



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

CHPC • NUMBER 003 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Wednesday, November 3, 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, November 3, 2004

• (1545)

[English]

The Chair (Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.)): I call the meeting of the heritage committee to order. We have quorum.

I think we had agreed at our last meeting that we would consider future business. I would like to now do that.

There is a report that has been prepared. Has that now been distributed?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Jacques Lahaie): Yes. And I will distribute the newer version.

The Chair: The report starts with potential witnesses, but it seems to me that what we should do is go to potential areas of interest first. That might determine what witnesses we want. What I would hope the committee would do is take a long-term view: If we're here for a year what issues in the department's mandate do we want to consider; if we're here for two years, what would we want? This is so that we have a plan. It will change, obviously.

I don't know if anybody can inform us of what potential legislation might be coming before us. We've already heard of the likelihood of the Copyright Act being back before us. There is the Telefilm legislation in the House.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): The Telefilm legislation will be debated on Friday, I understand from the House leaders. Hopefully, it will be referred immediately after to the committee so that we can deal with it after that. So perhaps we're in a position, after a vote next week, to have it to committee about next Wednesday. I think everybody agreed.

The Chair: I don't know about you, but I'm not planning to be here next Wednesday.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: The Wednesday after the recess week. Everybody can study it during the recess week.

The Chair: At the committee's direction, the minister has been invited to appear before the committee. We do not yet have a date. I would hope that maybe the parliamentary secretary might assist with that, and I will as well.

Do we want to look at areas that we might want to consider on the agenda? I'm sure each one of us has some ideas on that.

Ms. Bulte.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: With respect to upcoming legislation, I believe that legislation with respect to the Copyright Act, and the work that we did in the last session of Parliament regarding the

ratification of the WIPO treaties, and the so-called short-term issues that were dealt with in the last session should be before us sometime in the spring. Section 92 on review is a five-year statutory review that is required under the Copyright Act. When we started that review, the order of reference came to us. Notwithstanding the fact that the Copyright Act is under the Minister of Industry, there was an order in Parliament referring the section 92 review to us. At that time, we identified the short-term issues, the medium-term issues, and the long-term issues.

Mr. Schellenberger, you can help me on this. We were both on there at the same time.

We did deal with the short-term issues. We hope to have legislation, which then we'll be able to work on. But there are the medium-term issues in there. Right now, we should possibly be looking at that. If you're looking at long term—being here for two to four years—then we should really look at the longer-term issues.

I'm not speaking as a parliamentary secretary here, I'm speaking as just an ordinary member of this committee. I think copyright is a very important area that we in Canada have lagged behind in. Everybody seems to be ahead of us, and we need to ensure that we keep up with our obligations under WIPO, as well as keep up to speed to ensure that our creators are protected. If we want to have an innovation agenda that moves forward, we need to deal with that. Again, I know that many committee members are new, but this was something that we started. I think it should be something that we re-seize again and move ahead.

I would again defer to Mr. Schellenberger to help me on this.

• (1550)

Mr. Gary Schellenberger (Perth—Wellington, CPC): My whole thought on that was should we not know that the short-term issues have been looked after by the department before we enter into the mid-term part of it? It's redundant if the work we've done already isn't looked after by the minister.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: Maybe what we could do is re-table the report. Perhaps we could agree to re-table the report we did, because technically once the House dissolves they don't have to give us a response, but if we as a committee agree to re-table that report then we could get a response that way. While we're waiting on the response we could move into the medium- and long-term issues.

Mr. Gary Schellenberger: I think that's important.

The Chair: My recollection from the meeting with the deputy minister is that it was indicated the legislation would be the response, but I think it's entirely legitimate for the committee to re-table the report and request a response, even if it's only in preparation for the legislation.

Is the committee agreed on that? It's carrying on work that was done previously.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): I have been approached by a number of groups who are raising concerns. I know I'm new here, and I certainly wouldn't want to undermine the work of the committee. I'd prefer to be able to find out what some of these concerns are. They're asking to meet with me, so before we table that, I would feel more comfortable once I've had a chance to meet with some of these groups.

The Chair: I think the proposal was for the committee to re-table it in the House and to ask for the government's response. I think the government has 150 sitting days to respond, so it's not something that would be taking committee time right away, it would just start that process of getting a further government response, which wasn't done before Parliament prorogued. The suggestion is not that we table it here at the committee, but that we re-table it in the House.

Is that agreeable? All right.

Perhaps our researcher could take us through the list of items that are here in the report and tell us why they're there. Would that help?

Mr. Joseph Jackson (Committee Researcher): By way of background on the document that you have before you, in light of some of the things that members said last week, I felt it was important to provide you with an overview of the heritage portfolio. The first part of this document merely identifies the various crown agencies of the portfolio and it lists the various funded programs as well. It struck me as I was listening to the questions during the meeting last week that there's quite a range of interests and different subject areas that members would like to look at. So it expands significantly over some of the areas that this committee has looked at over the past five years. That's what the first part of this document is all about; it's just to give you some background information. That's what the first four and a half pages are all about.

Starting from page 5 are some subject areas related to what this committee has looked at over the past five and a half to six years. An area that the committee has taken significant interest in over the last five years, of course, is CBC/Radio-Canada. CBC/Radio-Canadians always in the news. This committee has always taken a strong interest in it and has regularly invited the president of the CBC and other representatives from English and French-language television and radio to appear before the committee to provide some insights and answer some questions on the direction of the organization.

Another organization the committee has taken a strong interest in—and of course this also has to do with the fact this committee spent two and a half years looking at the Canadian broadcasting system—is the CRTC. Over the past few months, in particular, the CRTC has been in the news, in part because of the non-renewal of CHOI-FM's radio licence, and also because of the question of the licensing of third-language ethnic television services. So it's possible some members may want some more background on the role of the CRTC, how it functions, operates, and makes its decisions.

Therefore, I've put that on the list as one other option the committee could consider.

Further to that, in point (c) on page 6, I've mentioned the third-language ethnic television services as a separate item. That's because last summer, following the CRTC's decision concerning the licensing of third-language ethnic television services, the Minister of Canadian Heritage established a three-member expert panel that included the former chair of this committee, Mr. Clifford Lincoln. During the summertime, with a very compressed schedule, and into September they worked on a report that they released on September 27 entitled "Integration and Cultural Diversity—Report of the Panel on Access to Third-Language Public Television Services". Within that report they make a number of interesting recommendations. One option for this committee would be to invite the three members of that panel to appear before this committee to discuss their recommendations concerning this subject.

