Foreign Control of Canadian Industries

gladly if they were meaningful to them, if author in getting his work published in Cana-Canadians. That is the only way that Canadian unity or identity will be served, not by grandiose statements of glorious intent and massive outlays of money that serve no real purpose.

We may well react as people betrayed. The publications industry, everyone reconizes, is an important factor in the exchange of ideas. And yet Saturday Night and Macleans are but two meek Canadian voices to counteract the flood of foreign opinion emanating from the 400-odd American magazines sold here, Macleans, we are told, is on its last legs. I should like to quote John Fisher from an article which appeared in the Toronto Telegram of November 16, 1968. The report reads as follows:

"Macleans Magazine, Canada's long-established national magazine, will be out of business within two years," freelance writer and broadcaster John Fisher forecast today.

And its death, he told 350 delegates to the Ontario English Catholic Teachers Association, will be only another symptom of a worsening state of affairs in the Canadian communications industry.

He urged teachers to encourage tough questioning of their society by both themselves and their students to counteract what he called "a sex-andmaterialistic-economic treadmill that bombards them day and night".

The main reason for Macleans predicted demise is that two magazines alone. Time and Readers' Digest, which receive a \$1.5 million annual Canadian postal subsidy, soak up over half the money spent in Canadian magazine advertising, leaving little for Canadian publications.

It is very generous of the Post Office Department to assist Time and Readers' Digest. However, the government has not been similarly generous to Canadian publications and Canadian postal users. While I am on the subject of the Post Office, Canadians should be gravely concerned about what is happening to our non-profit press, ethnic, political, scholarly, professional and labour publications, as a result of the new postal rates. When these papers fold, and hundreds have, or will shortly, opinion, dissent and thought will be limited and expression will be concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer and fewer men. In this situation there is no need to curtail freedom of the press or impose consorship, since it already will exist de facto.

The book companies in Canada are, by and [Mr. Rose.]

they preserved and enhanced the lives of da. I need not elaborate on this point further. But the preponderance of our school, and certainly our college texts, are published by foreigners. From his earliest contact with education the Canadian child is therefore exposed to the emphases and priorities of another country without being aware of this subversive subliminal influence upon him. The Indian child being confronted with a reader in English whose contents rely on experiences of a suburban middle class family is an extreme but not irrelevant example of what happens to most Canadian school children.

> Turning now to broadcasting, another powerful media for influencing Canadians, we find that the story is almost the same. Radio and television stations all across our land are becoming increasingly owned and controlled by outside interests. CKLW of Windsor, is owned by RKO. CKCF in Montreal is owned by British Marconi; television stations in Kitchener and Vancouver are controlled by outsiders. Wherever you go the picture is similarly dismal.

> In 1957 Robert M. Fowler in his first report outlines the problem on page 27:

> We have a good broadcasting system. We are trying to do something that is not easy. The natural pressures are against us; the flow runs north and south and we are trying to make some part of it run east and west. The forces of economics are against us too, as they have been against many odd Canadian dreams and aspirations in the past. But this is one we had better work at, for it is really important if we are to keep a Canadian identity and culture; if there is, in fact, to be a Canadian force in the world. And that may be important to many people—both inside and outside Canada.

> To do this, we must be prepared to spend public money in quite large quantities. The Canadian economy is just not big enough to support a broadcasting system on commercial revenues alone. At least, it would not be one we would want to have or one that would be anything more than the scattered outposts of American broadcasting networks. The central factor in a Canadian system is the CBC, supported by money out of the public treasury for both its capital and operating needs.

> But I submit that we are indeed becoming, to quote Mr. Fowler again, "scattered outposts of American broadcasting networks" and, in spite of C.B.C. efforts, sales of outlets to foreign concerns are achieving this by the back door.

Of current interest is the purchase of 50 per cent of Famous Players Canadian Corporation Limited by the giant Gulf and Western large, foreign subsidiaries. All of us are Corporation. The C.R.T.C. has stated that, aware of the difficulties faced by an unknown because of Ottawa's new broadcasting rules,