



House of Commons  
CANADA

## Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

---

CHPC • NUMBER 002 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Wednesday, October 27, 2004**

—  
**Chair**

**Ms. Marlene Catterall**

All parliamentary publications are available on the  
"Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire" at the following address:

**<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

## Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

Wednesday, October 27, 2004

• (1530)

[English]

**The Chair (Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.)):** I will now call the committee to order.

I would ask for the indulgence of the committee. I am trying to rearrange my schedule. I do have an appointment at 5 o'clock, and Mr. Schellenberger tells me he would like to leave at 5 o'clock. We have agreed that if the committee is agreeable, perhaps this afternoon we could go until just 5 o'clock, since it is our first overview with officials of the department and I don't want to wear you all out in one day.

Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** We have today Judith LaRocque, deputy minister; Susan Peterson, the associate deputy minister; and Bruce Manion, the assistant deputy minister of planning and corporate affairs. I will leave it to them to do an introduction.

I will say that the clerk has contacted the minister's office about a possible appearance before the committee at one of our meetings next week. I will leave it to the committee, frankly, to decide whether, after hearing from the officials this afternoon, you want a second session with them. This is all quite new to me and to most members of the committee, so we may in fact want a second session before we have the minister in.

Ms. LaRocque, I leave it to you to begin.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque (Deputy Minister, Department of Canadian Heritage):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

With your indulgence, I have a brief presentation, and then I'm very happy to take questions. As you mentioned yourself, if at the conclusion of this the members decide they would like to drill deeper into any one of the areas of policy or whatever, we would be happy to come back and discuss that.

First of all, we're pleased to be here before you today. We're going to be talking about the Canadian Heritage portfolio. We use the term "portfolio" to mean both the department itself and the 18 crown corporations and agencies for which the Minister of Canadian Heritage is accountable in varying degrees.

To begin with, perhaps I could provide you with some information about the portfolio's roots. The Department of Canadian Heritage was created in 1993 out of the former Departments of Communications, Environment, Secretary of State and Multiculturalism and

Citizenship. Sport was transferred from the former Department of National Health and Welfare.

With the crown corporations and agencies, the portfolio brings together most of Canada's key cultural instruments related to artistic creativity, heritage, and shared citizenship.

• (1535)

[Translation]

The resources of the Canadian Heritage portfolio are estimated for 2004-2005 at approximately \$3.9 billion in appropriations and revenues. The department and the 18 Crown corporations and agencies together have 16,404 employees. Of course, this includes Crown corporations like the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Telefilm Canada, the Canada Council for the Arts, and so on.

[English]

Let me outline the makeup of the portfolio, beginning with the department itself, whose own structure I will talk to in a moment.

The department includes two special operating agencies: the Canadian Conservation Institute and the Canadian Heritage Information Network, often referred to as CHIN.

[Translation]

Ten Crown corporations receive strategic policy direction from the minister on behalf of the government but operate at arm's length with regard to programming and day-to-day activities. On page 4, you will find a fairly long list of national museums, as well as the National Arts Centre, the National Capital Commission, the Canada Race Relations Foundation, and others.

[English]

Also at arm's length are five departmental agencies that deliver their mandates within the government's policy and legislative framework: the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, the CRTC; Library and Archives Canada, which were merged recently, in May of this year; the National Battlefields Commission; the National Film Board of Canada; and Status of Women Canada.

[Translation]

The portfolio also includes the Public Service Commission and the Public Service Staff Relations Board, which report to Parliament through the Minister of Canadian Heritage; and the Canadian Cultural Property Export Review Board, a separate stand-alone body that operates under the responsibility of the minister.

[English]

The portfolio focuses on supporting cultural expression and excellence. The cultural sector makes an important contribution to the Canadian economy. According to Statistics Canada, in 2002, which is the latest year for which data are available, Canada's cultural sector contributed \$27.9 billion to Canada's GDP, or 2.7%, a 46.2% increase from 1996. Also in 2002, 4.9% of Canada's workforce, or roughly 760,000 people, were employed in the cultural sector, be it in creation, production, preservation and support activities, manufacturing, wholesale and retail, and the export of cultural goods and services in 2002 were valued at \$4.93 billion, up 80% from 1996.

It's also becoming better understood that communities are defined and their quality of life is strengthened by their cultural excellence. A vibrant cultural milieu stimulates and builds creative talent, which in turn attracts capital and tourism.

Finally, on a daily basis, no group offers Canadians more insight and international profile than our artists, from Margaret Atwood to Céline Dion, to Denys Arcand, to Cirque du Soleil, and I could go on and on. Cultural achievements powerfully affect how others see us and how we see ourselves.

[Translation]

On page 8, you will find an array of directions. The portfolio supports artists and artistic companies such as orchestras, dance companies, and theatres. It supports cultural industries, book and magazine publishing, television and radio, film and sound recording and new media.

The purpose is to ensure a place for Canadian voices and diverse Canadian perspectives, to support excellence and to reach Canadians. The portfolio also includes the four national museums and the recently merged Library and Archives of Canada.

As well, it supports the broader community of Canada's Heritage institutions through policies and programs in the areas of conservation, exhibitions, collections management, and the export of cultural property.

At the same time, the portfolio is responsible for policies and programs that build social capital by promoting linguistic duality, multiculturalism, the unique contribution of Aboriginal peoples, amateur sport, youth exchanges, Canadian studies, human rights, state ceremonial and symbols, and shared citizenship.

[English]

The Department of Canadian Heritage has 2,188 employees. In 2004-05 the department's overall budget will be approximately \$1.1 billion. The department provides services from its headquarters in Gatineau and from 26 points of service across the country and via an extensive website.

The mission of the department is to contribute to a cohesive and creative Canada in which all citizens have opportunities to participate in Canada's cultural and civic life. To this end, the department has articulated two interrelated strategic outcomes: that Canadians be able to express and share their diverse cultural experiences with each other and the world, and that Canadians live

in an inclusive society built on intercultural understanding and citizen participation.