Item four on the list of potential areas of interest is the interim report on copyright reform. I think Ms. Bulte has already addressed that item. There's one point I would like to raise, if you look at the top of page 7 in the English version.

• (1555)

[*Translation*]

It is also on page 7 in the French version.

[*English*]

You will see there a quotation from the report, where you note that:

Future hearings of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage will study and make recommendations on the many unresolved short-, medium- and long-term copyright issues that are in pressing need of examination.

So this committee, in the past, prior to prorogation and the election, has in fact made a commitment to the study of these issues. This committee may need to make a decision with respect to where it goes in that regard.

Finally, one issue that I have also identified for you is the question of conservation and preservation issues. When the Auditor General released her report last year, she made note of the fact that at the National Library and the National Archives there were a number of issues related to preservation and conservation, and these are ongoing. These are issues this committee has identified in several past reports. Your committee identified problems in 1999 in its federal cultural policy review, and also in its study of the book industry and in its study of the broadcasting industry. There are some serious issues with respect to conservation and preservation that probably merit deeper exploration; the surface was just scratched when the Auditor General came in earlier this year. One option would be to invite in the representatives from the new Library and Archives Canada to discuss some of these issues and the directions they are planning to take to address some of these concerns.

The Chair: Are there any comments?

Mr. Schellenberger.

Mr. Gary Schellenberger: I'd like to say they're all interesting. I know that we did have CBC here last time, and I think that was very good. I would like very much to have the CRTC come here; I'd like to understand a wee bit more about its mandate and what goes on. Again, on third-language ethnic television, I would welcome Mr. Lincoln back to this committee and the rest of the committee to hear some of that, because I know it's quite troublesome with some of our cable people getting some of these other third-language TV stations in here.

Again, being part of the committee that put the library and the archives together, I would very much like to know what their direction is in saving some of our historical works.

I think everything you have here is very important; it's just a matter of the line that we should bring them in on. Maybe conservation and preservation of some of those things.... I know there have been leaking buildings and things like that. Is that important to people? I don't know.

•(1600)

The Chair: Ms. Oda.

Ms. Bev Oda (Durham, CPC): Thank you for letting me substitute.

I think the topics you're looking over are very interesting. If I could just make a comments for your consideration, there is a program under the Department of Canadian Heritage called "Tomorrow starts today". It's a significant amount of money. I would suggest that you consider having someone come to report on it and on how successful it has been as a three-year program. Consequently, if its renewal is being considered, I think we should look at how successful it has been, if it's met its objectives, etc.

The other area I'd like you to consider reviewing is the National Capital Commission. I don't know when the National Capital Commission was last before a committee for review. It is a significant part of Canadian Heritage's activities budget, and it does have a dramatic effect on our presence, not only in this community but also on our relationship with the communities here. So I think a review of the National Capital Commission as well would be useful.

I would suggest that if you were considering the CBC, you wait until there is an appointment of a new president. Eight members of the board are also up for renewal. So what you might hear from the current people might be very different from you would hear in a short period of time when that structure is changed.

On third-language television, as you know, the commission is in the midst of a process. The Lincoln report was submitted to the commission to be considered, as well as the other public comments. I'm sure it's always useful to hear from such distinguished persons as Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Tassé, etc. If the focus is on the third-language services, you may want to wait until the commission has deliberated and come forth with its decision, and then review the decision. At that time, you can make the decision as to whether you'd like to hear from Mr. Lincoln or any other parties. To undertake some work while the commission is in process, you may find there's going to be a reason to review the subject matter further.

I would support moving on with the copyright issue.

The Chair: Okay, I appreciate that.

So we have the program "Tomorrow starts today", which is probably....[*Technical difficulty—Editor*]. Their funding ends at the end of the fiscal year.

On the National Capital Commission, I'm not sure if you were interested in its budget and programs, or its mandate....

Ms. Bev Oda: I think, first of all, it's band-aid. I would certainly like to see the mandate under which it's currently legislated and if the activities it is undertaking are consistent with the legislation. I don't know what it is, and I think that's a good thing to review, number one. Then in light of its mandate and its activities, I think we'll reflect on whether there's need for further discussion on the budget.

The Chair: And then on third-language television broadcast, I'd appreciate hearing others' views on that.

Ms. Bev Oda: Certainly.

The Chair: Ms. Bulte.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: Just to respond through you, Madam Chair, to Ms. Oda regarding tomorrow starts today, I think that's a fabulous idea, especially in light of the meeting last weekend of the federal-provincial-territorial culture and heritage ministers, who unanimously endorsed the renewal of that program, I believe. So I think timing is of the essence, and I fully support you on that, Ms. Oda. I think it's a great idea.

I also concur with your comments on the work being done by the CRTC. I think we should wait, too.

•(1605)

The Chair: Mr. Rodriguez.

I'm not following our usual, formal process. I think a bit of back and forth here is helpful.

And then I'll be back to Mr. Angus and Mr. Kotto.

[*Translation*]

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

We have heard that the National Archives, which is in charge of protecting our heritage, has significant financial requirements for infrastructure and other things. I think that this is one issue that we should examine and discuss.

In my opinion, third-language television services are also an important matter. This issue is currently being discussed, but seeing that the report was tabled only a short while ago and the issue is still hot, we could perhaps take advantage of the situation to further the discussion. This is a very important issue in the Italian community in Montreal, Quebec. I would, therefore, like to see this matter discussed.

I will touch very briefly on one final point. Official languages are part of the mandate. This is one matter that we probably will not have to deal with here, because we are discussing this issue at the Standing Committee on Official Languages, which I chair.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Kotto, and then Mr. Angus for the second time.

[Translation]

Mr. Maka Kotto (Saint-Lambert, BQ): Thank you, Madam Chair.

