forward be passed. If she were here this afternoon I am sure she would speak on the amendment before us urging that the

[Mr. Wenman.]

government accept it on behalf of the people of British Columbia.

I think the statements made by the parliamentary secretary about Canadian stations selling advertising on the U.S. market and the fact that the CRTC has stepped in and stopped this, following which the hon. member had to explain that this was an error—

**An hon. Member:** The argument was not.

**Mr. Wenman:** —underscore a basic problem in the broadcasting section of this bill. Actually, there are two problems but the first one is major; that is, that even the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fleming), who probably knows more about broadcasting than most members of the House—and I give him credit for that—is confused about the various points at issue in this debate. The broadcasting section of this bill has been completely obscured by the publishing side. Because this affects the lives of many millions of citizens who are viewers, voters and citizens, I urge that we take time to give either the broadcasters who have served Canada for many years an opportunity to present a positive program which could be of benefit to Canada, as proposed in the amendments which we are discussing, or that we send this portion of the bill back to committee so that a clear-cut analysis can be made by members. By that I mean that members analyse that portion of the bill with an open mind to find the best way to improve the Canadian broadcasting system.

Secondly, over and above the fact that we have not had time to analyse the broadcasting section of the bill is the fact that was emphasized by the parliamentary secretary when he said that CKLW had no restrictions on selling in the U.S. market. He might have pointed out that the Americans put no restrictions on selling by CKLW-AM. There is no immorality there. By that I mean that CKLW-AM is a powerhouse, the maximum power station in Windsor, Ontario, which has been serving the Detroit market for more years than any U.S. border television station has served Canadian markets. In fact, the tax structure of KVOS-TV B.C. Ltd., when it was set up in 1955 by both the Canadian and the U.S. tax departments jointly, was based on a method that had been used for many years by CKLW-AM and its U.S. subsidiary, CKLW Inc. I might add that CKLW Inc., at its headquarters in Detroit, employs U.S. citizens and bills itself in magazines throughout the United States not as a Windsor, Ontario, station but as Detroit's number one radio station, which in fact it is. It is the number one audience station in the major market of Detroit, Michigan.

The point I am making is that it is not immoral to receive revenues for services rendered. We cannot say that the U.S. stations are doing something wrong when they sell in Canada, when for many years—more years than the U.S. stations—we have been, and still are, doing the same thing in reverse; in other words, selling from a Canadian market into a major U.S. market.

I should like to take issue with another point made by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt). He read from the brief submitted by the Canadian Association of Broadcasters which referred to the treatment of Canadian stations by U.S. cable companies. After checking with