• (1540)

[Translation]

Canadian Heritage is administered by a deputy minister and an associate deputy minister. The department is composed of the following: five sectors, each headed by an assistant deputy minister; six groups that report directly to the deputy minister; and finally, five regional offices.

The Cultural Affairs sector is responsible for policy development and program delivery related to the arts, new media, broadcasting, copyright, and cultural industries including book publishing, audiovisual production and distribution, and music.

The Citizenship and Heritage Sector is responsible for programs and policy in the areas of heritage, multiculturalism, official languages, Aboriginal peoples, human rights, Canadian studies, youth exchanges, volunteerism, and citizen participation.

The International and Intergovernmental Affairs sector manages the department's intergovernmental relations and international affairs such as bilateral cooperation with other countries, as well as involvement in multilateral organizations such as UNESCO. The sector supports cultural trade and exports. The sector is also responsible for sport activities and, on behalf of the Government of Canada, for supporting the organizing committee for the Vancouver 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games.

The Planning and Corporate Affairs sector provides integrated services to the departments, including financial grants and contributions management, information and technology management, audit and evaluation, strategic policy, and corporate planning and reporting.

The goal of the sector is to ensure that the department has the information, processes, technology, and the tools necessary to deliver the highest possible quality service to Canadians.

The Public Affairs and Communications sector is mandated to ensure an integrated and proactive approach in how the department reaches out to Canadians and abroad. The sector also promotes heritage through innovative use of the Internet and new media technologies. It ensures that policies, communications and services are informed by regional perspectives.

[English]

The five regional offices deliver and support a full range of Canadian Heritage policies, programs, and services to Canadians. They maintain networks and daily relations with the department's clients and with other federal departments and levels of government as well as with the public. They actively participate in the development and implementation of the department's policies and programs.

[Translation]

Diversity has become a critical issue for Canada's society and economy. Immigration is expected to account for 100 per cent of labour force growth by the mid-2020s, and 100 per cent population growth not long after that.

Since Canada's multiculturalism policy was adopted in the 1970s, our population has gone from 73 per cent French or British ancestry to 47 per cent reporting an ancestry other than French, British, or Canadian, with more than 200 ethnic origins in total.

The percentage of the population born outside Canada has reached its highest level in 70 years. Therefore, it is urgent that departments work together to address the issues of immigrant integration, foreign credential recognition, and related institutional racism.

The goals set out in the 2003 Official Languages Action Plan remain key to maximizing human capital and the potential of citizens in our bilingual, multicultural country, and of course, particularly the goal to double within 10 years the proportion of secondary-school graduates with a functional knowledge of their second official language.

I conclude with sport. Sport and physical activity are proven contributors to the health of our citizens and communities. Sport is also important to our economy. In 1995-1996, sport represented 1.1 per cent of Canada's GDP that is 7.4 billion per year or 360,000 jobs.

Hosting the Olympic Games in 2010 represents an unprecedented opportunity for voluntarism and economic development, not just for Vancouver but for Canada.

• (1545)

[English]

In closing, I hope this gives you a broad brush as to the department and the portfolio agencies. We're happy to take your questions, and we also have a few colleagues as well for other areas in case we don't quite have the answer for you that you need.

**The Chair:** Merci, Madame.

I shall try to follow the complex route of questions we laid out last time. The clerk has Liberals first, but I think we'd agreed on opposition first, so we'll start with Mr. Schellenberger.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger (Perth—Wellington, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair, and I'd like to thank our people here today for coming and giving us an outline of what Canadian Heritage is all about. That was one thing I missed. I came into this committee a little over a year and a half ago, so I'm one of the few who have a little bit of experience on this committee. But I didn't have that introduction to the heritage committee; I had to fly by the seat of my pants.

I felt I was part of the committee the last time, and one thing we were very proud of in that committee was our interim report on copyright reform that was brought forward. We worked diligently on that, in a little bit of a rush even, and we spent lots of time and listened to lots of witnesses.

I must say, when I sit on committee, I don't just sit on committee as an opposition member. I sit on it as a committee member.

We diligently worked with our experts and all the witnesses as we interviewed them and came out with what we thought was a very good report, one that would help speed up the ratification of the WIPO treaty and our world treaties. I just hope, with all the work we did, all the witnesses we listened to, and the tweaking to make sure that report was very refined and said exactly what we wanted it to say, that the report does not gather dust or find itself in the corner of the ministry, and that the minister will adhere to those things.

My question is, is it the intent of the department to move forward on the interim report on copyright reform that was presented to them in May 2004?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Thank you, Mr. Schellenberger.

First of all, may I commend the committee on the work they did in a very short period of time to put forward a response to the issues brief we had put forward between us and the Department of Industry. Yes, I'm happy to respond to you that we are working very diligently weekly—daily at times—with our colleagues at Industry on that first series of issues that were identified as the first phase in order to be able to come forward with those in the foreseeable future, I would say. It's complicated, it's complex, and even the drafting of legislation is complex, but we are making real progress.

Maybe Susan could add something. Susan has been working directly with our colleagues at Industry.

**Ms. Susan Peterson (Associate Deputy Minister, Department of Canadian Heritage):** The two associate deputy ministers are working together very closely to really keep this moving along. There are complex issues that need to be crunched. Your report was very helpful at that stage in keeping up the pressure, and we're moving along.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** I know one of our colleagues who was here but is not around the table anymore was very adamant that the ministry come forward with something by November 2004. I know November is very close at hand. My whole objective in this question is that I would like to see, again, a response to that report as quickly as possible. Again, we should put a timeframe on it somewhere along the line so we don't go on. We have to realize that this deal was signed back in 1996 and that we haven't really got much further, I don't think, since 1996, or that was my understanding.

Again, my question is, with respect to the timeframe that was mentioned—and we all wanted to make sure it was brought back up as soon as committees started again—is something going to be presented in the near future? I know we got started late as a Parliament—instead of the middle of September, it was October. Can we see something back on WIPO and the ratification of that thing in the near future?