There are indeed some very hot issues that pertain to Montreal and some pressing files that I would like to deal with here with you. The International Film Festival is in conflict with one of the Crown corporations, namely Telefilm Canada, and Bill C-18 redefines Telefilm's mandate. It would be interesting to find out whether or not Telefilm is mandated to launch a bidding process in order to establish film festivals. These are the questions that I am asking. My idea would be to bring the parties together to appear before the committee so that we will have a clear idea on the matter. The war is being waged in the media. There is a strong likelihood that, next year, the size of the Montreal film festival will not be anywhere near what it has been for the past 28 years. It is therefore a pressing matter.

The other pressing file, which has already been raised, pertains to the next appointment at the head of the Société Radio-Canada. Many people are concerned about this issue. We should ourselves be asking questions to avoid another debate on patronage. We should be asking the same question with respect to the CRTC.

[English]

The Chair: Merci.

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Having read over the Lincoln report throughout my summer, I realize how much work has been done in so many of these areas. I'd like to focus in on areas where we need to bring some closure, areas that are still unanswered, so that we can carry on from what's been done.

I've broken down four quick areas that I think should be addressed. One is in terms of the appointment process for the CRTC and CBC. Our credibility in supporting culture is going to be very dependent on our ability to show a transparent process, and I'm very concerned when I see political reappointments happening. I think we should be bringing forth the CBC board of directors and the CRTC to see what kind of skills qualifications are put out. Is there a headhunting process? I know this was recommended. Will it be done in this coming term? That would be the first area.

Second, also in regard to the CBC and the CRTC, it's been talked about whether the CBC has adequate funds for a regional development plan. For people who live outside the big areas, CBC is a lifeline. Do they have a business plan? Do they have adequate funding, particularly in light of the hockey strike? I think that's going to have a real impact on their operation. We should be looking at that.

Again, we should be looking at the CRTC in terms of whether they have the adequate tools. These were brought up before. This past summer, with the CHOI decision, and Al Jazeera, there were a lot of questions. So we need to look at whether they have those tools.

Third, and the issue has been raised in the past, is concentration of media. I think it's a very timely issue for us to be looking at as a committee, particularly when we have certain areas of the country

where you have one or two voices who are not just in control of most of the media outlets but also very opinionated. I think it has an impact on the democratic process if there are not adequate voices and if you have one or two voices who are expressing very clear political positions. So I would suggest that we look at media concentration in light of how it affects our larger ability to interact, especially in terms of our politics.

Fourth, we had a very, very strong television industry, and it's taken serious hits. We've lost a lot of jobs because of pressures and I think changes in both the U.S. and on the home front. We need to look at how we are supporting our cultural industries. I could mention book publishing as well, but I would concentrate on television initially.

Those would be the four recommendations I'd bring forward, Madam Chair.

●(1610)

The Chair: I was just checking with our analysts here, but the so-called brick did deal with issues of concentration when it looked at broadcasting specifically, not necessarily the other media. I'm informed by our researcher that the Senate is now currently examining.... I don't know if we want to do, in parallel, the same thing, or wait and see what they produce and perhaps add to that.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Actually, I'm sorry; I'm glad...because he's obviously much more in the game than I am. I wasn't reading my notes.

Would it be possible to do a joint committee with them? They are doing this work, and the work does affect us as well. I would bring forth that recommendation, of maybe a joint subcommittee.

The Chair: What I'm doing right now is just recording what everybody brings up. I might want to suggest that our researchers and our clerk then work on a schedule. I'm trying to see what are the priorities, who brings it up, and what the various angles are. Then we might want to look at a possible draft schedule of when we might want to get to these issues.

So let's get everything on the table and then try to make some sense out of it, if that's okay.

Monsieur Lemay.

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Thank you, Madam Chair.

First of all, I would like to thank the committee for suspending its work on Monday in order to pay tribute to the Olympic and Paralympic athletes. I know that we lost one sitting day, but I do think that the athletes really appreciated having certain committee members attending this small ceremony.

Secondly, as for the document handed out to us today for today's meeting, we submitted a notice of motion pertaining to the appearance of the Minister of State for Sport. Naturally, I would like to make his appearance at one of our meetings one of our priorities. We could give him an hour or an hour and a half, depending on how much time is available to us. We have some very serious questions to ask him, given that we expect him to be tabling, over the next few days or weeks, a program for the Olympic games in Turin, Beijing and Vancouver. We of course would like to ask him some questions on this issue.

[English]

The Chair: Merci.

Mr. Simms.

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
sor, Lib.):** I want to reiterate what was said earlier by Mr. Angus about the regional broadcasting. I certainly would like to address that issue. I won't presuppose that we can put a mandate upon the CBC, obviously, but certainly we witness a one-size-fits-all broadcast policy for them, and the regions have definitely suffered.

There's my opinion of the day, on that one. I certainly would like to address that.

The other issue concerns a question I brought up in the last session. It deals with satellite. From what I understand, the answer I got, as it was addressed to me, wasn't quite right, meaning that what we have here is between the departments of industry and heritage. Is that correct?

I'll get to the issue in just a moment. Perhaps you could just explain to me, once again, when it comes to satellite theft, the heritage department....

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: If I may, Madam Chair, it's the radio communications act. It falls within the scope of Industry Canada.

If you're asking about the decision last week in Quebec, I think the government is deciding whether or not to appeal that decision right now. In the last session of Parliament, we did bring in a piece of legislation under Industry Canada, with amendments to the radio communications act. I believe there is some discussion around bringing in a revised bill on that, but again, it would not come to us. Both spectrum and satellite fall within Industry Canada, and specifically that act.

•(1615)

Mr. Scott Simms: Okay. I thought that some of the issues dealing with satellite were dealt with through Heritage Canada. Is that not correct?

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: I think the judge, in her decision, talked about broadcasting policy, and invoked broadcasting policy when she talked about....

I see Mrs. Oda here, so she can help me on this one.

The judge invoked broadcasting policy as a way to rule that the grey market was not constitutional. However, the Supreme Court found in 2002 that in fact there was no such thing as a grey market. Black was black was black; stealing was stealing was stealing.

So I agree; I think it's a fascinating....and I wish we could.

Actually, if the committee is interested in this, the same way as we did the copyright, because it does cross broadcasting, and subject to House leaders agreeing, maybe we could ask that we refer that to us. If it does go to appeal, then we have a problem, the same as the third-language question and the CRTC.

