

*Non-Canadian Publications*

these stations. For example, Montrealers know very well that some American stations located near the border advertise suits sold on the Plaza Saint-Hubert in Montreal, for which Americans could certainly not care less, or restaurants located on the outskirts of Montreal, or products for which the American price would often be lower than the Canadian price.

It is therefore obvious that an intentional and exclusive operation exists in the United States with a view to exploiting Canadian radio and television stations, which is inadmissible.

It is also obvious that stations existing for other purposes in major American cities bordering on large Canadian centres—for instance, in the Niagara Peninsula—direct towards Canada, with a view to obtaining a share of the Canadian publicity market, commercials that are in no way justified by American stations interested in American publicity or businesses.

Pragmatically, such a situation is easy to evaluate. Between 20 to 30 million dollars in Canadian publicity cross the border to enrich American stations. I know that some Canadian stations, and one in particular that I shall not bother to mention, create fund transfers in the opposite direction, but such transfers are evaluated at five to seven million dollars, whereas funds for commercial publicity aired by American stations are estimated, as I have just stated, at between 20 to 30 million dollars, which makes of us overall losers.

Everything points out to standardizing a given situation. It is not a question of persecuting anyone, it is simply a question of standardizing a situation, such as we have done in 1969 when the government asked the CRTC to grant broadcasting rights only to stations that were 80 per cent Canadian-owned and that were headed by boards of directors made up totally of Canadian citizens. I am aware that at the time, some people cried out aloud. Like the previous speaker some said that we were anti-American. But all we had to do was answer them that such legislation was being applied by the Americans themselves. Have you ever accused Americans of being anti-Canadian because they did not allow Canadians to go and set themselves up in the American broadcasting system?

I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words on the debate with which I became acquainted through *Hansard*. While reading the report of this debate, seemingly based on a few newspaper reports which I had also read, I was astonished, I must confess, by some statements. Indeed, the former Secretary of State has been charged with failing to develop a policy on publishing and periodicals in line with the bill now under consideration. Mr. Speaker, I confess that I find that statement astonishing. I do not understand how it could have been made. No policy on publishing or periodicals, Mr. Speaker? I wonder how could he call those steps taken during the past four years by the Secretary of State. Firstly to help directly, through subsidies, the publication of Canadian books and periodicals by Canadian publishers. Secondly, the promotion in Canada and abroad of Canadian books and periodicals also through Canadian subsidies. Thirdly, the translation in Canada of Canadian works, from French into English and from English into French, so that Canadian cultural

activities are not stopped on all sides, do not come up against the language barrier on both sides.

What more do they want, Mr. Speaker, when the government already helps the publishing itself, when it assures the promotion and the translation as well which, I admit, has often been a serious obstacle to the knowledge of Canadian English works among the French-speaking people or of Canadian French works among the English-speaking people? Often, it is well known, a writer earned less, and it is perhaps still true, with copyrights than it costs to get a translation in another language. And that does not mean that the book is valueless. The fact is that the Canadian publishing market is rather limited. And this is one of the unfortunate but inevitable results of limited markets.

As I was saying: once we have taken these steps, what more do they want? The government's part, in cultural activities, Mr. Speaker, is not to define itself the cultural values. This task is up to the citizens, to those called cultural workers, or cultural officers. It is up to the citizens, and the government's task is to help setting up conditions which allow the cultural workers to do their job in the most favourable conditions possible.

Were the state to go farther, that would be interference in cultural matters in contempt of the most basic and dearest liberties to the citizens in any real democracy. And I can hardly refrain from mentioning a very well known French example, André Malraux, a renowned critic, a French writer amongst the best known in the whole world, translated in some 30 languages. When he was Minister of Cultural Affairs, because he understood the nature of the cultural activity, Malraux has always contented himself with setting up the favourable conditions and never tried to run cultural affairs. He knew that, as a minister, it was not his role and that would have been an unwarranted intervention of the government in intellectual matters which are none of the state's business. On the other hand, one of his successors, whom I shall not name, a mediocre novelist, adopted a totally different attitude and presumed to say what theatre would be seen, what music would be heard in France; within a matter of five or six months he came to grief.

That is to say, then, that those who have reflected upon the matter know that the state has no direct role to play in matters of culture, of its contents, but that it behoves it to create the environment, the circumstances which allow culture to develop and flourish.

Those who say that the Secretary of State has no policy in matters of publication, what more do they want? I wonder. That we hold them by the hand? That we publish in their stead? That the state substitute itself to the initiative of the journalists in putting out their publications? Then, Mr. Speaker, one could rightly strike out against what would constitute real aggression against some of the fundamental privileges of the citizens in a democracy, those that allow those citizens to define their cultural values themselves and serve them as they see fit.

As a former journalist, for one thing, I could not allow that request, that which would have us go further than we already have gone. We could perhaps increase our assistance. Perhaps is there a question of degree. But, to say that there is no policy strikes me as obviously false to any