

to a Canadian audience, is dubbed by a Parisian actor.

I am wondering if this anomaly could not be corrected through a minor amendment that the minister could move on his own. Nevertheless, I do not move it myself as an amendment, but rather as a suggestion. In my opinion, the minister should add, after paragraph (a) a provision to the effect that the dubbing of feature films produced in Canada, be done by Canadian artists, both English and French speaking. In doing so, I think we would be spared this unpleasant and deplorable practice of seeing Canadian films subsidized by our country, by our government, and by our taxpayers, being dubbed by foreign actors.

I also think that the minister should have stated in the bill that all films being financed by this Crown corporation must answer to certain public moral standards.

A few minutes ago the hon. member who spoke before me referred to some European, Swedish or Norwegian films that have been translated for Canadian viewers. But, I believe, the example mentioned by the hon. member does not represent exactly the type of film we would want as far as the morals described are concerned.

Mr. Prittie: Never.

Mr. Valade: There are certainly good films that come to us from those countries. We hope that the Canadian film industry will produce good films; because when we look at films on television and in the movie houses, too often do we find that we are being snowed under by war films of low moral standards.

These films encourage violence among youth, crime, free love and even prostitution.

All those films that clutter up our cinemas are surely not of a kind to help our young people to orient themselves toward the future imbued with the moral standards we expect of them.

Therefore, I hope that the minister will see to it that this assistance we want to extend to the film industry will not be merely confined to helping producers whose sole concern is making profits. The Corporation should rather provide guidance in the production of moral, artistic and cultural films. That, to my mind, should be the motivation of a crown corporation such as this.

Much more could be said about this bill, Mr. Speaker. It may not be elaborate, still it provides certain guiding principles. For my

Development of Film Industry

part, I think we are doubling, perhaps tripling, our help to the Canadian film industry.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The C.B.C. is financing the production of films. The National Film Board also produces a number of films, and I wonder why an amendment has not already been brought to the Canadian Arts Council Act, so that the funds would be paid by the National Film Board, since such is the name of that organization. The words film and cinematography are synonyms and, from a practical point of view, if the word "cinematography" was substituted for the word "film", I do not see that it would make a difference. I wonder why the government has not already considered altering the present structure of the National Film Board, so that a branch of that organization would specifically look after the development of a Canadian film industry.

Mr. Speaker, we realize that we are still dealing with another corporation. We are increasing the number of crown corporations, we are involving state intervention in a field where I feel we could encourage in a very unobtrusive and discreet way those who would like to launch out in the film industry.

If, whenever there is a dearth in an area of economic activity, the government were to establish a corporation to take the initiatives which the people themselves should take but are reluctant to take because they fear to take the risks, the government should take the risks instead.

I wonder if there again, we are not complicating things or even competing with existing industry. There are movie concerns in existence, some of which have been successful and others which have not succeeded, probably because their management or their production was of poor quality.

A government organization could step in and finance the film itself, without regard for the management, because the film may be very good and the management very bad. Then the government would be financing a production and not a poor administration. Therefore, it seems to me that it can, through indirect means, through already existing agencies, give assistance to those who proved that they were really able to produce quality films. In my opinion, this would serve at best the Canadian movie industry.

Therefore, if she is agreeable—and I shall not insist on some amendments I have mentioned a while ago, since the members of the house seem to have properly put the helm over as regards the previous legislation—the minister could at least give me her assurance