•(1550)

**Ms. Susan Peterson:** The issues we are crunching right now include all the issues needed to ratify the WIPO treaties. We have two new ministers, of course, who have arrived since your report came out, so November is not realistic for you to expect something back before this committee. What we're looking for as a response to the committee report is, in effect, a piece of legislation to move. So it won't be November, but it will be as soon as possible thereafter.

**The Chair:** Mr. Schellenberger, your five minutes has been exceeded a little, so we'll move on to the Bloc Québécois.

Monsieur Kotto.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maka Kotto (Saint-Lambert, BQ):** Good morning Madam. I in turn would like to thank you for coming. I will take advantage of your presence to ask a string of questions, which include a conclusion that is a question in and of itself.

I assume that in your opinion, the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage is rather important. If so, I also assume that the recommendations it makes concerning the Department of Heritage are taken into consideration. If this is the case, I would like to know what has become of the recommendation whereby the minister would submit to the House of Commons, the parliamentarians, the process that would result in the appointment of the future president of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Would you like me to answer your questions individually, or would you like to ask them all at once?

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** I assume that this committee is of importance to you. I assume that any recommendation made by it carries some weight or has some resonance within your office. If that is the case, my colleagues and I would like to know what has been done about that June 2003 recommendation.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** I would like to clarify one point: did the 2003 recommendation state that the minister should make a recommendation directly to the committee?

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** No. I do not have the exact wording in mind, but it said roughly that parliamentarians should have some input into the choice of the future president of a Crown corporation. As far as the CBC is concerned, parliamentarians should have the opportunity to say what their choice would be for the future president. This would also be the case for other Crown corporations, as well as for any government agencies affecting communications and culture.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** I really could not speak to this theory of participation or non participation of parliamentarians. On the other hand, what I can say is that a public process has been launched. This was announced either by the prime minister or by the president of Treasury Board. If we take the CBC as an example, the process now requires that the board of directors of the corporation create a selection committee. They would even be encouraged to use headhunters or to place adds in major newspapers, in order to present recommendations on potential candidates for the position of president of the CBC to the minister—in this case the Minister of Heritage. I know that in this case, the president of the CBC board of directors has launched this process.

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** You therefore did not give any consideration to the recommendation made by the committee in June 2003 on this matter.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** I must say that this was a decision for the government and not for the officials.

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** That enables me to ascertain that the recommendation did not reach you. That is what I wanted to point out. That answers my first question. That means that the committee does not carry much weight when it comes to making recommendations.

•(1555)

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** I could not—

[English]

I would not draw those conclusions.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** It is factual. I am going to base myself on that. I said before that I was a disciple of St. Thomas: I believe what I see. That is all. Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus, you are next in line if you want to use the slot.

**Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP):** I'd love to use the slot. Thank you.

I would like to follow up on that question because I understood that the heritage committee didn't break new ground in making recommendations for appointments to the CBC. We've been looking for decades and decades and decades at how to have public accountability.

In fact, since 1936 I understand that 90% of the appointments to the CBC have been friends of the ruling party. This committee brought forward recommendations on having a transparent procedure. My understanding is that it is not the case in the appointment of the president of the CBC, so did you have discussions with the Prime Minister, or did the minister? Are you aware of how this decision was made to make the appointment of the CBC president?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** My understanding is that in the case of all crown corporations now there was a recent announcement—and forgive me, but I think it was by the President of the Treasury Board—that there would be a new procedure of appointment, which includes asking the chairmen of the boards of all crown corporations to create a nominating committee. They are encouraged within the work of that nominating committee to use whatever means they deem needed, be it the use of a headhunter or the use of advertising, to cast the widest possible net for appointments. From that point on, once they've culled that information, they are to recommend a list of people the minister might consider. It is my further understanding that once the minister has accepted the recommendation and the recommendation is approved by cabinet, the committees are fully welcome to invite those people to speak. That is my understanding of the procedure as it stands.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Okay.

I'm not very good with numbers, but I think 8 out of 10 or 8 out of 12 present board members are long-time contributors to the Liberal Party of Canada.

I understand that we've just reappointed Mr. Rabinovitch. Has that decision been made public? That's the word going around....

No, that's not the case?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** No.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Well, that's wonderful. So then we would be in a situation to apply these rules to the reappointment or new appointment or anointment of a CBC president...we'd be able to do that as a committee?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** My understanding is that there is a process that has been announced by the government, and it does include the board of directors calling for names and bringing them before it. I can't speak to whether or not there is an additional role for the committee.

**The Chair:** The clerk may want to respond a bit on this as well, but this is a new process and something that we might want to ask the minister about when she appears.

As well, all committees have the right to review appointments. As I understand it, this committee has not reviewed any appointments under the mandate of Heritage Canada, so it's something we might want to be a little more responsible for—

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Oh, I definitely think so.

I feel so caught out here because I read the newspapers about who's being appointed and who's being talked about, and I don't hear about any of it here. I would just like to make sure that if I'm reading the *Montreal Gazette* or *Le Soleil* and they are aware of who's being appointed as the head of the CBC, I should certainly—

**A voice:** [*Inaudible—Editor*]

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Yes, maybe we could have a meeting with them on this.

Will we be able to bring that forward before any decisions are made by the Prime Minister?

**The Chair:** Can we undertake to get an answer for you on that?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** That would be wonderful. I'd be a happy man.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** My remaining time is ticking away here.

I wanted to go back to the issue of copyright. You know, it's a funny thing with democracy, because a new voice gets elected and it might be a dissident voice. I have a number of concerns about the copyright report and what it means for digital reproduction.

Please don't get me wrong here. I've lived my life surviving by my own copyright, but I'm looking to see, when you have done your number crunching, if your recommendations on copyright will come back to the committee for discussion.