But I agree with you; I think it's a fascinating issue.

Mr. Scott Simms: Well, you have encapsulated it into a much larger issue about satellite signals themselves.

I don't know, being new, and my newness is still there, how this could function, but I certainly do feel that we would address it, and I'll leave it at that for now. But my biggest point again is to reiterate what Mr. Angus said, which was about broadcast policy and the heritage department in general, and that is the lack of a regional presence.

The Chair: Mr. Kotto.

[Translation]

Mr. Maka Kotto: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would like to draw the committee's attention to a major issue with respect to culture, and more especially with respect to the preservation of cultural identity. Right now UNESCO is debating—at least I hope it is—a draft Convention on the Protection of the Diversity of Cultural Contents and Artistic Expressions. The Government of Canada may have already provided some idea of its position. However, we do not know what this position is. I submitted a request to the Department of Canadian Heritage but I have yet to receive an answer. Those countries that have not yet tabled their position must do so by the end of November. We would like to be kept informed so that we will know what is going on.

A major player representing the interests of the American entertainment industry would like culture to be deregulated throughout the world so that it can leave its mark, or at least win market share, because a lot of money is at stake. Those countries that are not able to showcase culture and entertainment products to the same extent are more inclined to defend a position that would establish a binding instrument, that is not integrated with the WTO, to adjudicate conflicts.

The Bloc Québécois is more in favour of this position. We do not know the choice made by the Government of Canada or the Department of Canadian Heritage. We would like to find out more about it. If we opt for a soft approach, you can be sure that within 10 or 20 years, our national identities will be eroded. We know the strength of the American industry. As soon as this market opens up, which is what the Americans are hoping for, we know what the children, sitting in front of the TV set, are going to register as their identity and consumption models. Whoever controls consumption behaviour controls the economy as well. It is all interrelated. The stakes are not strictly cultural; there are also trade issues behind all of that. This is a very important file.

We often talk about structures and technicalities. At least, this is what I have observed here in the committee. I think that it would be wise for the committee to examine the artistic and cultural future of those working in the art industry, regardless of the sector, namely the artists and craftpeople. We talk about them so little. Throughout Canada and Quebec, these are the people who are living hand to mouth. I would like us to discuss all aspects of their financial and material stability, as well as their tax issues.

• (1620)

[English]

The Chair: Is this something we might want to raise with the minister when she appears before us as a starting point? I agree with you. It's very important

Madam Bulte.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: I agree with Mr. Kotto. I think it is very important that Canada is taking its leadership along with Quebec together on this issue of cultural diversity.

I know it was actually the Standing Committee on International Trade in 1999 who recommended this separate instrument be done, and from there it moved. It's the same way with Mr. Angus, because it's also a trade issue, and I agree with you.

I think maybe this is something on which we could meet with the heritage department jointly with the subcommittee on trade and delve into this.

Mr. Kotto, I would like to see the agreement itself. Let's look at it. What are the ramifications? I understood that there were some concerns on the dispute settlement process, but I think it's a great idea. I know the former Minister of Heritage, Sheila Copps, introduced the International Network on Cultural Policy, and that has grown.

We could start with the INCP. We could also get the NGOs in who are working on this. So I think it's much bigger than the minister. Again, if we're going to do co-meetings, we could do one with the trade committee.

Ms. Bev Oda: I think that ties right in. One of the things we do have to pay attention to as a country is our significant cultural trade deficit. We have to ask the minister and our trade people about what plans and initiatives we have to address that, and how our programs will be designed to assist that.

If I may make another comment, Madam Chair, if you're looking at the concentration of ownership in the media, I would suggest—because of priority-setting—looking at Quebec and the francophone broadcasting community. I think the concentration there is much more of a severe factor than in anglophone Canada.

The Chair: Are there any other comments before the chair puts in her two cents worth?

Mr. Khan.

Mr. Wajid Khan (Mississauga—Streetsville, Lib.): I want to know if there is any fund or facility available to protect culture from private ownership and export. There are certain things that are important to Canada, and we want to maintain them within the

country rather than having them exported. France has it, England has it, and I think we should have it too. We don't have it.

We do? Okay.

The second thing—you can tell me whether it comes under the jurisdiction of this committee or industry—is that the conventional television companies have one stream of income, which is strictly advertising, whereas the cable companies have two streams; they have subscribership as well as advertising. I think the CBC and some of the others would benefit from having a level playing field. We should also discuss how to get that second stream of money for the conventional television companies.

The Chair: I think that would fall under an area that was mentioned earlier about the television industry generally and the pressures it's undergoing.

Can I take a couple of minutes to suggest a few things?

Sam, go ahead.

• (1625)

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: May I make a direct response to Mr. Khan? We do have an act called the Cultural Property Export and Import Act. It has a review board. It might be interesting to examine that act. It's the same as the NCC. I don't think it's been examined in a long time.

This is also part of the cultural trade deficit, export, import, and how that works. It might be something that could be packaged together, because again I don't believe that's been.... The interesting thing is that while it's an act with a board that is appointed through this, Revenue Canada is involved.

Speaking of Revenue Canada, Mr. Kotto, the other thing you talked about was the Status of the Artist Act. Maybe we should look at the status of the artist legislation. There's a huge problem right now with Revenue Canada, which I've already.... But again, I like the idea of these joint meetings we could have with the finance committee. We could really take some leadership here.

We can do what we want. Have the joint one with the Senate, trade or finance, to look at the whole thing so it doesn't get buried in the finance committee consultations. We can look at what's happening with Revenue Canada and the whole traditional role of the status of the artist, and the independent contractor versus the employee. There are huge implications for all of our cultural institutions. It's pan-Canadian what it will do to our volunteer boards and the volunteer sectors. I think we could do something really creative here.

I'm finished. I won't say anything more.

The Chair: I think it's pretty clear, just from what's been said so far this afternoon, that there's enough to keep us going for four years if we end up being here that long. The difficult thing is going to be prioritizing. There is some framework. Obviously, if we're going to have a piece of Telefilm legislation, I'm not sure if that will be a matter of one meeting or a couple of meetings, or whether we'll need witnesses. I get the impression it's a fairly straightforward piece of legislation to deal with a particular problem.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: It is, because the legislation has been tabled. It is basically to have their mandate conform to what they have been doing. It's sort of retroactive legislation. It's not that we're giving them new powers. It's also responding to the Auditor General's report.

