

increase Canadian culture is not by restricting or severing our relationships with the United States, or by allowing only Canadian content, or a high percentage of it in our publications and in our television and radio broadcasting. The way to extend Canadian culture is in fact by playing upon that larger market of 220 million people to the south. I believe such a convention between Canada and the United States ought to be aimed not at destroying border stations or cutting off U.S. broadcasting into Canada, but quite the reverse. We should be increasing Canadian influence into the international market, and we should be increasing significantly our intake of cultural matters from all countries of the world.

It must be recognized that our world is not getting larger, it is getting smaller, and this is not the time in our history to shut off our borders, limit information, and restrict the flow of communication. This is the time to open up and begin to communicate more and more with international markets, creating more opportunities for our artists, and all this by developing situations in which they can broadcast into the United States.

In much the same way we found that other parts of this bill represent censorship. The 80 per cent figure is in effect censorship in that we are using a mathematical concept to deal with something that has no mathematical unit. The whole thing becomes a subjective judgment, and therefore censorship. The same applies to the broadcasting regulations.

This House should give full consideration to an acceptance of this amendment because in essence all it is asking for is more time in which to conduct an in-depth study, and a chance for those who are to be affected to appear before the committee to make recommendations and suggest other alternatives. This time would allow a more thorough study of the issue, and I see no reason why anyone in this House would oppose the suggestion that we allow a minimal amount of time for greater participation and for greater study.

Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, since this debate has been going on for some time I think it would make sense to read again the amendment now under discussion. It is:

That motion No. 7 be amended by deleting the proposed sub paragraph (c) and substituting therefor:

(c) "a written agreement entered into after the coming into force of this section with a Canadian subsidiary of a foreign broadcasting undertaking if the Minister of the Department of National Revenue has approved a plan submitted by the said Canadian subsidiary providing for compensatory payment by such subsidiary by the allocation of funds to Canadian television program production, extension of Canadian television service, development of Canadian talent, or otherwise for the benefit of Canadian broadcasting; the Minister may require as a condition for entering into any such agreement that a percentage, to be stipulated by the Minister, of the voting shares of such subsidiary be beneficially owned by Canadian citizens".

In participating in this debate I should like to refer again to the comments of the hon. member for Bruce-Grey (Mr. Douglas). Far too often when members representing regions in Ontario speak in this House they portray the attitude that the Canadian border ends when it reaches Manitoba. I do not find this as evident on the part of members on this side of the House, but far too often

Non-Canadian Publications

Canada is considered to be Ontario, and nothing but Ontario.

In the speech of the hon. member for Bruce-Grey he made an extremely strong case for the province of Ontario, and I commend him for that because he has a responsibility for that region. The amendment now before the House would have a great deal more effect on the residents of the province of British Columbia than on those in Ontario.

As an Albertan I feel there is more at stake than just this broadcasting issue. The issue is whether we want to see the government prying into many aspects of our private lives. We in the Progressive Conservative party are aware that in equities in the broadcasting industry exist and that legislation is required to correct these. The present legislation before us fails to take into account the needs of our regional areas.

It was of interest to note the other day that an hon. member of the Creditiste party complained about not having a French-language station in his area which is predominantly French-speaking. At this time some of our friends opposite are attempting to do something that is perhaps contrary to the beliefs of many of us. They are planning to put a French CBC station in Vancouver over the objections of the local residents. This is an indication that the government fails to recognize the regional needs of the country. We have an area in Quebec which would very much like to be served by a French-Canadian television station, but seems to be having great difficulty in getting one. Yet in Vancouver where the need does not exist the government is pushing such a station down the throats of those residents.

Many northern areas in British Columbia and Alberta do not have decent television reception, yet we do not see a great effort on the part of the present administration to provide such service to those areas. On the contrary this administration, as we see by this legislation, is attempting to eliminate existing stations in southern British Columbia.

After listening to the speech by the hon. member for Bruce-Grey I find it difficult not to agree with him. Perhaps it is difficult not to agree unless one has his fingertips on the very complex facts. Herein lies one of the problems. Very few people have bothered to take the time to get the facts in respect of broadcasting. Most of the time during this debate has been spent in respect of publishing problems involving *Time* and *Reader's Digest*.

It is all very well to say that we should protect Canadian broadcasters, and by doing so automatically great sums of money will flow to Canadian stations. That sounds good and it reads well in print. It is also nice to hear people say that we should be patriotic and protect the Canadian broadcasting industry. It is all well and good to be patriotic, but I think it is also essential that we be realistic.

This is not a simplistic piece of legislation. We must protect a number of Canadian entities, and among those entities is the Canadian broadcasting industry, but we must also protect the Canadian businessman who advertises in order to sell his merchandise. No one has talked very much about him during this discussion. We need to protect the Canadian viewer, the Canadian citizen we all