**Ms. Susan Peterson:** On the recommendations, we're now at the stage of having the committee look at this. Having consulted publicly, we're now at the stage to make recommendations to the

minister, and the Department of Industry to their minister, and then go to cabinet. That's the stage we're at now.

• (1600)

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** So I was elected three months too late, is what you're telling me?

**Ms. Susan Peterson:** Well, no, because legislation will obviously be referred to committee.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Oh, wonderful. See, I'm learning here! You guys are going to have to wait while I get caught up to speed on all of the things you've been dealing with over the years.

If I have one more question, I'll just ask this—

**The Chair:** Can you hold it until the next round?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Oh, for sure.

**The Chair:** Mr. Rodriguez is next.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

First of all, thank you for coming here today, for accepting our invitation. For the new members, it is always useful to become more familiar with the committee's main files.

I have two quick questions on two different topics. First of all, where are we with respect to access to third language television channels? Mr. Clifford Lincoln and his committee tabled a report about three weeks ago. I would like to know whether or not things have changed since then. What steps need to be taken before a final decision can be made? Perhaps you could provide a brief answer to the first question; I have another question on another topic.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** As you know, the Minister requested a panel composed of three persons to report on the public aspect of broadcasters. This report has been submitted to the Minister and to the CRTC for consideration during the third language review currently underway.

We are expecting the CRTC's final report on the matter in December.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Thank you. I have a brief second question, and this one deals with the 2010 Olympic Games. You touched on the matter briefly, since amateur sport comes under the Heritage Minister.

Is there an action plan, or at least a draft plan, to make these games truly bilingual, namely, that the country's two official languages be not only taken into account but respected and visible throughout the games?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** We are working, the whole government is working, to try to make these games truly Canada-wide games, with all of that entails.

There is an Assistant Deputy Ministers committee and a Deputy Ministers committee, which I chair, which are in the process of reviewing the entire plan for the Olympics, including ways that the country can benefit from tourism and branding. In addition, we are of course well aware of our obligations and the desire to project Canada's image as a bilingual country. We truly do take this aspect into account in all of our discussions.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Rodriguez, you have a couple of minutes left.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** No, I'm fine, thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Obhrai.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, CPC):** Thank you.

It's good to see you, Judy, after a long time.

I knew Judy personally—we were on the Governor General's trip—before she became a deputy minister.

This is the first time I'm here on this heritage committee. Like all the other members, I have to get up to speed here.

Over the last period of time, one of the serious criticisms of the heritage department has been around its very low presence in regional areas, specifically in western Canada. You have most programs directed elsewhere. To look at your map here of your regional presence, aside from the fact that, yes, you do spend money in regional areas, and you do these things, really, people with decision-making abilities and everything else are still concentrated here. You haven't attempted to decentralize your department to a level where more decisions of this....

I mean, you have a lot of responsibility here, with crown corporations and all the other things. But the feeling that comes out all the time is that it is from here there, never from there here, and that we are at the receiving end of whatever is happening. Many of these programs are not even relevant to....

So in terms of the functioning of your department, what about any input that comes from the other side, from the other regions of Canada, into your headquarters? As well, perhaps you can tell me if there is a decentralization process or not.

• (1605)

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Let me speak to that from a couple of angles. We are largely a grant and contribution department, which means that we do need to have officers in the field. Much of the work we do is in the area of capacity building, be it with official language minority communities or multicultural groups. It is important for us to have a presence on the ground, and we do have a presence in I think 26 or 28 points of service across the country. That's important to us just for practical means in terms of being able to work with the communities, follow their progress, and be of assistance to them. So that does occur.

We do also have the five regional offices, which play a greater role in policy influencing than maybe they did in the past. I think I would take your criticism that in the past maybe policy was developed at headquarters with less regard for the regions, but I think we're getting better and better at bringing the regions into the policy development process. It's almost like an automatic tick mark for us now—what do the regions think, how is this going to affect the regions—in anything we do. We have five very strong regional executive directors who continue to remind us of the need to listen to the regions and to be present in the regions.

I'm not sure if I addressed all of your concern, but yes, we are cognizant of where we need to ensure that the regional voice is heard.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** Your set-up here shows that your deputy ministers are all based here. You have only executive directors out in the regions. So it is a very heavily centralized operation, or that's the feeling I get. Is there any long-term strategic planning to say, in order to decentralize and to get this thing in here, some of the deputy ministers...or maybe not deputy ministers, but people with the ability to make decisions, strong decisions, will be on the other side, across the country? And when I say other side, I mean right across, in the regions.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** The five regional executive directors are all ADMs minus one level. They are supported in most circumstances by at least two executive positions as well. We do bring them in with regard to policy direction and that kind of thing.

To my mind, my strongest allies in the regions are my executive directors, who are all strong and all knowledgeable and who really bring a lot of value to the headquarters discussion, and vice versa.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** How long has this system been going on?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** The department was created ten years ago, and that has been the structure for the last ten years.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** For the last ten years. Is there anything in your new strategic direction to see if that is effective or not?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** To see if it's effective? We do a review, an evaluation, on an ongoing basis of all of our programs to see whether or not they are being delivered effectively to Canadians. We have not felt the need to make a change at this time, based on those evaluations.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** None is contemplated?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Not at this time.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** Okay, thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Lemay, and then whichever Liberal would like to have five minutes.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marc Lemay (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Good afternoon, Madam Deputy Minister. For your information, I will tell you right away what I'm most interested in: sports.

To give you a bit of an idea of my background, I was Canadian biking president, so I'm very involved in sports, right up to the international level, where I was the international president of mountain biking. I am familiar with the entire sports organization in Canada. For the past 10 years, ever since the fall of the Berlin Wall, I have been asking that we remove the word "amateur" from all that it entails in Canada. There is no more room for the word "amateur". Several of your predecessors have told me that the word was going to be removed because the situation no longer applies ever since the East and West were reunited under the aegis of the Olympic Games.

When are we finally going to get rid of the word "amateur", which gives a pejorative idea of our Canadian athletes? That is my first question. I will ask all of my questions at once.