I think it is a good opportunity to learn about Telefilm. We could use that opportunity to have.... Again, it's the same thing. The new executive director hasn't come in yet, but the chair, or something like that.... It's an opportunity we could use with that to learn a little bit about what Telefilm is and does.

The Chair: The second area that has not been looked at for a long time—another minister who falls under Heritage Canada—is multiculturalism. It is my view that's a policy that needs a fundamental review. I think it's something the minister perhaps is interested in reviewing.

Since the act was brought in, Canadian society has certainly changed, and the mainstream has changed. I think we have tensions around many new religions and many people from different parts of the world. We certainly have issues around how we integrate visible minorities into the economy—not very well, is my own personal conclusion.

I just feel, from my own riding and from what I see happening across the country, this is a very important area for us to schedule at some point, in order to potentially avoid some significant tensions in Canadian society. I just don't think there's that growing acceptance yet that the mainstream is a multi-coloured thing now, among other issues.

So that's one I would like to put on the agenda as something we should do. Perhaps having the minister in fairly soon to see what his thinking is would be very helpful.

The third thing I want to raise is the film industry. I think that's an area under huge stress. It's causing some economic issues, certainly in Montreal, Vancouver, and Toronto. Production is way down. I'm not sure what the situation is in Ottawa. I know we were doing quite a bit, but I'm not up to date on that. It's an area that I understand needs some intervention fairly quickly, or we may not have an industry. Our talent may be leaving the country.

Can I just put another framework thing here? Our clerk was just pointing out to me that last time I raised the issue of the estimates and whether the committee wants to spend some time on them. That has been referred to the committee of the whole. In other words, they're one of two estimates that the opposition wishes to have a full debate on in the chamber. So that's not something we have to do here in committee. But we're having the Minister of Sport and the Minister of Heritage, and if the committee agrees I would certainly be interested in having the Minister of Multiculturalism here.

We might use the plans and priorities that have been tabled as the basis for our discussion with those ministers, and possibly even have a briefing from our researcher before the ministers are here. Right now, they're working toward their estimates for next year. Bottom line, whatever we recommend, if the money isn't there to do something nothing's going to get done. In fact, we might want to look at those plans and priorities and see if we have any comments

or recommendations to make on what we think should be in the estimates for next year.

Mr. Angus.

• (1630)

Mr. Charlie Angus: Judging from what's on the table, I think we're going to have to be very judicious. I would suggest—I'll leave it to your discretion—that a number of these issues are going to be hitting us politically. I wouldn't want to be in a position where the committee says we're going to get to that, when we haven't had a chance to look at things. So when we pick our priorities there are a number of things. It's like you said with television—it's a big issue. So if we're looking at short-term, medium-term, and long-term goals, which I think we should be working toward, this is something to consider.

I'll now completely contradict myself and say there's one other thing that I think should be very much on the table here. I think it's a great idea to have the Minister of Multiculturalism here. I would like to have the official languages people here, because representing a rural Franco-Ontario region, we do not have the resources. Our community groups are pretty much out there on their own. They do amazing work, but I'm very concerned about the lack of a cultural voice in Franco-Ontario. That could probably be added to other areas of Canada, but I know from my own region it's very important. So I'd like to have a sense of what's available and what's being done in that direction.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Ms. Oda.

Ms. Bev Oda: Madam Chair, I have one comment concerning the interest in looking at the film industry in its current state and maybe looking forward into the future. I would suggest in that consideration you should include international trade and international relations. We are being impacted not only by the dollar, but also by certain initiatives being taken by certain states and the Congress.

The Chair: Okay. Let me set a framework here. We've put a lot on the table. There are certain things we'll have to do—Telefilm, the copyright legislation when it comes forward. I trust the committee will want to spend some time on estimates when they're tabled in the spring, and maybe we can take one area we want to go into in some depth to lay a foundation for future work in that particular area.

Can I suggest we ask our researchers to look at what the committee has said, to put into a schedule those things we have to take care of, and then see what they can do about working in other issues around it. Then we can make some decisions as a committee as to what we want to tackle first.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: I put my hand up on the subject of film. I agree. I think there's a whole issue of tax credits as well, which is a finance issue, but there's also the provincial tax credit, so it's almost a federal-provincial-territorial question. I think it's a super idea to see how we could bring that in, and I agree with adding on the international side as well.

I think it actually could be a fabulous study if we looked at the whole film area the same way we did the study on broadcasting. Certainly with New York now, and with Congress.... I don't know whether Congress has actually passed the bill or was about to pass the bill, and we don't know what may happen now, but it had gone, I think, into first reading somewhere and hadn't actually been enacted. But it has huge implications.

At the same time, we could even look at the whole mandate of Telefilm and at the whole documentary area, because I think it's often neglected, and sometimes the greatest work comes out of documentaries. I concur; I think that could be a whole study, just a wonderful study.

• (1635)

The Chair: All right.

Can we leave that, then, and let our staff review what's been said today to try to make some sense of what the priorities might be?

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: We can be working here night and day.

The Chair: All right.

Under item number one we've dealt with issues rather than witnesses, but it might be easier to decide.... We have decided, though, that we want the ministers of this department before us, and I think that's a really good way to start.

Like the rest of you, maybe, who are new to this, I'm just overwhelmed by the scope of this department and the work we have before us. But you're lucky in that way, because that means I can't get into the debates too much; I can just facilitate the debates.

Can we consider that we've dealt with item number one now and will come back to witnesses when we decide what it is we're doing?

Who wants to explain to us what this notice of motion is about?

Essentially what I said is that the estimates of this committee have been referred to the committee of the whole house, so that item is for our information.

The reports on plans and priorities and performance reports are of specific agencies under the department. I'm wondering, if we want the ministers in front of us, whether we shouldn't be focusing on the department's reports and using them as the basis for our discussions with the ministers.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: Chair, I don't even know what reports on planning and priorities and performance reports are. You're going to have to help us.... I see Joe is showing us one. Maybe we could look at it so we know what we're talking about.

