



House of Commons  
CANADA

## Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

---

CHPC • NUMBER 002 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Thursday, May 11, 2006**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger**

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:

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

## Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

Thursday, May 11, 2006

• (1530)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Gary Schellenberger (Perth—Wellington, CPC)):** I am going to call this meeting of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage to order.

Our first order of business today is routine motions. I think everyone has a copy of them, and hopefully it won't take us too long to go down these routine motions.

The first motion is services of analysts from the Library of Parliament: that the committee retain, as needed and at the discretion of the chair, the services of one or more analysts from the Library of Parliament to assist in its work.

Do I have a mover?

**Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** I so move.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maka Kotto (Saint-Lambert, BQ):** Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an amendment to this motion. On the basis of what you have just read, it could end as follows: “and to allow them to be present at in camera meetings.” That is a suggestion. I do not know if...

[English]

**The Chair:** It is suggested to me that there's no need for that motion, that the analysts are always there.

So on the motion of Mr. D'Amours, are we all in agreement?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** The second motion is on the subcommittee on agenda and procedure, to the effect that the chair and the two vice-chairs, and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, and a member of the—then we have a space that we have to fill in—will compose the subcommittee on agenda and procedure.

**Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, CPC):** What is the purpose of the blank space?

**Mr. Georges Etoka (Procedural Clerk):** It's to include the other opposition party, or the NDP member.

**The Chair:** Just put NDP in there. Is there a mover?

**Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP):** I have a couple of questions. I don't remember that we had the subcommittee last time. I thought we dealt with this—

**The Chair:** We dealt with it pretty well, yes. It's something that's probably redundant; we deal with it in the committee of the whole.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** My only concern with adopting this method that some other committees use is that it would change our practice somewhat; we've always had that sense of going around the table and people speaking, which I think has been a good approach.

**The Chair:** If we were a committee of 30 people, it might be okay.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** I don't have my heels dug in on this at all. I'm just thinking, though, that there would have to be an agreement by the committee of the whole that the subcommittee would actually perform some kind of task. So it's not as if it's going to automatically happen, but I'm just suggesting that we might want to consider that it's there, it's a tool, and if it needs to be used, that's fine. It could be a very redundant tool, but to not have it in the quiver would.... It has to be there for some reason, as far as committees are concerned. As I say, if the fail-safe is that it would only go to the subcommittee on agenda and procedure if it were voted there by the committee of the whole, then it's not a threat. It's just possibly a useful tool that we might be able to use at some time.

**The Chair:** Mr. Kotto.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am referring to the procedure we used last year, and I have the feeling that a subcommittee would only complicate things. I do not know how that might turn out. We got along very well in committee of the whole, and I think that that structure would suffice for this Parliament as well. I have no experience with any subcommittee, but because this is unfamiliar, I prefer to keep the same process that we had last year.

• (1535)

[English]

**The Chair:** Hearing those things, I've been on this committee for three years and we never, ever had a subcommittee. We've done it all in committee of the whole since I've been here.

Do I have a motion, then, that we do our business without a subcommittee and we do it in committee of the whole? Would that be a motion?

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** I'm sorry, what was the motion?

**The Chair:** That we do our business in committee of the whole, that we do not have a subcommittee.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** We would just—

**The Chair:** Stroke it out.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** Just stroke it out and that's it.

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

**The Chair:** Number 3 is to reduce quorum: that the chair be authorized to hold meetings to receive and publish evidence when a quorum is not present provided that at least three members are present, including a member of the opposition.

Do I have a mover? That is moved by Mr. Warkentin.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Time limits for witnesses' statements and questioning: that all questioning of witnesses be limited to five minutes per member and that the chair direct the first two questions to members of the official opposition, followed by five minutes for the Bloc Québécois, five minutes for the Conservative Party, five minutes for the New Democratic Party; and that subsequent questions be alternately shared between government and opposition members, at the discretion of the chair.

Charlie.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** If my memory serves me, this would be a change from our previous position, which was that each party in the first round took a round of questioning. I think it should stay that way. Again, this might be a practice on other committees where we are more in terms of government and opposition, but we have had a practice that each party takes its position in the first round for five minutes, then we move to changing format.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** If I understand correctly, we would have two fives, which is ten minutes, for the Liberals; then another five minutes to the Bloc; another five minutes to the NDP. So the first 20 minutes would be given to the opposition before it gets to the government. Considering that we are in a minority Parliament, and by virtue of the fact that the government, because we are a minority Parliament—yes, we are the government, but we do not have the same kind of clout or power that you have in a majority Parliament—I'm wondering if it would not be more appropriate to go with two to the Liberals and then with one to the government. In that way if there was a contrary perspective that was wanting to be brought out in committee, it would at least be on the table before it would go back to the Bloc and the NDP and then come back to the government.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** On a point of order, I don't think that's how it reads.