Secondly, I would invite the chair of the committee to request that the Minister of State (Sports) and the director of Sport Canada appear so that they can answer the following question, which I will now put to the deputy minister of Canadian Heritage.

Do we have a policy, a strategy, for meeting the objectives that we have set for ourselves? Have we set any expectations? I'm looking at the entire structure that I know. I have been involved in sports, and in culture as well, for years. We do this in 2004, we do that in 2005. I am focusing on sports, but it is the same question. I am showing fair play.

There will be the Winter Olympic Games in Turin in 2006, which will be the preparatory games to the 2010 Olympic Games in Vancouver. Today is October 27. Unless I am mistaken, I have not seen the objectives that we want to meet at the various Olympic Games, particularly the games that we will be funding, namely the 2010 Vancouver Games.

I would like the Minister of State for Sport, Mr. Owen, as well as the other individuals responsible, to come here in order to answer that question. For the time being, I will be satisfied in asking you whether, at your level, there are any strategic policies or strategic planning being done in the sectors under your purview.

•(1610)

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** As for your first question about when we intend to remove the word “amateur”, in all honesty, I cannot provide you with an answer today. I can get back to you on this. I have already heard this discussion. I have already heard people raise this question and I've heard you talk on the matter. Nevertheless, I have no answer for you right now. I would be pleased to get back to you on that matter.

As for a strategy for the games, a strategy for our athletes, yes, I can tell you that the minister is working on a strategy that also includes our support for sports, our athletes. Moreover, the Prime Minister has asked the Minister of State, Mr. Owen, to prepare a plan. We are in the process of working on it.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** I have finished for the time being, however, Madam Chair, my request has been noted, as has the fact that the deputy minister will provide an answer to my question.

**The Chair:** She can come back before the committee or provide an answer...

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** I have been told, Madam Chair, that the word “amateur” was removed in the most recent piece of legislation, the Physical Activity and Sport Act.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** Yes, I saw that. But this expression is still being used in, among other things, your documents.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Yes, we still use the word.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** We still use this word in the House. That will filter downward.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Yes.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Simms.

•(1615)

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.):** Thank you.

I have a quick question outlining the relationship you have with the CBC—which I could never quite understand, even though I spent several years in the broadcasting business.

I suppose you can expand that to say any crown corporation, for that matter.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** In the Canadian Heritage portfolio we have arm's-length relationships with various organizations. We like to say that some are more arm's length than others. The crown corporations themselves, versus say the agencies or the special operating agencies within the department, are really at arm's length from us.

What that means in a day-to-day way—and I'll use the CBC as an example—is that the CBC, with its president and its board of directors, is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the CBC and any programming or content decisions. The minister is responsible for tabling their business plan, tabling any information they need to table in Parliament. The minister is responsible for the appointments process for those agencies, and the minister is, of course, responsible for answering in question period any questions related to those crown corporations.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** I have one other quick question on a different note. Is the Canadian Television Fund also under your jurisdiction?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Yes.

Maybe I'll ask Susan to speak to it.

**Ms. Susan Peterson:** The Canadian Television Fund doesn't show up in these documents because it is not a crown corporation. It's incorporated under the general laws of Canada and it's funded by satellite and cable companies as well as by Telefilm Canada and the Department of Canadian Heritage. So it gets its funds from both public and private sources, and it's a privately incorporated not-for-profit organization. It has a board of directors on which the Minister of Canadian Heritage can appoint five members out of 18 or 19.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Do I have time?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** I have another quick question. I'm coming from different angles here, but these are just a few questions that I had on my mind.

The other pertains to satellite signals. I've had people in my jurisdiction, my riding, tell me they were unfairly judged against over the satellite issue. Is this something under your domain as well? How does this fit when it comes to laws about satellite theft, signal theft?

**Ms. Susan Peterson:** That comes under an act that is the responsibility of the Minister of Industry.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** So it's not under your jurisdiction whatsoever?

**Ms. Susan Peterson:** We take a keen interest in it, and the officials in the Department of Industry certainly know our views on it, but it comes under the responsibility of their minister.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** I understand. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

On this side of the table, Mr. Tweed.

**Mr. Merv Tweed (Brandon—Souris, CPC):** Thank you.

I apologize for coming in late and not getting all of your presentation, but I can tell you that in the short time I've been sitting as a member of Parliament, our office has had dealings with your department and they have been very positive. I appreciate the support that has been given.

I have a couple of questions, more for information. I wonder if you or anyone with you can provide any information in regard to the application on behalf of the Canadian human rights museum that's been proposed for the city of Winnipeg? Is there an application process or has any money flowed from this particular department to them?

Perhaps you could give a status update as to where it's at.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** The Canadian human rights museum approached the Department of Canadian Heritage several years ago with respect to potential funding, and we were asked to do an analysis of the proposal. As a result of that analysis, I believe a \$30-million contribution was made to the human rights museum in Winnipeg, not through us, Mr. Tweed, but through the western diversification department.

My understanding, more from reading the papers and everything else, is that there is an expectation that there might be a second contribution by the Government of Canada, but I'm not aware of where that stands now, other than having read about it.

• (1620)

**Mr. Merv Tweed:** Okay, thank you.

You mentioned they had made application or had discussions with your department. Was that something that you or policy dictated that it didn't fall under your jurisdiction?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** It's because we fund only the five national museums that are crown corporations linked to the government. This was going to be, as we understood it, a private museum. We don't fund private museums, other than on a project basis. We do have the museums assistance program, which helps museums across the country, but certainly not to the extent of funding that was being requested at that time.

**Mr. Merv Tweed:** Okay. Again, everything I've read and that has been presented on it has suggested to me that it's really not a private museum, but I guess that was obviously the position the department took.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** At the time we were in our discussions with the Aspers on this, the view was that it was a private museum.

**Mr. Merv Tweed:** That was approximately how long ago?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** That would have been a year and a half ago, before the death of Mr. Asper.

