

whether such an arrangement would be workable. In reply Mr. McLean stated that it had worked effectively in London and Mexico City and that he felt it could work in the other countries mentioned. The alternative would be for the Department to appoint its own film officers, a proposal which Mr. McLean seemed to regard as unnecessary and perhaps wasteful.

9. Mr. McLean welcomed the proposal that the Department should set up a prints budget to add to that of NFB, but felt it would be more appropriate for the Department to support a request by the Film Board for additional monies. In any case he felt that the budget should be administered by NFB.

10. At the conclusion of the meeting Mr. Anderson again recapitulated the Department's basic position, pointing out that while the discussion had been friendly, informative and, he thought, helpful, the question of control still remained unresolved.

Observations

1. While the atmosphere of the discussion was friendly, it was quite evident that Mr. McLean would resist any attempt at control in the sense discussed in para 1 above. It is perhaps worth noting that sections 14 (1, 2, 3) of the National Film Act read by Mr. McLean refer, by implication, to domestic distribution, since section 9 (g) deals specifically with distribution abroad, and since the general intent of the Act, as stated in section 9 (a), is to enable the Film Board to produce and distribute "national films designed to help Canadians in all parts of Canada to understand the ways of living and problems of Canadians in other parts." Under section 15 the Governor in Council is empowered to "make such regulations as may be necessary for carrying out the intent of this act". It may be doubted if in 1939 international distribution was regarded as more than a remote contingency.

2. The proposed Advisory Committee, while it would establish closer day-to-day working relations than now exist, would not, it seems to us, meet the Department's requirements unless the Department had a controlling voice. The proposal that disputes should be referred to the Under-Secretary on the one hand and the Film Commissioner on the other seems to us to equate the Department's responsibility for the conduct of Canada's foreign relations with the Film Board's responsibility to produce and distribute films, whereas in fact, the latter should be regarded as a segment of the former.

3. If the Department wishes to control the distribution of films abroad, such a Committee could fill a useful function at the working level, provided such control were secured by amending the National Film Act.

4. The proposal that the Film Board establish international distribution officers in the various cities mentioned above, seems to us merely to perpetuate a situation which has already caused a good deal of confusion by reason of divided authority. On the other hand, if the Department wishes to control film distribution abroad, the necessity for the appointment of such officers by the Department must be faced.

5. The proposed prints budget could only be effectively administered by the Film Board, if the Department had control of policy.