

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

measure of hypocrisy or at least inconsistency. More than once we heard of protests, prime ministerial and otherwise, by letter and otherwise, to Britain. But in reference to France, a considerable merchant of arms to South Africa and other areas, not a word. Are British arms more deadly than those manufactured in and sold by France? The minister said the protests are made to Britain because of our Commonwealth membership. But surely this is a strange reply. France and Canada are charter members of the United Nations. That body has made many protests and has passed many resolutions concerning arms sales. Are we to believe that this government regards the obligations of Commonwealth membership as transcending our responsibilities under the United Nations charter? What an interesting scaling of priorities this would be!

I believe, Sir, we would be well advised to deal with these matters with a greater sense of realism, more consistency and not make pretensions unsupported by the hard facts.

[Translation]

Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on February 22 last, the British government made known its wish to supply South Africa with naval defence material. In the minds of some people, this announcement on the part of Great Britain somehow deprived the committee of any reason for being and, as the hon. member knows very well I think, Nigeria and India, followed by Malaysia, announced their intention of withdrawing from the committee. Other countries, such as Canada, that felt that the terms of reference of the committee went far beyond finding an immediate solution to the problem submitted to its consideration, were ready to convene the committee so that it could examine the longer-term problems now occurring in South Africa and the Indian Ocean.

But as Nigeria, India and Malaysia have persisted in their intention of not taking part in any meeting, whatever the purpose, Canada thus finds itself forced to admit that the committee is no longer representative and, therefore, cannot call a new meeting, because the terms of reference cannot be fulfilled. We regret, Mr. Speaker, that such an opportunity of discussing various problems, and in particular that of South Africa, should be lost.

I would like, in closing, to talk about the comments of the hon. member who saw fit to include in this debate the question of the sale of arms by France. I believe it has already been said, many times, in this House, that Canada, in the speeches of its representatives at the United Nations, as well as elsewhere, had always clearly expressed its complete disapproval of any country selling arms to South Africa.

[English]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY—POSSIBLE SALE OF McCLELLAND AND STEWART PUBLISHING FIRM TO FOREIGN INTERESTS

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my intervention this evening has to do with the possible sale of

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

the publishing firm of McClelland and Stewart to foreign interests. Perhaps I might take just a moment to explain the situation which existed when I posed the question which has given rise to this debate. The publishing firm of W. A. J. Gage had been sold to United States interests. The publishing firm of Ryerson Press had been sold to United States interests, and it had just been announced that McClelland and Stewart might follow the same route.

On February 18, as reported at page 3509 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) if he was considering any specific action such as the creation of a Canadian book development corporation or the provision of long-term, low-interest loans to Canadian-owned book publishing firms in order to assist their avoiding falling into this kind of sale. At that time the minister said he would look into the matter to see what was being done.

Then on February 19, in answer to a further series of questions from myself and the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce suggested that an interdepartmental committee and the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) were looking into the whole problem of the foreign ownership of Canadian publishing firms. He also said that in that regard they were specifically examining the possibility of creating a book development corporation and means of promoting the sale abroad of Canadian books.

Subsequently, in a speech in this House and on other occasions I suggested five means which the government of Canada might undertake in order to prevent the sale of McClelland and Stewart to foreign interests, and also to preserve the Canadian publishing industry as it now exists and perhaps to see it grow and flourish. I suggested the creation of a Canadian book development corporation which would operate similarly to the Canadian Film Corporation, that is, provide loans for the publication of books in the expectation that any profits derived therefrom would be shared by the corporation.

I suggested the provision of long-term, low-interest loans through institutions such as the Industrial Development Bank. I suggested that more aid should be made available for the publication of scholarly and artistic works by the Humanities Research Council and the Canada Council. I suggested that a Canadian-owned book distribution system be established to operate in rivalry with the book distribution systems which now exist in Canada which are largely U.S. owned, and I suggested the creation of a Canadian book publishing house in the U.S. which would increase potentially the volume of sales of Canadian books.

Subsequent to these events the Secretary of State met with representatives of Canadian-owned publishing houses who made representations to him suggesting steps which he might take in order to maintain the industry in a healthy state. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say, to allow that industry to regain a state of health. In subsequent questions in the House I attempted to learn from the Secretary of State when action as a result of this meeting might be expected from the government. Perhaps understandably, the minister has thus far only