**Mr. Merv Tweed:** I'm sure there will be more information as we move forward.

The other question I have is in regard to Sport Canada. It was announced, I believe shortly after the Olympics were completed, that

Sport Canada was forwarding or contributing an increased amount of money towards the development of athletes.

Can you confirm the amount that was committed, and does that flow at all in this year's budget or is that something we will look for in next year's budget?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** I'm just trying to get my numbers correct here.

Monsieur Lemay knows his numbers better than I do.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** It's \$130 million for this year. They have \$30 million now to use for the rest of the year.

**Mr. Merv Tweed:** I wonder if the deputy could perhaps confirm those numbers or present the numbers that....

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Yes, I'll confirm, if we could just take a moment, Mr. Tweed. I want to make sure I get them right.

**Mr. Merv Tweed:** That's fine.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** The total budget of Sport Canada is \$120 million, and \$30 million was announced for this year—that is, in the year, this year.

**Mr. Merv Tweed:** So is that an increase?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** There was an increase year over year this year.

**Mr. Merv Tweed:** Of \$30 million?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Yes.

**Mr. Merv Tweed:** Is that to continue to increase, or is that something that has been pegged at that number and they'll receive that baseline?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** What I'm in a position to tell you is that this is the number we have to work with at this time. Whether or not our political masters decide it will be that number or another number in the future, I'm not able to speak to.

**Mr. Merv Tweed:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Ms. Bulte.

**Hon. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.):** Thank you very much.

I'm going to follow up on a couple of questions, one Mr. Schellenberger had and one Mr. Angus had.

With respect to the interim report on copyright reform of the Standing Committee of Canadian Heritage, which we tabled in May 2004, just before the election, I also was proud to be part of that, as was Mr. Schellenberger, and proud that it was a unanimous report, which, as you know, is quite a rarity in this Parliament.

I think we did work hard. But while we may have had a short timeframe to complete that report, the copyright study has been going on for a long time. It was certainly one of the things we talked about in the interim report—that we seemed to be dragging and dragging. I remember at that time, Ms. Peterson, we asked you what we could do to speed up the process and I remember you specifically saying that timelines really help.

One of the things we did ask in the report, as Mr. Schellenberger noted, was that November 14 was when we would like to have seen legislation tabled. I heard you just say that wasn't realistic to expect.

My question is, where is that timeline now? Is the department intending to formally reply to our report? If not, would it be advisable for this committee to re-table the report so we can get an official response, and what kind of timelines are we now looking at?

The WIPO treaties have been outstanding for some time and we've had some major decisions by the courts—the Supreme Court and also the Federal Court. Some are subject to appeal, but it seems to me this is not something we can wait on longer.

The other thing is, what are we going to be dealing with? Is this committee going to be dealing with the medium- and long-term copyright issues? And what's happened to the statutory review, which is section 92 in itself.

I'm going to ask Ms. Peterson because she said that timelines are important. How can we impose those timelines now? What do you see as your timelines on the report, on the WIPO Treaty, the medium-term and also the long-term copyright issues?

• (1625)

**Ms. Susan Peterson:** Our game plan, if the ministry so decides, is to make it possible for the cabinet to respond to the committee's report with a piece of legislation rather than more.... That's the way to get things moving. Certainly I know our minister is very happy with the support of this committee for moving on copyright.

That is what we, as advisers to ministers, are trying to do, to get the ministers in a position to go to cabinet so that the response can be in the form of legislation. That's the game plan. If that holds, there wouldn't be a response, apart from legislation. That would be the best way to really come back with something concrete.

When the section 92 report to which you referred was tabled, as you know, it set out short-term issues, one to two years—that two years is now up—medium-term issues, two to four years; and then longer-term issues thereafter.

We're very cognizant of the passage of time. I do come back to the point that there's been an election in between and there are new ministers and what have you, so one has to allow for these things. That is our game plan with respect to the short-term issues.

With respect to the medium-term issues, we hope to be in a position to get a discussion paper out on at least some of them, because you're right. Once you deal with the short-term, by gosh, there are these medium-term ones staring you in the face. We don't see the medium-term issues entirely waiting until the short-term issues are all said and done. We want to start a process with respect to at least some of the medium-term issues so the start of consultation on them doesn't have to be held up waiting for the conclusion of everything on the short-term issues.

**Hon. Sarmite Bulte:** Then if I may follow up on Mr. Kotto's question and Mr. Angus' question with respect to the appointment process at the CBC, I believe what Mr. Kotto was speaking about was the recommendation that was made in the standing committee's report, the broadcasting study, which was tabled in June 2003. One of the things that happened—again, prorogation became an issue around that time. While there was a report that was tabled in response to that 800-and-some-odd-page report, it was a very short report that had about 11 pages in it. If I recall correctly, in it, when you responded to that report, you also said that “consideration of the

work of the committee begins, but will not end” with its response. “Many of the issues”—and I'm quoting from your response—

the Committee addressed are complex and interrelated, and call for further analysis, examination and policy development before any decisions are taken.... Accordingly, our response addresses itself in a focused manner to many - but not all - of the recommendations in the report.

My question is—and this then may address the recommendations that haven't been responded to, such as the appointment process for the CBC—is there some intention or some desire within the department to respond to the rest of those recommendations that were not responded to?

• (1630)

**Ms. Susan Peterson:** What we're doing with respect to the rest of the recommendations in the Lincoln report is coming at them in groups and doing analysis and work on some of them so we can keep on responding. That was a really big and very interesting report and, as you know yourself, very complex in many ways. We hope we'll be in a position to help the government come back and respond to them, not as a second formal response but to take some of them and say, okay, now this is what we're doing on this issue, this is what we're doing on that issue—kind of a response in stages to the really rich recommendations in that report.

**Hon. Sarmite Bulte:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus, and then back to a Conservative member.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Thank you.