The Chair: Reports on plans and priorities are supposed to be helpful documents to help committees understand what their departments are doing and where they're heading and what they're accomplishing. For instance, somebody mentioned, and I agree completely, that we should be looking at the Tomorrow Starts Today fund. We set it up three years ago and extended it for a year to accomplish certain goals. Well, it's time to look at what those goals are and whether they were accomplished and whether this is the best way to accomplish them.

Supposedly that's one of things the plans and priorities documents should be looking at. Essentially they lay out what the department

intends to do and how much money it intends to take to do it. That's certainly the level of discussion we should be having with the ministers, frankly.

Let's leave number three, because I think we've given our researchers enough, unless you want to look specifically at these reports or work them into the topics as we work our way through them. We mentioned the preservation issue, and it might bring in the report from the National Library and Archives. We mentioned film. The National Film Board report would be relevant to that.

We haven't talked about the National Battlefields Commission.

We've certainly talked about the CRTC, and I think there was general agreement, at least on the third-language issue, to wait until they have dealt with that.

• (1640)

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Actually, I said the opposite. It's something quite important for a lot of people in Canada and some communities. I'm thinking of the Italian community: it's very important, especially in Montreal.

[*Translation*]

Seeing that this report contains several recommendations, it will also have an impact on the community. Since this is a topical issue, I think that we could study the recommendations made in the report. That is my opinion on the matter.

[*English*]

The Chair: You mean we should not wait for the CRTC's actions on this?

Ms. Bev Oda: Madam Chair, the fundamental recommendation of the Lincoln report was that the commission, in looking at third-language services, decided it should be more open and try to accommodate them more. That's the fundamental underlying recommendation.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: There are different options—

Ms. Bev Oda: But the CRTC has —

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: —for international TV stations to access Canada—for example, being part of a package or having a deal with a cable distributor or whatever. Those were the things I wanted to discuss, because they have impacts. Some people might be happy to have access to those TV stations, but not in the way suggested in that report.

Ms. Bev Oda: What I would suggest is the commission right now is in a process. The call for comments is now; the deadline has passed. The Lincoln report went to the commission as part of that process, as did comment by anybody else who wanted to comment.

The commission is taking that into consideration and will come out with what it plans to do. When it comes out with what it plans to do, at that point there's another process of allowing 30 days for public comment before they finalize how they're going to change their regulations or how they're going to change their approach.

I think that is the time to bring them in to ask, why did you not consider this option as recommended in the Lincoln report, or why did you choose this option? Right now they will say that because they're in process they really can't tell you very much of what they're considering. They're considering all the submissions made.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: I understand your position and completely disagree with it. I also understand the process, but it's something I consider important. That's why I thought it was important to bring it here. You may decide otherwise, and—

The Chair: May I make a suggestion that might satisfy both of you?

I would suggest we ask our research staff to find out how long the CRTC thinks it might be spending on this. If they're going to have the following 30 days for public comment after they come out with their recommendations, we don't want that period to fall when the House isn't sitting and we don't have any opportunity to look at it as a committee. If we can find out what their timeline is, we might in fact decide we want Mr. Lincoln et al. in to brief us on their report, as a background to considering the CRTC's actions at the time.

Can we just get that factual information and then make a decision on this?

Sarmite.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: Canada is already licensed. You've got to get Telelatino in here. It's not that simple. It has huge ramifications for Fox...it's huge. It is really, really huge. Again, think about the CRTC. Why we have the CRTC in the first place is its arm's length, it operates that way. If you want to look at the sections of the Broadcasting Act that deal with the CRTC, that's one thing. If you want to deal with the CRTC, what I think we should do is—the work's already been done—to start with the Broadcasting Act, chapter 19, at that point. It's a question of when we do it. But it's not simply bringing in a third language. It is a complex issue. We can tackle it, but it's not as simple as the Lincoln report. It's much, much bigger. It has huge ramifications.

The Chair: Thanks very much. Let's try to find out the timeframe on this, so that if the committee does want some involvement it's not just sort of bypassed and there is no opportunity because we didn't pay any attention to the timeframe. I don't think we're here to start telling the CRTC what channels to approve and what not to approve. That arm's-length relationship is too important. But on the general issue of how they're approaching third language, I think that's where our role is quite legitimate.

Okay, returns and reports referred to the committee. This is something that was tabled with us at our last meeting. I don't know about the rest of you, but I didn't bring it with me.

Oh yes, it's in the package of documents. It's about two-thirds of the way through.

•(1645)

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Madam Chair, I refer you to document 3, where it states "Returns and reports tabled with the clerk of the House and referred to committees pursuant to Standing Order 32 (5)." Everything is all right to that point. However, we didn't receive these documents. Does that mean that we will be receiving them? It

states that on October 6, 2004, Mr. Owen tabled the report of the Sport Dispute Resolution Centre of Canada, and that on October 20, 2004, Ms. Frulla tabled the

[English]

summary of the corporate plan for

[Translation]

2004-2005. That is all that, I would think. I have a practical question. We have the summary, but we do not have these reports. Will we be receiving them?

[English]

The Chair: I might suggest—I notice there are two reports here, National Capital Commission, for instance—that our staff look at these reports in the context of what members have said they want to examine today and see where we might fit these in. Would that be acceptable?

Can we meet 24 hours a day to get through all this stuff?

Can we leave that and let our researchers work that around the topics we've identified?

Now, something that's always of interest, order-in-council appointments.

Ms. Bev Oda: Madam Chair, I've been asking for copies of this report via three different vehicles, and they are very difficult to get. I'm wondering if the committee staff could provide assistance in obtaining these. It's difficult to find exactly where you go to get them.

The Chair: Are you talking about the reports that have been tabled in Parliament?

Ms. Bev Oda: Yes, I am.

The Chair: Have you tried the distribution centre?

Ms. Bev Oda: We've asked for them. They're slow, etc., so it is a little difficult, particularly if you're new, to know where to go.

The Chair: I wonder if the clerk of our committee could assist you with that, since it's for your committee work.

