

*National Film Act*

**The Chairman:** I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but section 9 is carried.

**Mr. Murphy:** I did not understand that section 9 was carried because the minister was just replying to my question.

**Mr. Winters:** In doing so I reminded the hon. member that the section was carried.

**Mr. Green:** I submit that the hon. member could raise this matter under subsection 1, paragraph (a).

**The Chairman:** Proceed.

**Mr. Murphy:** I think the minister is as fully aware of the situation as I am. I have felt that this matter should be brought to the attention of the committee in order that it may be surveyed with more intensity, of course to our own benefit. May I make a suggestion in a truly business sense? In pursuing a policy of developing the tourist industry through the national film board you should go further than providing film libraries. They are all right, but they do not go far enough. As I have said before, if you are going to show Canada to the United States or any other country you must do it through closer contacts and on a more friendly basis, shall I say, than has been the case to date. It is true that we advertise Canada through the different magazines and that sort of thing, but my firm conviction is that the best approach for the development of the tourist industry is through the film board. I think we are not getting from the provinces the co-operation to which we were entitled. Looking at the advertising in different magazines and newspapers, it seems to me it is about time that the dominion, the provinces and the municipalities got together. A two or three day conference is not enough because we could develop a billion dollar industry and we are not doing it. A 5, 7, or 10 per cent increase per year is not enough for this country when we have so much to offer to so many people. I can visualize the minister going before the treasury board and saying that he wants another \$50,000. Apparently it all goes into advertising in newspapers, magazines and periodicals of different kinds.

I may be out of order in what I am about to say, but if I am I hope you will pardon me, Mr. Chairman. One of the best advertisements that the maritimes have had this year was an article written in a United States national magazine, with a circulation of some two million in that country, describing a trip through the maritimes. Let us be serious about the business because we certainly have not been in the past, and let there be no mistake about that. I think the value of the article which appeared in that magazine a few

days ago is comparable to what we could accomplish with the film board. That article is worth a quarter of a million dollars to the maritimes this year.

That is the kind of thing we want. Let us try to develop it through films. We can tell the Hollywood moguls that if they want to show pictures in Canada they will have to show pictures of Canada in the United States. Within recent years everybody in the United States has at least two weeks or three weeks for vacation. They are a vacation-minded people. Yet our tourist industry is not even as large as that of Florida, and is about half that of California. We are not going after it. I hope the minister will not take these remarks personally. I am speaking on behalf of every member in the house when I say we want to develop the tourist industry. I think that department has not had a show since it was inaugurated by a former leader of another party. It has been treated as a Topsy. I think it is about time that the people of this country realized that we can develop a billion dollar a year industry instead of having a little increase of \$10 million or \$15 million. I do not blame the minister one bit, and I hope he will not take my remarks as criticism of him. I think parliament should accept greater responsibility for what we have to offer, and I think the film board provides a good opportunity to do so.

**Mr. Winters:** Before section 10 carries, I should like to suggest a change in subsection 2 in order to make the wording conform with that of the act to amend the statute law recently passed by the house. I suggest that subsection 2 read as follows:

Actions, suits or other legal proceedings in respect of any right or obligation acquired or incurred by the board on behalf of His Majesty, whether in its name or in the name of His Majesty, may be

(a) brought or taken against the board, without the governor general's fiat, or

(b) brought or taken by the board, in the name of the board in any court that would have jurisdiction if the board were a corporation that is not an agent of His Majesty.

That will make the wording conform with what the house recently approved. I would ask my colleague, the Minister of Veterans Affairs, so to move.

**Mr. Gregg:** I so move.

**Mr. Winters:** Mr. Chairman, I did not have the latest reprint of the bill before me and I understand that it already contains that wording.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Is this section 10?

**Mr. Winters:** Yes.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** As a matter of fact, does the section cover the situation at all? I have