

Development of Film Industry

makes grants. This is more of a banking function; it is to assist people in the Canadian film industry who find it is necessary to receive assistance. This is not a large fund to be used for investment and in which we will become a partner. This money may not last beyond 1967 in our centennial fields, because it takes a long time to get the scenario ready and the arrangements set up with regard to budget arrangements.

● (5:40 p.m.)

I have been told by Canadian film makers, not I might say the one which produced "Nobody Waved Goodbye", which was a National Film Board production, but who have produced others, and particularly the producer of "The Luck of Ginger Coffey", that having once dealt with the distributor they are aware of the pitfalls and know how much more they should receive. Distributing companies are prepared to go along with the distribution of meritorious films, but a number of things must be shown.

Promotion is a big part of distribution as was demonstrated by the film "Nobody Waved Goodbye". Certain things have to be included in the distribution guarantee, but neither the government nor the commission arranges it. An individual cannot come to the Film Development Corporation and say: "Here is the package I want". He must make his arrangements about distribution. We have been concerned about this all along, from the time when the interdepartmental committee first met and began to produce reports to my predecessor, the hon. member for Outremont-Saint-Jean (Mr. Lamontagne) and into the early days when I represented this agency. The officials wished to ensure that the whole spectrum of the industry would be considered and that this should not be a place where people can walk in from the street with a hot idea and receive \$2 million to create a film. We know this is something which will have to be handled carefully. This is public money which should be used to promote an industry and not just one film.

One hon. gentleman mentioned the question of dubbing. We consider that this is covered under section 10 (2) (a) which requires a significant Canadian creative artistic content. However, it is not intended that this bill provide the subsidization of Canadian dubbing of foreign films either in English or in French as a major part of the enterprise. The problem raised by the hon. gentleman concerns many individuals in the province of Quebec who

[Miss LaMarsh.]

would like to see all films dubbed in this country, and not in France. Nevertheless, where French or English dubbing of Canadian films is done, it can be part of the assistance granted under this legislation.

I should like to say one last word in reply to the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke, who suggested that a film such as Dr. Zhivago could not be produced in this country. I would suggest that there is no reason why it could not be produced here, provided there were Canadian stars and Canadian people both in front of and behind the cameras, and that the script was written by a Canadian so that in fact it had a largely Canadian content. There should be no restriction on the origin of the ideas which are produced into a screen play.

This leads me to one last point, namely the question of whether I or the members of the board will be the ones to judge as to the morality in the plays. I suggest that if any of the vital elements of the passions of human beings are excised completely from any films in which the Canadian Development Corporation might invest, there really would not be much left in which to invest. We have to remember that films which are most popular are those which are a reflection of life. I do not think we should produce licentious films, but we want to produce films which are of good commercial quality and of value. Our purpose is to promote and develop an industry and not to produce one or two art films for which Canada has already become famous.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. Churchill: On division.

Motion agreed to on division, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Richard in the chair.

Mr. Prittie: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. You said that the motion was agreed to on division. I want to know for the record whether in fact there was a division or whether it was agreed to unanimously.

The Deputy Chairman: Yes, there was a division.

On clause 2—*Definitions.*

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a general remark on clause 2. I regret that the house is faced with having to