

Non-Canadian Publications

in order for it to be fed back to Canadians? We can use our own media to place our own advertisements.

Mr. Symes: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Sauvé: The hon. member argued that KVOS is a good Canadian corporate citizen. I do not know how one can say that. As I understand it, KVOS is a good American corporate citizen, not a Canadian corporate citizen. I can understand why the station wants to be thought of as a good Canadian corporate citizen. I am told that it took \$8 million in profits out of B.C. last year. It cannot be considered as a Canadian corporate citizen. It is not even regulated by a Canadian regulatory body or agency. It is regulated by an American authority. Equivalent enterprises in Canada are regulated by the CRTC, the Canadian regulatory body. KVOS cannot, by the very fact that it is in the United States, identify with our needs and our particular sensitivities.

Mr. Wenman: What is the government's position on freedom of choice?

Mrs. Sauvé: One has heard arguments about compensatory measures, about the creation of a fund in order to help us build up the Canadian industry, and so on. Those are totally unacceptable trade-offs. We do not need those trade-offs. We need to protect the revenues of our television industry.

Mr. Wenman: You mean, to protect mediocrity.

Mrs. Sauvé: We need to protect it from loss of revenue so that it can operate on its own and feel its strength in our country and particular environment. We must see if the industry can be viable on its own. We do not want compensatory measures which would confuse the whole picture.

Mr. Wenman: How do you know what the people want?

Mrs. Sauvé: We want our own television stations to earn our money in order that we can build up our own original, indigenous television industry. We want our industry to earn those revenues and so allow artists, artisans and writers of this country to earn their living in this country. Already they find it difficult to earn a living.

An hon. Member: I am sure they earn a living now.

Mrs. Sauvé: If the hon. member will look at statistics on earnings of Canadian artists and artisans in this country he will see that it is difficult for any of them to stay in that field. Revenues are hard to come by. Their scope is limited and their livelihood precarious. I made this speech the other night and I will not repeat it. I hope the hon. member will read it.

Mr. Wenman: I have read it. It says nothing.

An hon. Member: You were not here.

Mr. Wenman: I was here, and I have read it.

Mrs. Sauvé: The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway suggested that the government wants to enact this legislation because it does not understand the west. She suggested that we cannot look beyond the Rockies and do not

[Mrs. Sauvé.]

know what is going on in that part of the country. Since becoming a minister I have been out west several times. I know some things about the west. I do not pretend to know more about the west than the hon. member. But I know that the west is not indifferent to the necessity of creating jobs for artists in Canada and of protecting the Canadian television industry.

Mr. Wenman: Is that exactly what the west says?

Mrs. Sauvé: The west sees things our way and knows that we must protect the industry from losses of revenue resulting from American stations broadcasting to this country.

Mr. Wenman: But people want a choice.

Mrs. Sauvé: It is bad that some hon. members, when arguing this problem, should emphasize the so-called alienation of the west from the east. Such arguments are calculated to exercise under pressure on the issue. They arise in connection with just about every problem we discuss. I think that is wrong. It is just as if I raised the so-called French Canadian problem apropos everything we discussed in this House. Such an action would have bad consequences to Quebec. You just cannot do it. We should resolve arguments through logic. That is the sort of discussion I should like to see regarding Bill C-58. Let our discussion be on Bill C-58 and on nothing else.

Some hon. members ask what would happen if the Americans decided to retaliate and charge us the full price for the American shows we view in Canada. They saw, "Would it not be terrible if they charged us the full price?" There is no danger of that. Hon. members opposite should know that. I do not blame the hon. member who raised this argument because she is probably not acquainted with the pricing practices of the television industry. The American industry is following normal marketing practice. The United States runs cost so much and reruns in other countries are priced substantially below the initial price. This is the philosophy underlying the pricing of television shows. The present practice is not abnormal. The United States networks would not change their marketing practices just because they might want to retaliate. To begin with, they negotiated with those who created the shows, with the producers and artists, so much to run in the United States and so much to rerun in Canada, Sweden, France, Spain, and so on. They cannot change that. There is no danger of the kind of retaliation referred to, as if we should be afraid of retaliation any way. Who cares about retaliation? We want to do our own thing. We shall do what is good for us. We are not worried about retaliation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Sauvé: I think I have covered many of the arguments raised. I should like to answer the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) who complained that I was not listening to him. I sat here and waited for him to say something. In the end he said a few things to which I should like to reply. Unfortunately, he did not stay in the House and wait for my reply. This will be bad for the hon. member for Provencher, because when he produces copies of his speech to his constituents in order to show that he spoke about radio and television stations in southern