The Clerk: You are right, they are difficult to get. I made the request myself. I went to the distribution office in this building, on the ground floor, and they tell me there's not a big demand for them, so the department only provides a copy to the Journals Branch of the House. If there's a request, we can get them, but there is not automatically a wide distribution.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Clerk, explain that to me in French. I understand English, but I would like you to repeat it for me. I want to understand what you're telling us. The document 3 that we received is entitled "Returns and reports tabled with the clerk of the House and referred to committees pursuant to Standing Order 32(5)." According to Standing Order 32(5), members of standing committees are supposed to receive a copy. However, I did not receive one. Somebody at this table may say that he did in fact receive copies, but I did not. I have only the summary. I would therefore like to receive a copy of what was tabled, and I insist on this, unless you are telling me that this is not how things work, but then you would have to tell me that Standing Order 32(5) was amended.

The Clerk: I can tell you that a copy of each of these reports has been tabled with the Clerk of the House and registered with the Journals of the House as sessional documents with a given number. These documents and those we have before us are the subject of an order of reference which give this committee and others the power to review these reports, if they so desire. If the committee wishes, I will communicate with Journals and the Department of Canadian Heritage in order to get copies for everyone. That is the situation.

• (1650)

Mr. Marc Lemay: All right then, I make the request: I would like to have a copy.

The Chair: Would you like to have a copy of each of these reports?

[*English*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Yes.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: The clerk will attend to that.

Mr. Marc Lemay: I will read them. I have plenty of time.

[*English*]

The Chair: May I suggest that if there are other members of the committee who want all or any of these reports they also ask the clerk to provide them?

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: I'd like to see them.

The Chair: On order-in-council appointments, I did ask the clerk.... There has been a great deal of discussion recently about committees having more influence on order-in-council appointments, something I agree with entirely. However, it has now been several years that committees have had the ability to review order-in-council appointments. Most committees, this one included, have not used that authority at all.

We have a number of order-in-council appointments here. They've been tabled with the committee before but not reviewed by the committee. Would members indicate if they want to review some, all, or any of these appointments, and if so, which ones?

Madam Oda.

Ms. Bev Oda: Madam Chair, from what I understand, most or all of these appointments have already been made, so coming before the committee would be after the fact. There are a number of appointments coming up that have to be made in the near future. I

suggest that those are the ones that should come before the committee before they are finalized and presented.

We have a number of them, as you pointed out. There is Telefilm. There's the president of the CBC. There are eight CBC board members. If you look at a number of the other corporations, etc., there are terms expiring, and that's how we would be able to flag those candidates to come before the committee. There were two just this week to the CRTC.

I think the faster we can make this request and start putting it on the agenda of the committee, it would be more consistent with what everyone, as government, would like to have happen.

The Chair: Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair, I'm very concerned about order-in-council appointments because I wonder exactly what they mean.

My colleague mentioned two appointments to the CRTC. I found out about that on its website. Do they just willy-nilly appoint and then write the orders in council later? I felt pretty foolish when someone phoned me and asked if I had looked at the order in council about reappointments at the CRTC. I asked what reappointments; nobody had told me anything. I was told to go to the website. I was wondering where we were supposed to find this out. Was this just a little number change? Is this the standard procedure for how things are done?

The Chair: Ms. Bulte.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: An order in council, by its very term, means it is an appointment by the government, by cabinet. That's what an order in council means.

You can correct me if I'm wrong, but under the Standing Orders, while we have the opportunity to examine people after they've been appointed, there's nothing in the Standing Orders that allows us, or perhaps not allows but....

Mr. Angus, let me finish, and then you can respond.

• (1655)

Mr. Charlie Angus: I will let you finish. I'm just putting my hand up for her.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: That doesn't mean that if we, at this committee, decide we want to do that.... We can do that, but an order in council, by its very nature, is an order of cabinet.

That said, I do understand that on March 15, 2004, I think there was a directive issued by Treasury Board with respect to senior executives, board people, and chairmen of crown corporations or agencies. What is required now is for each board or agency to get a nominating committee as such, and in addition, for executive directors they're requiring a search firm to get involved. Then you can review those nominations, but ultimately the order in council remains the government's priority.

That doesn't mean we can't find a new way to recommend, as well, or to be part of that recommendation process, but I just think if we're trying to tell the public that now we're all of a sudden going to make order-in-council appointments, that's still an order-in-council appointment by its very nature. Where it is provided in the legislation that they be appointments by order in council, those are the prerogative of the government. I'm not saying we shouldn't have input.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, and then Ms. Oda.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I thank you for that explanation, because that pretty much cuts to the heart of what I'd said earlier, that we need a transparent process, because it is the prerogative of the government to hire whoever the heck they want, whether or not they have the qualifications or whether the fact is that they are steady financial contributors to the party, and that seems to be the case. So they can do what they want, and then we're left defending cultural institutions that I think lack major credibility when the government is making decisions based on political contributions.

This brings us back to our credibility as a committee and where we are going in terms of protecting the CRTC and the CBC. So we need a transparent nomination process that we can recommend to the government, maybe like a 12-step program for recovering patronage supporters.

The Chair: Ms. Bulte.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: On a point of order, are you suggesting, Mr. Angus, that the people listed here, such as Andrée Wylie, are not qualified to be reappointed? Is that what you're saying here?

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm saying look at this—

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: Do you know who Andrée Wylie is?

Mr. Charlie Angus: —ten straight years of political contributions to the Liberal Party. This is who we're talking about today.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: I don't know what that is. I don't have it. Is it in both official languages?

The Chair: I'm going to put an end to this discussion right now. I don't think it's fair. If we want to invite any of these appointees before this committee and examine them on their qualifications, we are entitled to do that. We are not entitled to sit here and suggest that they're only political hacks without any qualifications whatsoever.

I don't think that's the way this committee has operated. I think this committee has operated by goodwill and consensus among the parties and has avoided being partisan on either side. I hope we will continue operating that way. I think that kind of comment that slurs the reputation of somebody and suggests they're not worthy of an appointment is simply not fair. If we're going to talk about individuals and personalities, that's one of the things we are going to do in camera.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Chair, I will withdraw that comment.

The Chair: Ms. Oda is next.

Thank you very much. I appreciate that, Mr. Angus.

Ms. Bev Oda: Madam Chair, I just want a clarification, because I know, as Ms. Bulte points out, it is according to the government's decision and that's the way things are set up. However, with orders in

council, the minister of government or the cabinet does have an ability to call people before the appointment.

