

*The Address—Mr. Pugh*

are right; we had better run for the bomb shelters." They then cut down the tax to 4 per cent, and will impose the balance of the 11 per cent in two stages, one of 4 per cent and one of 3 per cent.

I am suggesting that if the government listen to the people, they will remove that tax. I am wondering if the ex-minister of forestry, who is now the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson), and who has a long association with the lumber industry of British Columbia, did not ask the Prime Minister to relieve him of that portfolio. He is an honourable man, and I do not believe he could take the reasoned approach of the lumber industry of British Columbia. I thank the hon. member for his interjection, because it gave me a chance to put these remarks on the record.

In so far as dominion-provincial relations are concerned, we find the same sort of careless disregard for other people's interests. There have been pronouncements indicating a disregard of the end result. We had a glaring example of that during this debate when the Prime Minister spoke. He made a rather good speech, and the words were those Canadians like to hear. They were to this effect: "All provinces, all provincial premiers—we must get together. We must talk these things over for the benefit of Canada." But those words were hardly engraved on our minds before the Prime Minister took a roundhouse swing at the premier of Ontario with regard to the Liberal Canada pension plan. If it cannot stand any criticism, particularly after asking for it and seeking co-operation, then I say that the government with its pronouncements is in for a lot of trouble. If it advocates these things, then why not go through with them?

I have been told that the Prime Minister is no slouch on diplomacy, but if that is evidence of his diplomacy, his chopping away at the premier of Ontario in the middle of the throne speech debate, where there is no opportunity for reply by the premier, to my mind it does not seem to be in essence diplomacy.

I imagine it was a little hard for the premier of Ontario to take those remarks, particularly in view of Premier Lesage's attitude toward the Canada pension plan. Premier Lesage opted out of it, so we have the two largest provinces, one Liberal and the other Conservative, at loggerheads with the federal government. I suggest that the government sit it out, talk it out, and try and get a little more unanimity.

As I said, I want to confine my remarks more or less to cable television. At the beginning I think the government took a reasonable step. I refer back to last June

[Mr. Pugh.]

when it was decided to find out the impact of cable television on Canadian broadcasting as a whole. However, at the end of December it did something which is just one more example of bureaucratic handing out of stuff: "Here is the plan. We will listen to your remarks later, but this is what we are going to do". Dealing with cable television the government first issued a directive and then a press release dated December 31, in which it was stated:

For some time, the problem of the effect of the development of community antenna television on national broadcasting policy has been of concern to the government.

It is the policy of the government to maintain the Canadian identity and character of broadcasting to the greatest extent practicable and, to that end, the board of broadcast governors, with the technical advice and in consultation with the Department of Transport, has been asked by the government to inquire into and recommend any legislative action that may be required to ensure that, so far as the constitutional jurisdiction of parliament will permit, the use of community antenna television for the dissemination of television programs is subject to similar regulation under parallel conditions to that applied to direct broadcasting.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing at all wrong with that. In other words, this is a straight, general inquiry into a matter of great interest to all Canada, the impact of cable antenna television on broadcasting. However, I have one serious objection concerning the use of the word "broadcasting"; in other words, calling cable television companies broadcasters. What I object to most strongly is the bureaucratic ending of this directive and press release, which went out under the joint names of the Secretary of State and the Minister of Transport; and it is interesting to see that the then secretary of state is now the Minister of Transport. The next paragraph in the release stated:

Meanwhile, the government has decided that no new licences or amendments to existing licences will be approved for CATV—

—that is, cable antenna television—

—installations to broadcast programs emanating from broadcasting stations outside Canada. Until a long term policy has been adopted as a result of this inquiry, CATV licences will not be disturbed in cases where transmission had been commenced before December 31, 1963.

This is one more case of the government leaping before looking, issuing directives without following the consequences through, and I hope to point out a little later that it has a tiger by the tail. The reason the government should have taken a little more care is that the subject is not new in any shape or form. The whole matter was discussed in the special committee on broadcasting two years ago, a committee of which I and the present Minister of Transport were members. It has not arisen suddenly; it is not some