

Non-Canadian Publications

French language television station that was to go on the air in Vancouver.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I do not want to restrain the hon. member in his remarks, but I think he is getting farther away from the amendment in front of us at this time. He is entering a completely different subject, although somewhat related. I hope that he will direct his remarks to Bill C-58 before the House at this time, and in particular to motion No. 7 and the amendment thereto.

Mr. McKinnon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was trying to relate the allocation of channels and licences to television and radio stations to Bill C-58. In my area, cablevision channels are in part held by United States stations, KVOS being one of them. I think it is agreed that this subamendment relates directly to KVOS. It relates to about five television stations in the U.S., the main one of which is KVOS. As I read the subamendment, it makes specific reference to the Canadian subsidiary of a foreign broadcasting undertaking.

I have twice started to make some comments about the French language station in Vancouver. There is no room on the cablevision band for that station at the present time unless some other station is dropped. I should like to point out that the CRTC, the CBC and the Canadian government, showing a total lack of political sagacity, decided to bring on this application for a French language station at this time when channels are scarce. If the CRTC had waited one or two years, both cablevision companies on the west coast have applications in now to go to mid-band broadcasting, which would open up a dozen or more new channels. At a time like that we could transfer some of the favourite programs to those new channels. People would buy transformers which would allow them to listen to the new channels, and the people who wished to have a French language station on the west coast would run into very little opposition.

It is not that people do not want a French language station on the west coast. What they do not want is to have one of their favourite programs pushed off the band. I deeply regret that the government did not have the wisdom to wait another year or two until all the people in that area had converters on their sets. If the cablevision application had been approved, we could have had these converters on our sets within a year or so. With all the extra channels that would be available on the mid-band, the ultra high frequency band, I am sure that the application for a French language station would have run into minimal objections on the west coast and would have been accepted without furor.

I have been wanting to make that point for some time, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate your allowing me to make it. I think that the public outcry that there is against a French language station on the west coast is due, not to racial or language differences but to the annoyance at being placed in this difficult position when there is no need for it at all. A delay of a year or two until the cablevision companies were allowed to go to mid-band and ultra high frequency broadcasting would have completely obviated this problem. I hope that members on the government side will carry that message to their cabinet masters.

[Mr. McKinnon.]

● (1420)

I am pleased with this subamendment that would make an exception for a Canadian subsidiary of a foreign broadcasting undertaking if the minister of the Department of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) approves a plan submitted by the said Canadian subsidiary that would provide for compensatory payment by such subsidiary by the allocation of funds to Canadian television program production. This is the part that is really hurting in Vancouver. KVOS has established in Vancouver quite considerable program production expertise. They use a lot of artists. They are particularly good at the type of programming that calls for art work, and it would be truly a pity if such an industry were forced to relocate in the United States.

This additional money would go to the extension of Canadian television services. I am thinking of money being put into public service, such as in Cable 10 in Victoria or its equivalent in Vancouver where the general public is allowed to present programs which are of local interest. This is certainly done by Cable 10 in Victoria. I have the privilege of appearing on a program on that channel one night per month, as do most of the local elected representatives. The time is divided on party lines. The station operates a telephone call-in service and the people of Victoria are permitted to conduct a dialogue with their representatives. This is the kind of public programming that can be carried out. This type of public programming carried out at the present time in Victoria and Vancouver seems to be far ahead of anything I have seen elsewhere in Canada. These channels were among the first to install colour cameras, and their productions are a credit to the community. I do hope this heavy-handed type of legislation will not do away with the allocation of funds to Canadian television program production, particularly of the community type.

These talk shows which are popular on the west coast—this seems to be a west coast phenomenon—help to train the technicians necessary to operate cable, television and radio stations. For all of these reasons, I most heartily support the subamendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Perhaps I can take one moment to point out, as did the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt), that Bill C-58 is most unreasonably unfair to some of the periodicals Canadians have grown accustomed to receiving and count on for coverage of news events around the world. *Maclean's* magazine is apparently to replace them. I can only say of *Maclean's* magazine that it is nice looking and fairly Canadian. One of the problems is the lack of depth in its reporting. When I read *Maclean's* I rather feel I have surveyed a beautiful lake and found it is only two inches deep. However, that is getting pretty far from the subamendment we have at hand.

In conclusion, let me commend the amendment to hon. members opposite. I do not have to commend it to all of them because some are already convinced of the ineptitude and mischief created by this bill. I highly recommend it to those members who are as yet unconvinced. Perhaps they will consider this matter further this weekend, or next, when members of this party will be labouring at their duties and members on the government side will be sitting idly watching the excitement created by the choosing of