In talking with a number of arts groups at the beginning of this Parliament, I found that there was a fear that the various departments in this government would be looking for cost-cutting and saving measures. Now we have quite a large surplus to deal with. I'm wondering if there are ongoing discussions in your department about cost cutting that would go on with any of the programs.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** As you know, many of the arts groups have been very interested in following what will become of the Tomorrow Starts Today package. I think it's come to be understood under that title. We have now had I think four years of funding under the Tomorrow Starts Today programs, and we are in the process of doing all of the evaluation work that needs to be done to come forward and report on progress on that. We have now completed pretty well all of that work, so we're well positioned to come back and tell the good story of what happened with all of the resources that were provided under Tomorrow Starts Today.

We have been asked to participate in the government's exercise to review—I think it's being called the 5% exercise—to look at low priorities and whether or not these funds could be reassigned to higher priorities.

In our department we adhered to a certain number of principles. One of those principles was that we did not wish to target individuals who were what we called “mission critical”, so artists, athletes, etc. In our attempts we have tried very hard not to go there at all.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Can arts groups count on stable funding, on what they're getting now, for the life of this Parliament, however short it may be?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** I don't think I would be in a position to comment on that further, other than to say that we are doing the work that I think should be done at the bureaucratic level to ensure that these programs are evaluated and that we have a story to tell to ministers.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Brown.

**Mr. Gord Brown (Leeds—Grenville, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'd like to start by saying I'm delighted to be on this committee. I'm a newly elected member of Parliament for the riding of Leeds—Grenville and I have a significant interest in some of the areas that fall under the Canadian Heritage portfolio.

I spent some time learning about a few of the issues that were before the committee, specifically this WIPO ratification and the interim report on copyright reform. I'm interested in any other ways that we can help accelerate this. It seems the committee from the last Parliament did a lot of work on this. It seems there's almost unanimity on getting this thing done as soon as possible. Is there anything else we can do to see that through?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** I would agree with Susan's statement that a deadline focuses the mind. It was a very helpful thing last time. I know the members of this committee worked very hard in a very short period of time to keep the pressure up. I can tell you that it worked. As a result of that, deputies met, associate deputies are meeting regularly, and real progress has been made.

As Susan said as well, the intervening events—the election, two new ministers who needed briefings, all of that—have taken a bit more time than we had anticipated, but I'm very optimistic that we will be coming forward. Of course, you will be there to keep our feet to the fire.

**Mr. Gord Brown:** I'm also interested, and looking forward to, the opportunity to see the secretary of state for sport and seeing if there's any way we can help support our amateur athletes, I guess they would be called—the professional athletes don't necessarily need government funding in order to better represent our country. I'll be interested in seeing that.

Another area I have a significant interest in is that of built heritage. I realize much of that falls under the Parks Canada portfolio, and there's currently housekeeping legislation before Parliament to move all of that out. I have personal experience working with Parks Canada in one of my former roles to do with Fort Henry.

In my riding there are things like the Rideau Canal, Fort Wellington, and Fort Henry, which is just outside of my riding. They are, in my view, built heritage attractions in many ways. I'm very concerned that by moving all that built heritage into the Ministry of Environment, these attractions may not get the attention they would get if they were kept here under Heritage. Were there any discussions about breaking those out of Parks Canada? I'm not sure they're under the right flag now.

•(1635)

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** I'm not aware of discussions that might have occurred in that area, sorry.

**Mr. Gord Brown:** Another question I have has to do with the CRTC. You talked about agencies and different “lengths of arms”. Can you maybe give me a little more background on how far that arm's length is with the CRTC?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** It's the longest.

**Mr. Gord Brown:** It's the longest one, okay.

I think that pretty much answers my questions at this point. I appreciate the opportunity to have you before the committee today. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Seeing no hands up on the Liberal side of the House—oh, Mr. Khan, I'm sorry. I was about to take your spot.

**Mr. Wajid Khan (Mississauga—Streetsville, Lib.):** I'm delighted to be here too. Thank you very much. Excuse me if I sound like a novice in this area of questioning; however, my question relates to the cultural expression and excellence, the defining feature of Canada's identity and image abroad. Tell me a little bit about that. How does that work, and how do we express our image abroad?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Part of it is done through the Department of Canadian Heritage, and, frankly, some of it is done through Foreign Affairs. I think some of it is also done through the Canada Council in terms of, for example, permitting touring of Canadian orchestras or Canadian companies abroad, showing the work of our excellent ballet companies, dance companies, opera companies. This happens both through us and also, as I said, through the Department of Foreign Affairs.

We also have the trade routes program in the Department of Canadian Heritage, which is specifically there to supplement assistance in the cultural industries abroad. So we have cultural attachés in I think five offices abroad who are specifically dedicated to helping our cultural industries promote their works, be it book publishing, establishing our presence at the Frankfurt book festival, or things of that nature.

**Mr. Wajid Khan:** Are we limited to any particular area of the world? Are we concentrating more on Europe? Is there a possibility of perhaps going to Africa or Asia or anywhere else?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** I believe at this point in time we have five trade routes officers in a variety of places—I believe Los Angeles, New York, Paris, Singapore, and London. But I would say that more broadly we would probably marry our priorities to the priorities as expressed by the Department of Foreign Affairs as to which countries or areas of the world they are concentrating on.

I would add one more thing. Canada is also participating in the International Expo in Japan in 2005, where we will have a pavilion and we will tell the story of Canada. That's another opportunity we will take advantage of abroad.

**Mr. Wajid Khan:** Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Mr. Schellenberger.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** Thank you. I have one more quick question.

Back in June 2003, in the *Second Century of Canadian Broadcasting* report, there were recommendations made. At that time it said the CBC should be provided with “increased and stable multi-year funding (3 to 5 years) so that it may adequately fulfill its mandate”.

Now we hear about reallocation and every department must cut back 5% in its budget. What has happened to the reallocation in heritage or in this department, and when might the direction come as to where they're going to make these cuts?

• (1640)

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Pretty well all agencies of the Department of Canadian Heritage were asked to participate in the reallocation exercise. We did not dictate what the agencies would recommend. They recommended what they felt they could contribute.