**The Chair:** No, that's not how it reads.

**Mr. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC):** He's not suggesting that.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** Help me understand how it reads.

**The Chair:** It says the first two questions are to the official opposition, but you're right—

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** Followed by five minutes for the Bloc and five minutes for the New Democrats.

**The Chair:** Previously was it not one, one, and one down the line, and then to the governing party? Then we went one, one, and then to the governing party. Then we came back.

Here's what we did last time. In the first round and the last round we had Conservative, Bloc, NDP, and Liberal. The second round for five minutes was Conservative, Bloc, and Liberal. Then we went Conservative, Liberal, and NDP. Then we went Conservative and

Liberal. So we'll just reverse Liberals and the Conservatives in that particular way.

I am only the chair, but it has worked quite well for us in the last couple of years. Would the way we did it previously satisfy the people around the table?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

• (1540)

**The Chair:** So we'll just rewrite it to go with this.

We're all in agreement, then, to go with the format we had previously—

**Mr. Ed Fast:** Subject to the switch between Liberal and Conservative.

**The Chair:** That'll be rewritten.

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

**The Chair:** Item five is on payment of witnesses' travel and living expenses: that, if requested, reasonable travel, accommodation, and living expenses be reimbursed to witnesses, not exceeding two representatives per organization; and that, in exceptional circumstances, payment for more representatives be at the discretion of the chair.

Do we have a mover for that?

**Mr. Ed Fast:** I suppose it's appropriate if someone wants to make the motion and speak to it. I would have some problems with that because it does leave it open. All it requires is a request from any witness. It doesn't even have to be a witness who's called by us. If someone asks to speak to this committee, is accepted on the witness list, and would like to have their reasonable expenses covered, this doesn't seem to provide us with the discretion to say we don't think their testimony is really relevant enough to trigger expenses.

Do you see what I'm driving at?

**The Chair:** Mr. D'Amours.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

When I read the motion in French, that is not what it says. The words "the witnesses who request it" mean that those who are considered as witnesses may request reimbursement, but the committee decides who the witnesses will be. If reasonable expenses are claimed by the witnesses, it is up to the committee to reimburse them, without judging the relevancy of their testimony. If they are here, it is because the committee invited them.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ed Fast:** I understand that point. But say someone is accepted as a witness and twenty days later, once they've considered it's going to cost them some money to get here, they make a request and it's going to be fairly expensive, although it might still be considered reasonable. We're then obligated to make that allowance. It's somewhat vague and leaves it open to abuse.

**The Chair:** Mr. Bélanger.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.):** Mr. Chairman, my colleague is quite wrong. It is my colleague Mr. D'Amours who is right. People come here because they were accepted by the committee. From that point on, they have the status of witness and they have a right to be reimbursed for their expenses, whether they come from British Columbia or from Ottawa. The expenses of a person coming from Ottawa would be limited to their taxi fare, whereas in the case of those coming from British Columbia, the expenses could add up to much more. We cannot start discriminating between witnesses because they come from farther away and it costs more to get them here. It would be never-ending, if we made that kind of discrimination.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** The standard practice for the other committees is that if witnesses have been approved and decided by us as a committee and we ask their presence, we pay for up to two from each organization that we've asked to speak, if they're coming, unless at our discretion we feel there warrants a larger representation. But in general we're not looking to have six people from an organization come. We pay for two, and that has been the standard practice.

• (1545)

**The Chair:** Mr. Kotto.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On the one hand, I wanted to remind you that the procedure is the same one we used during the last Parliament and that we never received any reports or complaints from witnesses who might have felt wronged.

On the other hand, it is up to us to assess the witnesses we bring here. I repeat what was said earlier on. If these witnesses are considered to be valid, then we do consider them as such, and if there are expenses to cover, they will be covered, on a reasonable basis; it is clearly indicated.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I would just like to expand a wee bit. I think this is standard in most of these procedures. I know it's something we've accepted in this committee since I've been here and there hasn't been a problem with it.

