

*Foreign Control of Canadian Industries*

frequently is. It is not always bad, as some of our friends here would suggest.

They should be skilled in the social sciences so they are totally mature men who realize the need for political activity, who realize their responsibilities in housing, in social concerns, in bringing people along, in breaking down prejudice, in the cultural aspects of our society. If we develop leaders, management people of this quality, we will have a brand of Canadianism, I suggest, with a dynamic economy that will be unsurpassed. I believe we have an opportunity in this country to do very many great things. We must work at it. We have lots of ideas; some constructive ones were suggested this afternoon.

The fact that this is a subject of debate is interesting, because we can bring forward constructive suggestions. I hope we can be more constructive from here on. We have so much going for us in this country. We are in a unique position because we are just ready to take off. We think we are pretty good now, but it is nothing to what we will be if we do it intelligently, if we anticipate, if we think and are thoughtful instead of just being clever, which we are not always, if we realize the potential of our youth, the potential of our future immigrants, the potential of our natural resources, the potential of our good will, the potential of our own strength, if we work toward it in an organized fashion, in an orderly fashion, with fairness, with compassion, with humanity and a full appreciation of what is good in Canada and for Canada, and what is good in the whole world, of which I hope we will be an effective part.

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate today we will hear much about the effect of economic domination of our industry and resources by foreign powers. While it is well known that our industrial and resource base has reached such an alarming degree of foreign domination as to be well nigh irreversible, according to Professor Watkins, we do not generally recognize the extent to which the control of our institutions of learning, culture, information and communication have been similarly invaded, risking domination of our thought processes by ideas and ideals not necessarily reflecting a Canadian identity but reflecting instead a continentalism of outlook, taste, and attitudes, much in the manner that this government favours the continental approach to manufacturing and raw materials distribution. I intend, therefore, Mr. Speaker to deal with the

difficulties facing Canadians in attempting to construct a distinctive national identity and national pride when the very means to achieve this development are increasingly in the hands of citizens beyond our border.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I refer specifically to the domination of our magazine and text book publishing industry by non-nationals of Canada; I refer to the foreign control of our radio and T.V. outlets and their programming into Canadian homes; I refer to the presence in our institutions of higher learning of what is now estimated to be a majority of professors who owe allegiance of citizenship and ideas to countries other than Canada; and, finally, I refer to the cultural invasion into Canada in art, music and drama by the dominant North American culture.

It would be simplistic and unthinking to interpret this concern as an anti-American tirade. It is true that because of proximity and similarities of language and culture it is inevitable that Canadians should be influenced by American ideas and technology. For that matter, so has the whole of the western world. But we are not Americans, and if Canadians desire a genuinely independent Canada, a Canada which has not exchanged political colonialism for colonialism of the spirit—and there is considerable evidence that they do—then there are some pretty important steps we must take.

But a culturally independent community is not simple to achieve and requires courage on the part of the government, a quality which has not been its most notable asset. In fact, this government has not only failed to halt major erosions of Canadian cultural identity, it has given us only costly examples of government tinkering in an almost futile attempt to develop this cultural awareness and uniqueness. I cite as examples a few of the most prominent. The C.B.C., \$161 million this year; the National Arts Centre, \$46 million with an annual budget of \$2.5 million; the Canada Council, \$23 million. Then there is the new languages legislation, and God knows what this will cost in terms of translation, printing and courses before we are through; perhaps between \$80 and \$150 million. And there are many more examples.

What is the justification, I ask, for spending the Canadian public's tax money on this kind of cultural tokenism if those factors much more central to our development are ignored or soft-pedalled? I believe that Canadians would support all these institutions