

ensure the bargaining rights of fishermen. Deep sea fishing and salmon fishing come under federal legislation.

I am sure the minister will recall a session in which the union from British Columbia attended upon the fisheries committee. That was some years ago, maybe seven or eight. They protested this treatment as co-adventurers, as though it might have had something to do with federal influence. I am not prepared at the moment to say it was entirely federal. I am certain that part of it does impinge on federal jurisdiction.

Mr. LeBlanc: It was a Supreme Court judgment.

Mr. Rose: I am informed by the former minister that it was a Supreme Court judgment, a federal judgment.

I would now like to turn from fish to films.

An hon. Member: Filming fish?

Mr. Rose: No, not filming fish. I want to continue my representations to the President of the Treasury Board over the costs the National Film Board has had to face and their opportunities for the future as one of Canada's outstanding institutions. I say to the President of the Treasury Board publicly something that he already knows. I want everyone listening to know that we know too. It was not the original cuts that were imposed by the Conservative government which caused the trouble in the first place. It was the cuts imposed by the previous government which now, with inflationary conditions, amount to about 20 per cent.

This great Canadian institution has won at least five Oscars and I do not know how many other Academy Award nominations for shorts, documentaries and other innovative films. They provide all kinds of well trained film makers and various other kinds of artists and technicians for the private industry in Canada. We are told it is virtually on its last legs because it desperately needs money. It has had to fire at least 125 people as a result, some of the best people we have. I would say another Canadian success story will be headed for the block unless we do something about it.

The minister is quite familiar with this matter. The information I have is that approaches have been made to the minister for supplementary funding of about \$1 million and they have received a kind of counter offer of \$330,000. I remind the President of the Treasury Board that the cuts that have been imposed are all the more crucial because compared to all other agencies of government over the past ten years it has not grown at all significantly in terms of numbers or in terms of budget.

When I came here ten or 11 years ago the budget for the whole of the year was roughly \$12 million. We thought that was terrible, that the sky was falling. That budget has now quadrupled. In those same ten years the National Film Board, an agency that has had all kinds of international acclaim, has not grown at all. There has been little or no growth in the past ten years. By cutting the budget 12 per cent, which through inflation has grown 20 per cent, you are cutting its throat. I know the minister and the government do not want to preside

Supply

over the funeral of the National Film Board. Canadians would never forgive them. A \$330,000 amount of saw-off may keep the patient breathing, but certainly will not perpetuate the quality and reputation we have come to expect from this agency.

● (1450)

Furthermore, the Secretary of State is anxious to regionalize the offerings and also the film-making on behalf of the National Film Board. There is no chance of that happening. There is not enough money to keep the office in Montreal operating properly. I am told there are film-makers answering the phone down there, which is rather nice in some ways because you can probably get hold of one of them occasionally; but apart from that little half satirical aside it is a very serious matter. I have letters from Lincoln Plaza, New York, from the television workshop, pleading with the Prime Minister not to allow the National Film Board to go under. Media Probe in the United States made similar representations—again this is a New York production outfit. They know the contribution in terms of training, leadership and innovative styles for which the National Film Board is responsible in the documentary field as in others.

May I close, then—

Mr. Breau: Any time you like.

An hon. Member: Right now!

Mr. Rose: We have a special case here, not just an ordinary case but one that calls for government attention because it has been neglected. The funds have been cut by the former government. I say to those people on my right who are anxious for me to be quiet, no wonder they do not want me to talk about it, because they did it to them. They have been trying to out-restrain the restrainers for the past two years. When they say things like that I am not likely to sit down before my time has expired unless I have severe chest pains.

The cuts have hurt the film board more than just by the 10 per cent or 12 per cent. There has been no growth in the last ten years, but since other departments of government which might have been making communications films, media films, advertising films, public relations films, if you like, have not been placing orders with them, the cuts are that much more damaging. I leave the committee with the plea that the President of the Treasury Board stand up here smartly and tell us that he has repented, that he is sorry he did it and that for the good of the nation he intends to restore those funds.

Mr. Stevens: I am not sure whether the hon. member will feel that what I am about to say is part of a process of recanting or not. I certainly agree with him that the estimates of the National Film Board were reduced under the former government. As I recall it, their total budgetary funding in the fiscal year 1979 was about \$34.1 million and in the estimates now before us it is \$30.3 million. It is true this has put the National Film Board under pressure. We are well aware of that, and we are particularly sympathetic.