I would suggest a mover.

Madame Boucher.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Motion number 6 concerns the distribution of documents with translation: that the clerk of the committee be authorized to distribute to the members of the committee documents only when they exist in both official languages.

Again, this is something that has been standard, that if there's a motion or something to be presented to this committee, it be in translation, it be in both official languages.

I would ask for a mover.

Mr. Angus.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Motion number 7 deals with working meals: that the clerk of the committee be authorized to make the necessary arrangements to provide working meals for the committee and its subcommittees.

In the last session, I think we might have had one working meal, if even that.

It is moved by Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** While we're talking about that, just out of curiosity, has there been a dollar budget established for all committees, and specifically this committee?

**The Chair:** Yes. I was at the Liaison Committee at noon. Every committee has a budget of \$5,000 to start off with, and it's my understanding that we have another \$40,000 that we can work within until we have something special where we might be going over that amount, which we would have to request. So we have \$5,000 to start with, and that works for food, witnesses, and things like that. That is our starting budget.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Motion number 8 is about in camera meetings transcripts: that one copy of the transcript of all in camera meetings be kept in the committee clerk's office for consultation by members of the committee.

It is moved by Mr. Kotto.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Motion number 9 concerns notice of substantive motions: that, except for amendments to bills, 48 hours' notice be given before any substantive motion is considered by the committee; that the motion be filed with the clerk of the committee and circulated to members in both official languages; and that notice given on a Friday be deemed to have been given on the following Monday. Upon receipt of the notice, the clerk shall put the motion on the agenda of the committee's next meeting.

Can I have a mover for that?

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** I'm sorry. I guess we need a motion and then discussion.

**The Chair:** Moved by Mr. Kotto.

Yes, some discussion.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** This is just for clarification. In the example there, "Friday be deemed to have been given on the following Monday", when does the 48 hours start to count? If it starts to count on Monday, that means that this motion could not be handled except by unanimous consent by the committee on the Tuesday. It would be the following Thursday; should that be that my understanding? So if something arose out of the Tuesday meeting, then it effectively would be the following Tuesday before the motion could be handled?

•(1550)

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** I just needed that for clarification.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** I have a problem with that, Mr. Chairman. I think we should be able to debate a Friday motion at the following Tuesday's meeting. What this means is that you're basically limiting yourself. Unless you come out of this meeting today at 5:30, and craft your motion and give notice by 6 o'clock, then you're stuck. I think that's way too restrictive. For a Friday motion, tabled in due course by—I don't know what the usual time is on Fridays, I think it's 2:30—we should be able to deal with that on the following Tuesday.

**The Chair:** Yes, Maka.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** I support what my colleague has said. Last year, we could table motions on Friday before 6:00 p.m. in order that they be debatable on Tuesday. That was done regularly.

**The Chair:** Mr. D'Amours.

**Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I believe that motions are tabled on Friday, but they are deemed to have been received on Monday. However, in the last sentence one can see: "Upon receipt of the notice the clerk shall put the motion on the agenda of the committee's next meeting", which would fall on the Tuesday.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** If the motions are deemed to have been received on the Monday, as 48 hours is required, that would bring us to Thursday.

**Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours:** Yes, but the way in which I interpret that sentence is that the motion is received on Monday, but it is taken into account for the next agenda, that is to say for Tuesday. Perhaps we need to clarify the wording.

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** We must establish a rule on this issue.

[English]

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** The problem I find is that on Thursday, particularly in this first session where Thursday ends at 5:30 and a lot of people are leaving, it means someone would not be able to have something dealt with that came up at a Thursday evening meeting until the next Thursday. It seems an unfair imposition. If someone on Friday morning said, "Something came up and we have to deal with it; I'm getting a motion and everything is translated, it's sitting on everybody's desk", after that, to wait a full week is unnecessary.

**The Chair:** Is there a suggestion, then, for an amendment?

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** I will give you my suggestion for amendment, but by the way, I should point out that I'd like to establish some goodwill here from the point of view of the parliamentary secretary. I brought that issue up because I knew it was going to be a bone of contention at some point. Clearly, it works to the government's advantage to be able to delay a motion. I just want to point out—

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** What if it's a government motion?

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** It's not likely it's going to be a government motion.

I just want to point out that we're a team here; we're trying to get things done. My suggestion is that if we changed it from 48 hours to 24 hours, we would resolve the issue. We don't have to reword the thing, we just say 24 hours.

