

*Non-Canadian Publications*

program at the same time, the Canadian cable operator substitutes the Canadian local signal on all the cable channels with the same program. The FCC procedure provides for simultaneous and in some instances, non-simultaneous "black-out" on American cable systems to protect the local station. Thus many "distant" stations cannot show the same program by means of cable in a community where the local American station already has the same program.

We cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. If we are going to give special exemption to American stations broadcasting into the Canadian market we have to give consideration to Canadian stations going the other way. That has not been the case to date.

If we look at the nature of public policy in public broadcasting and understand that this country is a string of small communities huddled along the United States border, as we can see when flying across the country, we realize that our chances of maintaining any cultural identity have a lot to do with the way we communicate from one end of the country to the other. If we decide to take the easy free enterprise route on broadcasting we can kiss goodbye to any hope of there being a Canadian identity.

We must consider another aspect of freedom of choice when we talk about whether American channels should or should not continue. I am arguing that we should continue to have flexibility. You cannot tell me it is freedom of choice to have Mary Tyler Moore at eight o'clock on KVOs, at eight o'clock on channel 2 and eight o'clock on channel 7. That is not freedom of choice.

People want a variety of programming, different things to suit individual tastes. That is what public broadcasting should be all about. If we are to zero in on the free market approach to this kind of thing we will not get more variety, but less. What we need today are more options open to people who watch. No country worth its salt would substitute foreign programming for its own. I do not believe that any country would give serious consideration to that proposition.

**Mrs. Holt:** They buy it cheap.

**An hon. Member:** CBC does it every day.

**Mr. Douglas (Bruce):** So what?

**Mr. Leggatt:** We have spent a lot of time in this House on two short amendments to the Income Tax Act when there are a lot more important things with which to deal.

KVOs can present further proposals in regard to that station and the lower mainland market, but I think they should be proposed not to the CRTC but to a joint meeting of the United States and Canada to consider the whole problem of broadcasting. You cannot isolate the problem to the lower mainland. We need an across-the-border dialogue on the question of television broadcasting to either area.

There is no question that what we are really debating is the conflict between Canadian nationalism and the use of broadcasting in a free market. An inherent principle is involved that somehow the air waves are the property of the advertisers or owners of television stations. I do not think any party in this House has ever adopted that principle in convention.

The fact is that the public airways are public property. The public must have licensing procedures for those prop-

[Mr. Leggatt.]

erties, and those licensing procedures must take into consideration the national interests of the country. If they do not, we might as well pack up, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Bob Wenman (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin and end my remarks with the same statement. The thing I am concerned about is that the Canadian interest will be best served through the passage or rejection of Bill C-58. With many other members of this party I am convinced that will not be the case. Testimony given before the committee showed very clearly that the national interest would not be served and the outcome would not be more Canadian writers, more production and more revenue, if the bill were passed.

I want first of all to talk briefly about some of the things that went on in committee and then comment on the remarks of the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé) and of the parliamentary secretary in this debate. I should compliment the parliamentary secretary for at least having a grasp of what he was talking about, which is more than can be said for the minister. Perhaps she can be forgiven because of her newness in the job and the fact that she was not able to attend committee meetings. But I wondered if she had read the minutes.

The intent of clause 3 of Bill C-58 is clearly to promote the creation in Canada of a broadcasting system with a strong Canadian identity by ensuring that all Canadian advertising revenue is channelled to Canadian stations, thereby repatriating the substantial portion of this revenue which currently accrues to American border broadcasters. Were there even the most remote possibility that this legislation could achieve that goal, my colleagues and I might be persuaded to support it. There is, however, no such possibility.

Testimony given before the standing committee by the American television stations involved and by the Association of Canadian Advertisers made it abundantly clear that the enactment of this clause will not aid Canadian broadcasters, especially those most in need of additional advertising revenue. Even if more revenue were made available it would not necessarily flow to the weaker television stations that require assistance.

The central point, which was emphasized repeatedly by Mr. Blakely and Mr. Hopkins of the A.C.A., concerns the purchase of advertising time on Canadian outlets. They put it this way, that it:

... is and will continue to be based strictly on the ability of those outlets to attract Canadian audiences. This bill will not induce advertisers to buy time that does not have adequate audiences. Advertisers will, however, of their own accord, buy time on programs and stations that have a high level of acceptance by the Canadian public.

On the larger issue I am sure the parliamentary secretary is only too well aware that the listening choice of 56 per cent of the viewing audience in the lower mainland of British Columbia is for American television stations. This 56 per cent represents a majority choice. Hopefully the parliamentary secretary still believes in freedom of choice—certainly freedom of choice of the majority.

The parliamentary secretary would attack that freedom of choice, and I should like to speak again on this subject at third reading. He would have us believe that British Columbians do not know what they want to see. He is