

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

resolution on Tuesday, October 17, you will find it very interesting to read the comments in *Hansard* of various members of the house. The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Prittie) said:

—and, as the previous speaker mentioned, we are dealing here in generalities and not until the resolution stage is completed will we have the bill and see the new legislation in which we are all very interested.

The hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Stanbury), the chairman of the committee, said as reported at page 3185 of *Hansard*:

—in the bill which the Secretary of State will be revealing to us shortly.

I emphasize the word “revealing”. Then we have the hon. member for Burin-Burgeo (Mr. Jamieson), a member of the committee, on page 3187 expressing the hope that there will be in the bill things which are as yet unseen. The hon. member said:

The legislation that we are to see introduced today has been a long time in coming, and I commend the minister for resisting the pressures of recent months and, indeed, even of years, to speed up the introduction of the legislation because I hope that the document we will see unveiled at the end of the debate on the resolution will be a comprehensive effort—

I know that my time is limited, Mr. Speaker, and I wanted to refer in detail to the community antennae television features of this measure. The community antennae industry is a growing one in the United States and Canada and it is going to be hit if part IV of this bill is passed in its present wording. Community antennae television is the fastest growing segment of the radio and television world today. I say that this bill negates the principle of the right of a people to view the programs of their choice. We make great fuss and palaver over the fact that we have the right to freedom of assembly, the right to freedom of speech, right of a free press and the right to freedom of religion. The four freedoms are extolled from time to time. If we have freedom of speech, surely the corollary is that we have freedom to listen. Twice when introducing this bill the Secretary of State referred to the great freedom of expression that is given to people on the air. In fact at one place it was said that this freedom must not be curtailed.

What is the use of having freedom of expression if audiences are prohibited from listening to you or, in the case of television, from viewing you? In the case of C.A.T.V. it does not in any manner make use of radio frequencies; it is nothing but a receiving

operation from start to finish. I have read the definitions in the first part of the bill. Members can read them for themselves on page 3 of the bill under “Interpretation”. We find these words in paragraph (d):

—“broadcasting undertaking” includes a broadcasting transmitting undertaking, a broadcasting receiving undertaking—

Nowhere can I find a definition of what a broadcasting receiving undertaking is, but we have been told that regulations will be framed by the commission to be appointed covering broadcasting receiving undertakings. If we were ever asked to vote a blank cheque, I can tell you that this is a duplicate, because this is a blank cheque in every manner, shape and form.

Why should parliament, consisting of duly elected representatives of the people, be asked to confer upon a commission as yet unnamed and unformed the power to create regulations which will bring C.A.T.V. receivers under broadcasting regulations? The reason they want these receiving sets under regulation is so that the viewing audiences of television stations in Canada will not be decimated by those who do not want to look at a certain television station, but at a station coming over cable television.

I have in my hand a statement on community antennae television broadcasting by the former minister of transport, Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, who has been transported, or I should say translated, to other fields of effort, and by Hon. Maurice Lamontagne, then secretary of state, dated July 22, 1964. In this mimeographed statement—by the way, no action was taken on it—it is said:

Proposed item re C.A.T.V. receiving stations to be included in supplementary estimates.

This is why they want C.A.T.V. brought under discipline and licence. This statement says:

—that the specification therein of that broadcasting station is unlikely to result in the operation of any existing television broadcasting station in Canada serving the area served or to be served by the licensed station becoming uneconomic or to inhibit the establishment of ultimate television broadcasting facilities in Canada serving that area—

Why should the parliament of Canada worry whether individual television stations are going to make a profit? We pay lip service to the idea of free enterprise, but when it comes to television stations we are told: We are going to try to keep C.A.T.V. out of your place. The most glaring example of the way the public will turn to C.A.T.V. in preference to watching television station programs