

not empowered to consider that question. The relevance of this question to the Annual Report of the Economic Council of Canada is not established in the second report of the Committee, and in my opinion it could not be.

For good and obvious reasons, one committee cannot direct another, not even indirectly, as committees are creatures of the House and can only do what the House orders or directs. They have no relation one to another.

Therefore, I have to rule that the second report of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs is out of order and that the *Votes and Proceedings* will reflect this fact.

At this point, I might also mention that the matter of broadcasting of committee proceedings seems to be occupying more than one standing committee of this House. In this connection I have already written to all committee chairmen. Committees, it is clear, are masters of their own procedure, but it is also clear that they must act only within the scope of the powers given to them by the House as they are but creatures of the House. The issue of broadcasting is one that rests currently with the House. It is a complex one and has been a subject of discussion from time to time. But as Speaker it is my duty to ensure that any initiative on such a matter remains the prerogative of the House until the House chooses otherwise.

The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) is rising on a point of order?

**Mr. Waddell:** A clarification if I might, Mr. Speaker. I have been in the House six years—

**Mr. Speaker:** With great respect, does the Hon. Member have a point of order?

**Mr. Waddell:** Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there are certain prerogatives that remain with Mr. Speaker himself, including examples of broadcasting—

**Mr. Speaker:** The Member's point of order, please? Does the Hon. Member have a point of order?

**Mr. Waddell:** My point of order is that I think the Speaker should use these prerogatives to have influence in bringing the House of Commons up to date technologically, including—

**Mr. Speaker:** I take it the Member wishes to make an intervention on the question of broadcasting. That is not a point of order. The Member has other routes through his own House Leader as to whether he wishes a committee of the House struck again. That is hardly a point of order. In fact, it is not a point of order.

### *Order Paper Questions*

#### CLERK OF PETITIONS' REPORT

##### CALL FOR REINSTATEMENT OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

**Mr. Speaker:** I have the honour to inform the House that the petition presented by the Hon. Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling) on Thursday, December 13, 1984, meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

#### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Paul Dick (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Government House Leader)):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos, 31, 49, 50, and 75.

[*Text*]

#### PRODUCTIONS OF THE NATIONAL FILM BOARD

Question No. 31—**Mr. Howie:**

Is there any mechanism for the government to express its attitude toward specific productions of the National Film Board and, if so (a) what is it (b) did the government make use of the mechanism with respect to the Board's production "The Kid who Couldn't Miss"?

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** The NFB is one of the agencies within my portfolio but decisions on questions of production are the responsibility of the Board itself.

Each agency has a selected board and a management whose role it is to make artistic and content decisions. The government will not intervene in the internal matters of the NFB as this would only serve to restrict the ability of the NFB to explore the types of social and cultural issues and concerns that serve to shape our lives.

The NFB has informed me that it has conducted an internal review of some of the criticisms raised against the film and concluded that the director, Paul Cowan, was scrupulous in his research and fair in his presentation of the exploits of Billy Bishop in the film.

There is a well established precedent, recognized through successive governments, which constrains the politicians responsible for Canada's cultural agencies, such as the NFB and the CBC, from intervening in the artistic and content decisions which must be made by these agencies. The government is committed to this precedent.

Some objections were raised concerning the depiction of Billy Bishop in this film. Notably, A. J. Bauer, Chairman of Billy Bishop Heritage, wrote to the NFB in March, 1984, outlining at least 15 historical and factual errors in this film, pertaining to the exploits of Billy Bishop. The NFB then asked the director to review and justify his research material. On