

Supply—Resources and Development

instead of Montreal. We have a lot of culture there. We have the little theatre and a very noted playwright, Mr. Robertson Davies. We have scenery, and we have a music festival. I do not see why the Minister of Public Works did not suggest that move.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): I could not even bring it to Hull.

Mr. Fraser: The committee investigating the national film board could not have made in 1949 the report it made this year, because the new director has tried to put a little management into that board which we certainly did not have before. It looks also as if the director, Mr. Irwin, has tried to carry out the Woods-Gordon management program. The recommendations of the Gordon firm have been carried out, and there is a statement to that effect on pages 35 and 36 of the committee's report. It might be a good idea to put that on the record, so that the members could see just what has been done.

There is one thing I regret, and that is that the committee did not call witnesses from the Canadian Commercial and Press Photographers Association or the Commercial Motion Picture Association. I believe that is something that should be done at our next meeting, if the committee is set up again next year. I hope that the minister will see to it that it is set up again next year. I think it is fair to the national film board to have such a committee. It gives the employees in the board a little build-up of morale, because they can see that nothing is hidden from the members. On May 8 I asked that the Commercial and Press Photographers Association as well as the Commercial Motion Picture Association be called before the committee. I was told that the steering committee would look into that, but the steering committee did not meet until the deliberations of the committee were completed, on June 20, at which time they studied the report.

The committee was also assured by the director that at the present time the board has not been out hunting up business at it was before. I feel this step creates better feeling amongst the commercial photographers. It was stated also that since 1950 the board has fewer employees engaged in distributing films, but with the excellent help of local film councils throughout Canada distribution has increased greatly. Even in foreign countries, where the national film board had offices which have been discontinued, distribution has gone up 15.9 per cent. We were told that revenues were gradually increasing since 1950 from the different

[Mr. Fraser.]

activities of the board such as commercial 35 millimetre film, 16 millimetre film and also television. In 1950, when the present director took over, there were about twenty treasury officers in the board, whereas now there are only eight. The film board is looking after its own account, and evidently these treasury officers are doing a good job.

The board also has a better system of planning its work. Films are taken at the proper time, and arrangements are made ahead of time instead of running out on a job and finding it was the wrong time to take the film. The cost of showing film has been cut in half since 1947, from 7.4 per cent to about 4 per cent. The Matthew report said that the film board should continue to have films produced by private commercial companies. I hope the film board will continue to do that. The minority report attached to the Matthew report said that at least 50 per cent of the work should be done by private companies. This recommendation has not been followed out. Private companies should at least have an opportunity of competing with the national film board. Tenders should be called so that private industry would have a chance to compete. I think you would get cheaper films and better films, not just because they would be made by private companies but because these companies would be competing with each other. Every motion picture company has different methods. This would give the national film board a chance to see how these people do the work. It would also help the commercial corporations.

I was sorry that a letter covering the policy declaration adopted at the annual meeting of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce which was held in Quebec city on October 30, 1951, was not placed before the committee, as this matter was not before the committee until our last meeting. But in that letter it is stated:

The Canadian chamber of commerce generally endorses the minority report of the national film board of the royal commission on national development in the arts, letters and sciences, in which it is recommended that two or three members should be appointed to the board of the national film board as moderators, with the duty of examining objectively all plans of the board. The national film board should not extend its operations. The film act should be amended so that it is no longer necessary for departments of the federal government to secure their films through the national film board.

I am sorry there was no chance for this matter to be discussed in the committee.

There are just a couple of questions I should like to ask. One is this. What are the arrangements with regard to the showing of 16 mm. films in tourist hotels throughout the country? These films are shown for the entertainment of guests. I should like to