

head of the National Film Board's French productions, said in 1969 that we required a lot of film to create a basis of culture. He said, "We need 30 films a year as a minimum to say that something is happening in Canada."

The Canadian Film Development Corporation, which was mentioned earlier in the debate, was established by legislation in 1967. When in 1964 the idea of establishing a fund to help Canadian feature film writers was first suggested by the then Secretary of State, some of the reasons given for such legislation were as follows:

In cultural matters, a country cannot continually live by borrowing its material from others. It must set up itself the institutions it needs. A country must express itself by works of art and feel that its participation adds something to the common legacy of world culture...

Of all the means of expressing himself and his ideas which are available to an artist today, the feature film is not only the most effective but also the most easily understood by the largest number of people around the world. It is in the world of the cinema that all the great questions of the day are asked; all the travails, the problems and the successes of mankind are portrayed...

A country without a feature film industry lacks one of the basic forms of self-expression.

A film industry, such as exists in France, in Italy, in the United Kingdom and in Japan, not only allows a nation to say what it has to say in the most easily understood medium of our era but to see itself, to see on the screen a reflection of its own country—and that, it seems to me, is a matter of great importance.

That is why it is all-important that we do all we can to promote the Canadian feature film industry and also the work of the National Film Board which, despite its many crises, has already brought such great credit to Canada. I would like to see the work of the Film Board greatly expanded. The recommendations of a Senate committee, following a study of this industry, might be the basis of such promotion and expansion.

The terms of reference of such a committee should be wide enough to include the study of many suggestions that have been put forward by people interested in the development of Canadian feature films, such as the introduction of quotas that would set the permissible number of foreign films that can be shown, or it might instead of that stipulate the percentage of Canadian films that must be exhibited.

In England and all other countries except the United States, such quotas exist to protect their national film industry. Why do we not have such control to protect our fragile film industry?

Study might also be given to the complaint often heard from film makers concerning the mass of feature films that are dumped in Canada. A film is dumped here when it has already recovered its costs elsewhere and is brought into Canada just to make additional profits. Distributors can secure these at such low rates that Canadian-produced films are not able to compete with them. A committee could look into this practice and might possi-

bly recommend the passing of anti-dumping legislation in this area, as has been done in relation to other imports.

The committee might study ways and means of securing larger markets for the Canadian film industry. To do this we must seek markets outside Canada, whose population is only about 22 million. This is very small compared to that of 200 million in the United States.

If we are to develop a truly great Canadian film industry we must seek, through the use of competent salesmen, markets outside Canada. The committee could discover whether attention is being given to the development of this foreign market by Canadian representatives of trade and commerce in the foreign field, and could encourage such promotion.

The high cost of distribution works great hardship on the producer in the film industry. Costs of promotion and advertising are so high that the producers' share of the revenue from rentals seems discouragingly low. If the costs of distribution and exhibition could be reduced substantially, films would be able to show larger profits and more people might be willing to invest in this industry.

The Canadian Film Development Corporation, I understand, subsidizes only producers. In France and Eastern Europe, government subsidies are available for distributors and theatre operators as well as producers. Perhaps the committee could investigate the advisability of providing assistance to distributors and theatre operators in Canada.

In my work on the Senate Committee on Poverty and the Joint Committee on the Constitution, where we have met the public constantly, I have become increasingly aware of the value of the exchange of ideas between those in authority and those affected by their decisions. I have come to believe that if we are to have the kind of country we would like to have there must be much of this interchange of ideas and greater participation.

A subject for inquiry might well be the standards now used by the Canadian Film Development Corporation before a decision is reached to support a production and what, if any, dialogue takes place between the Canadian Film Development Corporation and eminent and experienced film makers in the private sector and in the public sector. In view of the criticisms made by the public about some of the productions which have received support from the Canadian Film Development Corporation, it might be worth while to know what standard the corporation uses in coming to a decision.

Is the criterion applied by the Canadian Film Development Corporation mostly whether or not a production will be a money-maker? Do they feel they must produce a profit as does any ordinary business? Or is weight and consideration given to whether the film will have charm, integrity and humour that will creditably reflect Canada, not only throughout Canada but abroad? Will it also reflect morals, political ideas and mental attitudes which do not offend general public taste?

There is at present much public concern about taxpayers' money going into exploitation films. This concern was eloquently expressed by Senator Forsey in this