

(7) What specific steps is the government prepared to take to protect the Canadian book publishing industry?

(8) What specific steps is this government prepared to take to protect the Canadian film industry?

With regard to the film industry, the Minister of Communications, the Honourable Marcel Masse, made the right noises in Hollywood earlier this week when he said:

The overwhelming pervasiveness of American films on Canadian screens has been an issue for Canadian governments for a long time. Unfortunately, the last six months of discussion have produced no practical results whatsoever.

Honourable senators should be aware that in 1984 American movies accounted for 80 per cent of Canada's \$400 million movie box office receipts. The screen time for Canadian films was less than 2 per cent. In my judgment, levies and quotas are the only answer. Moral suasion of the American film industry simply will not work. It has been tried and it has failed. I hope that Mr. Masse is on the right track.

● (1450)

Finally, I come to my ninth question: Will this government guarantee the future of the Canadian Football League by spelling out in specific terms that American professional football will be neither desirable nor welcome in Canada? The last time I mentioned this subject in the Senate, somebody came up to me and asked how we could do this without cutting out the Blue Jays and the Expos. The answer is easy. The coming of baseball to Canada has destroyed absolutely nothing. Indeed, amateur baseball in this country is flourishing as never before. But bring in American football and we can kiss good-bye to the Grey Cup—a great, meaningful, national institution in a country which has far too few national institutions—as we know it.

I thank honourable senators for their courtesy and I look forward to Senator Kelly's answers to my questions. In closing, I quote from the 1977 Senate Committee on Mass Media report which has withstood the years rather well. The quote is from the report's introduction with only one phrase transposed. We said:

Geography, language, and perhaps a failure of confidence and imagination have made us into a cultural as well as economic satellite of the United States . . .

We are not suggesting that these influences are undesirable, nor that they can or should be restricted. The United States happens to be the most important, most *interesting* country on earth. The vigour and diversity of its popular culture—which is close to becoming a world culture—obsesses, alarms, and amuses not just Canadians, but half the people of the world.

What we are suggesting is that the Canadian (Government) . . . (has) an interest in and an obligation to promote our *apartness* from the American reality. For all our similarities, for all our sharing, for all our friendships, we are somebody else.

Hon. William M. Kelly: Honourable senators—

[Senator Davey.]

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, if the honourable Senator Kelly speaks now, his speech will have the effect of closing the debate on the motion for second reading of this bill.

Senator Kelly: Honourable senators, I must say that I have been scribbling furiously because Senator Davey, who is a great friend of mine, did not give me notice of his questions in advance, but I shall struggle to answer his questions at the end of my remarks. I think this has been a useful debate with thoughtful remarks being made on both sides of the chamber. Before making final comment on this important piece of legislation and its role in the overall economic agenda of the government, I will take a few minutes to attempt to respond to some of the specific concerns raised by honourable colleagues. Reference was made by Senator Sinclair and Senator Graham earlier to the need for a more specific definition of business activity related to cultural, heritage and national identity. I will come back to this subject a little later in response more specifically to Senator Davey. However, I believe that Senator Barootes dealt with this question, at least in terms of the definition of and identifying areas of concern in specific terms. I would point out that the minister has stated that these definitions will be included in regulations to be issued at the time the legislation is proclaimed.

In respect to the suggestion of Senator Sinclair that clause 14 be amended to require a review of any new business in the fossil fuel sector, I would suggest to my honourable colleague that if the government should find it necessary to increase control of oil and gas development, it might be better to do so in specific legislation, rather than in the Investment Canada bill.

Concern was expressed, both during the pre-study and in this debate, about the transfer of decision-making authority from the full cabinet to a single minister, that perhaps it gives too much power to one minister. Honourable senators, I would like to offer what is really a personal view on this matter, because it is something about which I have thought a great deal over time. Were it not for our system of parliamentary democracy, I, too, would worry about power in the hands of individuals. However, in our system, along with the power to decide goes accountability for those decisions. A minister with power to decide must be accountable to his cabinet colleagues, to his caucus and finally to Parliament. It is easy for me to understand how our system holds an identifiable minister responsible and accountable, but somewhat more difficult for me to see how you would hold a cabinet committee or a full cabinet accountable, except at election time, and this happens under normal circumstances only once every four years. So I do not have the fear of a minister having responsibility to decide, because he is accountable for every decision he makes. In addition, ministers must consult with one another on a regular basis in the carrying out of their responsibilities. The extent of that consultation would vary from case to case, but accountability is ever present.

I believe the government is simply trying to avoid an administrative strait-jacket that would necessitate a collective