**The Chair:** Just take that one line out.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** Just change the numbers from 48 hours' notice to 24 hours' notice.

**The Chair:** My suggestion would be that we say "members in both official languages" and then take out, "and that notice given on a Friday be deemed to have been given on the following Monday". If we take that out, it would do it. I respect that we used to meet in the morning, and yes, if we're done at 5:30, it would be hard to do, and I do understand why it might have been put in here, that if someone goes home on a Thursday night, you wouldn't get notice in your office until the next Monday when you came back, unless you've got a Blackberry, and I don't.

Anyway, all in favour of striking out those words from that?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

•(1555)

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** Mr. Chairman, a clarification, if I may, so there's no confusion. Are we to interpret 48 hours as two working days?

**The Chair:** That's what I would do, yes.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** The notion is working days, which excludes Saturday and Sunday. Thank you. Well, we do work on Saturdays and Sundays—at least I do.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Chair:** Me too.

Number 10, staff attending in camera meetings: that, unless otherwise ordered, each committee member be allowed to be accompanied by one staff person present at in camera meetings.

Moved by Mr. Kotto.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** I'd like to bring up one thing that was brought to my attention regarding our schedule. On May 18, next Thursday, the Prime Minister of Australia, the Honourable John Howard, will be speaking in the House at 3 o'clock. We are supposed to meet from 3:30 till 5:30. I would suggest that we should all be in the House to hear the Prime Minister. Would that be agreeable to the committee that we will not have a meeting on May 18, next Thursday?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

One thing that came to my attention, and I remember being told the other day.... At what time today is it that royal assent is to be given in the House by the Governor General? Is that 4 o'clock? It's 4:30. I don't know how many people think it might be pertinent for us to proceed to the Senate to watch royal assent of some bills. It's a practice that doesn't happen all the time, I understand. But today she is going to give royal assent to some bills.

Can I have your opinions?

Yes, Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** My concern is we have already lost a couple of very valuable weeks in which the committee didn't meet and we wouldn't have much time left if we left now. Our ability to set any kind of path is going to be impacted, so I'd prefer that we stay and work.

**The Chair:** Okay. Is there anyone else?

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** Usually, those who are on House duty are the ones who take a walk over to the Senate to witness the royal sanction being given. So, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't encourage that, either.

**The Chair:** All in favour of carrying on with the meeting and letting the Governor General have her meeting.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

•(1600)

**The Chair:** As I said the other day, we want to talk about future business, where this committee might go, and what we might bring before the committee. We have the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2007, coming forward. Parliamentary review of the Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Act is there. Most important, I think, is the certificate of nomination of Robert Sirman as the director of the Canada Council for the Arts. I suggest we ask Mr. Sirman to this committee next Tuesday, so we can quiz him to make sure this is the person we want to head the Canada Council.

It is moved by Mr. Bélanger.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** We will put a request in for Mr. Sirman to appear before us at next Tuesday's meeting.

Yes.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** Mr. Chairman, on the matter of nominations, if I may, would it be possible to ask in the spirit of cooperation—and as the parliamentary secretary was alluding to earlier—for the government to provide members of this committee with a complete list of current vacancies in the agencies and boards under the fiat of the Department of Heritage?

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** I'm sure we can do that, Mr. Chairman. Although it sounds related, with respect, it's not directly related. What we're going to be entering into next Tuesday is a formal part of the process. In other words, what Mr. Bélanger is referring to—and it's absolutely in order, and we'll be happy to provide the information—is something small *p* political that we could and should be doing as a committee. However, the process is that the committee has the yea or nay on this individual, and the Canada Council is without that person at this point. In other words, it's part of a process. They are related, but one is process and the other is small *p* political.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** In the process, Mr. Chairman, given that we have to schedule our workload, there may be others, and we may want to keep an open meeting once in a while to deal with these as they come up.

**The Chair:** That's been noted.

I have also requested that the minister try to have some time for this committee. It has been suggested to me that June 1 might be a time the minister would be able to come. I know we asked for the minister's times last session, and I think it would be very pertinent to this committee to have the minister here as soon as possible.

Is there any other business?

Yes.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** If we stay until June 22 or 23—and I have no idea whether we're leaving early or whether we're going to be here all summer—theoretically that leaves us with about six heritage committee meetings left open. I feel it's very important that we set some agenda that will at least springboard us into the fall.

