concept as it is applied to closed captioning for the hearing impaired is something very important for that community in this country. I think it is very important that we make sure that the ability of the CRTC to have jurisdiction over alphanumeric programming is not weakened or diluted by this Bill.

There are those who have argued that the definition of programming in this Bill will weaken or dilute the ability of the CRTC to deal with both alphanumeric programming and programming involving pictures. The definition of programming in the Bill could well mean that the commission may lose jurisdiction over this important aspect of broadcasting represented by the alphanumeric technology.

Furthermore, the CRTC said in its brief: "If the Commission's jurisdiction becomes the subject of litigation, the courts will be faced with the problem of when the commission has jurisdiction over an undertaking".

Let me illustrate this point by taking the following example: a television station, at certain periods of the day, broadcasts only alphanumeric texts. This may be from midnight to 6 a.m., as now frequently happens, or it may be for substantially longer portions of time. The question then arises: Does the commission have jurisdiction over this undertaking? If so, when?

We were told at the committee that a court would have at least two options open to it. The court could decide that the commission only has jurisdiction over the operation while it is distributing programming, that is to say, it could find that the physical apparatus constitutes two undertakings, one a program undertaking and one a non-programming undertaking. Thus, at times the operation would be answerable to the commission, for programming, and at other times it would not be, for non-programming.

Questions then arise. Could the commission force the operator to increase its programming activity? If it did, it would be increasing the undertaking.

Would the commission have the power to force one undertaking, programming, to encroach on another undertaking, non-programming, when it had no jurisdiction over the other? What happens when, during programming periods, non-programming occurs? For example, could a broadcaster circumvent the commercial content limits during programming periods by airing so-called non-programming commercials?

Profits made from non-programming enterprises could not be channelled to the production of Canadian programs unless the commission had jurisdiction over the entire undertaking. That is why the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture in an all-Party report, its sixth report, addressed the term "programming" and in effect recommended against splitting programming and non-programming on the basis of whether it would be alphanumeric or pictures.

The House should adopt the recommendation of the Standing Committee which said that in its view the term "programming" should be defined broadly in the Act to cover all forms of audio and video content, including entertainment, information, and advertising, disseminated to the public over broadcasting undertakings.

The recommendation goes on to say:

> While the terms "program" and "programming" are not defined in the 1968 Act, the CRTC defined the term "programming" in the Cable Television Regulations, 1986, so as to exclude alphanumeric services with music and still images. In the Committee's view the distinction between these kinds of services and full video services has and will become increasingly blurred.

The committee goes on to say:

> It is essential that the Act clearly categorize all such services as "programming"—

I hope the House will accept the point of view I have expressed. It is based on a careful study of the matter as recommended by our very distinguished critic, the Hon. Member for Mount Royal (Mrs. Finestone).

I want to commend the Member for the outstanding work she has done in the study of this Bill and for the development of very constructive amendments. In her work she has taken a broad constructive view of broadcasting in this country, a view that now appears to have the support of all those concerned with broadcasting in Canada.

These groups have now come to the point where they unanimously support the point of view expressed by the Hon. Member for Mount Royal, speaking in her capacity as critic for the Liberal Party. I believe the Minister and the Government should pay serious attention to the views expressed by the Hon. Member for Mount Royal, reflecting now, as they do, the almost unanimous viewpoint of all those connected with broadcasting in Canada.

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I want to say with respect to this particular amendment that obviously there is a difference between what the opposition critic considers as programming and what the Government considers as programming. We have a different definition.

Let me make it clear that the comments made in applying this to closed captioning are totally wrong. It does not apply to closed captioning. I also want to underline the fact that in our broadcast policy we have stated very clearly our commitment to closed captioning and to the needs of other disabled groups in our society.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question is on Motion No. 7, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Mount Royal. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.