My understanding of those is that they are now to be considered by ministers. We have not had a response yet, really, as to what has been accepted or not, based on those proposals.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** One thing I know is that last year officials from CBC were here as witnesses at one particular meeting. It was around the time that \$10 million was pulled back that had been promised them. Now there's another 5%, maybe, to come out of there. I am of the understanding that there was going to be some stable funding. I don't find that very stable when you keep getting a cutback.

That's just a comment. Thank you.

**The Chair:** We had agreed before some of the members came in that we would adjourn the meeting at 5 o'clock.

I wonder if the committee wants to proceed with questions. Should we look perhaps at our next two meetings and how many might want to use those? I'd like to wrap up and get some direction from the committee before we adjourn, and first of all, perhaps your sense of...

This is a very complex department, and personally, I'd like to hear a bit more about the pressures that are there, how they're proceeding to look at expenditure review, perhaps some of those issues. Does the committee wish to have the officials back?

As I said, we're trying to arrange for the minister. I doubt that will be Monday. I hope it might be Wednesday, but I know she has two other committee appearances, so maybe it could be after the week's break. But do we wish to have the officials back to explore further?

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** As much as we like them, I think they have given us pretty good background on this, and I don't think we'll get anything more until we get deeper into the meat of this committee's business. So I would suggest that we stick with the minister. When we do need them, they're available and they will come.

**The Chair:** They might even come with the minister. You never know.

On behalf of the committee, then, thank you very much.

We have a motion—I presume this is from Mr. Lemay, since he raised the issue—that we send an invitation to the Minister of Sport Canada and to the director to appear before the committee.

We do have a rule on the 48 hours' notice for motions, but the committee by consensus can decide if it would like to deal with this now.

Is there agreement?

**Hon. Sarmite Bulte:** Do we have the motion written in both official languages?

**The Chair:** No, we don't have it written, but we didn't have a written motion to invite the officials either.

**Hon. Sarmite Bulte:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Either the committee wishes to do it or it doesn't. If it wants to deal with it formally, we can have a written motion with our 48 hours' notice.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Can we entertain a motion in only one of the two official languages?

**The Chair:** The committee can receive an oral motion. If there is unanimous consent and the committee wants just to deal with the motion, it can do so. We can also wait until next week.

[English]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** It's all on the principle.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** It is presented orally in both official languages.

[English]

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** Why don't you present it next time in two official languages? Let's stick to some rules here.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** I did not understand.

[English]

**The Chair:** There is one other minister of state who also falls under Heritage Canada. We might want to consider as well the minister for multiculturalism at some point in time. That's certainly one area I'm interested in.

Committee members all received a list of reports and returns tabled with the Clerk of the House and referred to this committee. We don't have to deal with this now, but perhaps for our next meeting on Monday you could have a look at it and decide how we want to deal with these reports. Do we want to spend some time on them?

Mr. Lemay.

• (1645)

[Translation]

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** I just want to understand something. Are we or are we not going to invite the Minister of State for Sports and the director of Sport Canada to appear before us?

**The Chair:** We need a 48 hour notice before we consider a motion, unless the committee gives consent to deal with it now. There is no consent from the committee in this case.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** But what does the committee want to do?

**The Chair:** We will be able to consider the motion at the next meeting.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** We have to be careful. I wanted to say that I would like the committee to invite the minister. He does not have to come tomorrow afternoon or Monday morning. He can come on Wednesday or in two weeks. However, I would like the committee to invite the Minister of State for Sport as well as the director of Sport Canada to appear. That's all I want. I can say that in English if you want.

[English]

It's going to be in English and in French at the same time.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** I personally do not have a problem with an oral request. However, it is a problem when the document is in writing. At the last meeting, Mr. Lemay, you insisted that no document be handed out before... I agree with you on that. However, if the document is in writing, it should be, in principle, bilingual. If you are making an oral request, I do not... I would like us to follow our own rules. The Lord knows that as francophones, we sometimes have trouble. We should not do the opposite either.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** I just want the committee to invite them. If I have documents to table, they will obviously be in both English and French. That's for sure. But to invite the Minister of State for Sport and his senior officials, I don't think that there is a problem, even if it's not next week.

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** That is what we did for them.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** That is what we did for the officials from Heritage Canada.

**The Chair:** That is not a formal motion.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** It's okay. It is oral. It is an invitation, and I do not have a problem with that.

[English]

**The Chair:** What does the committee wish to do with this?

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** Can I have a little say?

**The Chair:** Yes, you may, Mr. Obhrai.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** With all due respect to my colleague from the Bloc, you're right. You want the committee to call the minister.

Nobody is suggesting there's anything wrong with that. All we're saying right now is that we established a process: we established a 48-hour notice; we established that it be in two official languages. This will happen in the next meeting. Whatever you're saying this committee should do, everything will be fine. At no given time did you say the minister has to come the day after tomorrow.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** At the next meeting.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** At the next meeting.

[English]

**The Chair:** You have this report on reports that has been referred to this committee. I would ask you before we meet on Monday to consider which ones you might like to propose the committee spend some time dealing with.

The other things that are not on this list, but that have also been referred to the committee, are: the main estimates, which we did not deal with before prorogation; the plans and priorities document of the department; and the performance report of the department. I would like to know, when we meet on Monday, whether the committee would like to spend some time on those.

Why it might be more relevant than normal is that this is also the pre-budget time for next year's budget. We might want, by looking at the plans and priorities and estimates report in particular, to have some input into next year's budget for this department. I would ask you to consider that.

If the minister cannot come on Monday, and I presume she probably cannot, would we like to spend Monday just generally sharing how we'd like to see the committee proceed and on what topics? We won't get them all done in a week, but we could at least have a shared sense of what we would like to accomplish over our mandate.

Let's set aside Monday then to deal with future business essentially. Thank you.

The committee is adjourned.

---







**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes**

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :  
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**