I was called before the heritage committee before an appointment to the CRTC. So it has been done before the appointment, and it's a matter of timing. In my case, I think my name was submitted in the morning and I went before the committee. So it's a matter of timing and staging, if the will is there to accommodate the committee's request.

I wonder if we could ask the research people to see if there is a flexibility to make that kind of examination possible.

The Chair: I would just comment that the Minister responsible for Official Languages, who we've already agreed to have before us, is also the Minister responsible for Democratic Reform, and although that's not strictly the mandate of this committee, we might want to raise that issue with him.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maka Kotto: Madam Chair, I agree entirely with what you have said. However, I wish to draw to the committee's attention the fact that we, for our part, could contribute to a reconciliation between the people and the polity, that is to say ourselves, the elected members, which is difficult to do. We are all aware of the gap that separates elected members and the man on the street. People have lost confidence. There's a great deal of cynicism. We are coming out of an election where we were able to see, from door to door, the level of contempt people have for politicians. In Quebec, there's an annual ranking that is done by job. Men and women in politics come in second last, right after used-car salesmen.

Therefore, as soon as we are not transparent, as soon as we begin to inspire distrust, it is clear that this gap will widen and that cynicism will become deeper. Therefore, if we as a committee could show the will to bridge this gap, that could spread to other committees. In this way, all parliamentarians may become aware of the seriousness of the issue.

• (1700)

Mr. Marc Lemay: I agree completely with my colleague Mr. Kotto. Personally, I have a great deal of respect for my colleague across the way. I would never question nor challenge the quality of these people, but you cannot ask me to approve appointments about which I have no information. I will certainly abstain, despite the fact that I know several of these people. Therefore, whether it is Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Tassé or Mr. Cianciotta, they have been appointed to an extremely important committee to focus on third-language public television services. We will not stop them from doing their work. However, it is a mockery to ask us to approve appointments that have already been made. Therefore, let's move on to other things, and put this aside. However, I would appreciate if we were more consulted in future.

[*English*]

The Chair: Merci, Monsieur. Your point is well taken.

Does that conclude our business for today, or do we have one other thing to deal with?

I think right now there might be some value, but it's up to the committee as to whether you want to spend the time on that, on actually selecting one or two of these people and having them before us to find out if in fact we think they are qualified.

Would it be wise to wait until we see what our researchers come up with in terms of a schedule?

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: If I may, I would follow on what Ms. Oda said, that we look into what flexibility there is.

Ms. Oda, I'm just adding on. I concur with you that if the researchers can look at what latitude we have before we make a decision, they can come back and tell us what the parameters are, what can be done and what can't be done, so that we don't also mislead the public into thinking we can do something that we can't do.

Going back to what Mr. Kotto said, it's one thing to be the bridge to the public, but to pretend to be able to do something that we're not able to do is also misleading the public.

Ms. Bev Oda: Madam Chair, I think that's a good suggestion, because it then enables the committee to decide where we are right now with the way the procedure is set up, and it would also enable the committee to discuss as a whole whether they would like changes, and so on, and what process to undertake following that. So I think, first of all, we should find out what is the proper procedure.

The Chair: I was trying to cut us short, and we still have a few other items to deal with. These were notices of motions that were put before the committee last time. Document 6 has a couple of motions. First is a request for government response on.... I'm sorry, does that coincide?

Wait a minute now, I think number 5 is orders in council. My apologies, it's item 6, but document 5. Perhaps somebody else would like to move that motion, and then we can discuss it and decide whether we'll adopt it. It was basically a follow-up to work of the previous committee.

Isn't this the one we dealt with earlier, which we re-tabled?

• (1705)

Mr. Gary Schellenberger: I'll make the motion.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: They had it in both official languages.

The Chair: No, we had consensus of the committee that we would re-table our report and ask for a government response.

Hon. Sarmite Bulte: Okay, so then it's been dealt with.

The Chair: Just to make it formal, we'll....

An hon. member: Let Mr. Schellenberger move it.

The Chair: We've already agreed on it. We'll move it.

(Motion agreed to) [See *Minutes of Proceedings*]

The Chair: Now, having decided to do that, we then need a motion to adopt the report. Has this motion been circulated? That's the adoption of the report and a request for the response.

It's moved by Mr. Schellenberger.

(Motion agreed to) [See *Minutes of Proceedings*]

The Chair: I don't think we've dealt with this one yet. The second motion is on bicultural sovereignty, the second century of broadcasting. That's the committee adopting the report and requesting the government to provide a more detailed response.

It is moved by Mr. Angus.

(Motion agreed to) [See *Minutes of Proceedings*]

The Chair: Great, thank you. That's the kind of consensus I really do like.

We have a request to invite the Minister of State for Sport and the director of Sport Canada. I don't think we need a motion; we've already agreed to that in our discussion.

On the request to invite the minister, again, I don't think we need that; we agreed on that at our very first meeting. We don't need a motion on it. We subsequently agreed that we would also invite the Minister of State for Multiculturalism and the Minister responsible for Official Languages. If we get those ministerial appointments all done before Christmas, I think we'll have done a lot of good work.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Madam Chair, I'm simply trying to understand things as we go. Perhaps you could assist me. When a motion is tabled, are we not obliged to discuss it? As a motion has been tabled, do we not at least have to discuss it and afterwards pass it?

The Chair: Generally speaking, when a suggestion has been made, for example to invite the minister to appear before the committee, and the whole committee agrees, we don't need a motion.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: I understand that. On the other hand, if a motion has been tabled and we have it before us, are we not obliged to discuss it if there's a consensus to say that we have already discussed it? I am trying to learn.

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: No problem.

The Chair: I don't know what the French translation for the word redundant is.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: It is "*répétitif*", "*redondant*".

[*English*]

The Chair: Is there any other business?

Monsieur Lemay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: I would like to know how our work is proceeding. Are we going to receive minutes from the last meeting? We have already had two meetings and we have not received the minutes from them.

A voice: There are the blues.

Mr. Marc Lemay: Yes, but can we get those?

[*English*]

The Chair: The clerk is telling me that they are published on the Intranet. If somebody wishes to receive a hard copy, please let the clerk know.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Fine. We will go to that site.

The Chair: Very well.

[*English*]

I declare the meeting adjourned.

[*Translation*]

Thank you very much.

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.