

Non-Canadian Publications

matters subject to the government's position that, although people might like something else, the government really knows what they ought to have.

The amendments put forward simply stop us from overstepping or overstating the position. It might be one thing to take a new direction for the future, but it is quite another to cancel out all the institutions and traditions of citizens. The government should take a second look at this matter, not necessarily at the principle it has put forward, but at the notion of uprooting. Obviously there is a difference between pulling people out from their traditions and changing the direction which affects our future, but the government has not recognized that.

Irrespective of the feelings of the people, the government will do what it thinks is right. If that is the attitude of the government, then why does it not be honest with the Canadian people and tell them to save their eight cent stamps, to quit writing and phoning, because the government does not listen anyway? Why does the government not simply take the honest approach and say that it makes the decisions and the people should not bother writing? If the government were at all sensitive it would know that the vast majority of people, especially in southern British Columbia, are extremely opposed to the bill in its present form.

It would be a simple thing to pass an amendment and achieve the desired result without destroying the principle of what the government is intent on doing, that is, to change the direction for the future. But the government need not uproot the trends of the past. I say that because some of these stations have proved their corporate citizenship to an immeasurably high degree.

There is an inconsistency with regard to how the government has treated publications as opposed to broadcasting. With regard to publications there is a clause which says that, if publishers meet certain requirements, they are accepted as Canadian; yet there is a blanket condemnation of the broadcasting industry. When did the government obtain the wisdom, the right or the privilege to say that certain principles exist for the publishing industry, but there will be different principles for broadcasting? That is an unacceptable position.

If some sense of policy and direction is to be put forward for the nation, one of the factors ought to be consistency. Publishers are told that if they meet certain requirements they will be accepted. The government took it upon itself to say that even though *Reader's Digest* formerly did not meet the requirements, it is now accepted. Then with regard to the broadcasting industry the government said that United States border stations cannot broadcast into Canada, irrespective of how much they pay in taxes, how well they have performed as corporate citizens, or how many shares are owned by Canadians. That is a blanket condemnation.

I challenge any hon. member on the government side to tell this House where the government gets its guiding light to make decisions which have so many internal conflicts, and why, while one position can be taken, another cannot.

[Mr. Malone.]

That must be answered, and it certainly has not been up to the present.

Even if the government were strongly bent on its intent that there be no broadcasting into Canada from the United States and that it will curtail such broadcasting, this approach will not work because people choose information, listening, and entertainment according to their personal preferences. They will continue to listen to the stations of their choice and to buy advertising on stations which have the largest audiences, be it KVOS in Vancouver or the border stations here in central Canada. Without the amendment and leaving the bill as it is the government still defeats its position because the citizens will still listen to the same stations. That has been established. Surveys have demonstrated they will. Therefore advertisers will pay because they will buy where there is a market.

On the one hand we have a piece of legislation which is inconsistent and which suggests that no attention be paid to the wishes of citizens, and on the other hand, even if implemented with all these evils attached, this legislation does not achieve the purpose it set out to do.

Canada and the United States share the longest free border in the world. This country has a history of continually agitating our most friendly partner. We have trade agreements and many associations, and yet here we have another piece of legislation which does not seek to extend a spirit of co-operation, but seeks to clash directly with the nation with which we should be seeking to be the most friendly.

It was mentioned earlier by an hon. member of the New Democratic Party that there is not enough broadcasting into the United States, and therefore why should we be accepting American broadcasting into Canada. I agree with that position, but I think it is wrong to say that we ought to be cutting the Americans off. We should be doing just the opposite. We should be lobbying and doing everything in our power to ensure that in broadcasting and in the extension of our culture we reach more and more of the American market.

If the Liberal government is really intent on developing artists in this country and on extending our publishing and broadcasting activities, should we not extend our market from 20 million people to something near 250 million people? If we really want to extend opportunity and allow Canadian television corporations, companies, and influences to grow, then we should not cut off the market and make it smaller; we should make the market bigger, and that is just the opposite to what is proposed by the bill.

● (1720)

Whatever the intent of the legislation might have been, the fact is that it achieves the opposite. If the government wishes to have legislation that protects the broadcasting industry in this country it ought to do everything possible to open up the border and make arrangements with the United States for them to accept considerably more Canadian productions.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. I regret I have to inform the hon. member that his time has now expired.