If we're going to end up having to deal with main estimates, if we're going to have to look at those for two days, I would suggest that we put as much time into June as we can, into discussing some of the issues that were drawn up the other day in terms of television—where we're going with the parliamentary review of Radio-Canada and television broadcast. We need to put together some suggestions so that we can get moving on an agenda; otherwise, June is going to come and we're not going to have accomplished anything, and we'll be very behind come the fall session.

•(1605)

**The Chair:** Monsieur Kotto.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** I would first of all like to remind you that it would be important to present copies of the statements and reports to the members of the committee, particularly the new members who have just arrived. I am thinking of the Lincoln report in particular, and the Catterall report on the feature film industry. It would also be a good idea to draft motions on their referral.

I would also like to tackle the suggested themes we might study, because there are very pressing issues, particularly that of the film festivals in Montreal — that will happen this summer — and the Cannes Film Festival which is happening in the month of May. It is the most important event of this kind in Europe, and it is attended by all of the organizations and festival organizers.

Montreal, for the time being, is in a no man's land. We do not know what will happen. We must tackle this issue before leaving for the summer recess.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Bélanger.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You will recall that at the last meeting, I raised the issue of the committee members potentially participating in the Banff Television Festival. We must come to a decision on this issue, because if indeed we decide to go to the festival, that would remove one or two meetings from the schedule, that is to say those on the 13<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>.

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** In May?

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** No, in June.

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** We will be gone as of the 9<sup>th</sup>.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** Where? Are you going on holiday?

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** Unless you want to bring the government down.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** Is the House not supposed to rise the week of the 25<sup>th</sup>?

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** Generally speaking, it is around the 9<sup>th</sup>.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** I thought we would be here, working.

Mr. Chairman, there is the issue of the Banff Television Festival. I had asked for...

[English]

**The Chair:** Why don't we see what the committee thinks about going to Banff?

Before we do that, I would just like to say one thing. Right now, we aren't studying anything. I think a trip to the Banff World Television Festival might look like a junket for this committee. If we were in the middle of a study and it was pertinent to what we were talking about, I think that might be one thing. I just think that right now, if Mr. Angus has things for us to talk about, there's.... I'm more than willing to take whatever the committee says. It's just that I want to make sure that people—

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** If I may conclude, Mr. Chairman, the reason that's suggested is that I had also suggested, like my colleague Mr. Angus, that the television industry review the government has been talking about or hinting at is of extreme importance, as is the review of the CBC/Radio-Canada mandate. I, for one, agree totally with Mr. Angus, and I suspect others around the table would agree too, that it is perhaps our top priority as a committee to look at that and to see what the government's intentions are and how we fit into those and how we can make sure that the mandate given to whoever is going to do this review is one that we're comfortable with. I think that is the top priority of this committee, after we've given our reaction to the proposed nomination of the CEO. There's that, but also, there's the deadline for dealing with the main estimates, which is sometime in November, if I'm not mistaken, so we could tackle those in the fall, if there's a bit of a crunch on time here.

My sense is that if we are looking at a review, or if the government is planning to look at a review of the television broadcasting industry writ large, and also a review of the CBC/Radio-Canada mandate, in particular, I think that a visit to Banff, where the entire industry is agglomerated at that time, is not a junket, sir, with all due respect; it is us doing our work, just as the people there are doing theirs as well.

• (1610)

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus.

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

I do want us to stay focused on sitting around this table as much as possible, but I do agree with the importance of Banff. I don't think anybody would think of it as a junket, because there has been a lot of interest in the past, as people have asked us and want to know where is their heritage committee in terms of television. Banff is one of the premier cultural institutions in the nation, and we have not been present there.

I do believe that the television issue is.... I mean, we can vote on it and we can discuss it, but I think it will be our number one priority. And I don't even think of it in terms of what is being proposed by the minister; we are masters of our house here, and we can see that numerous issues are converging on broadcast and television at this time. I think the relevance of our committee will be judged on how we set our own course.

I think Banff would give us an opportunity, especially for the new members, to get up to speed very quickly and to meet people in the industry. It's a way that we can cover a lot of ground without having to try to sit in the last few weeks and figure out a list of witnesses and how we're going to start looking at it. If we go to Banff, we're going to come up with some good directions right off.

But that being said, I think we do need to focus on setting the agenda for June, which will let us continue on in the fall.

**The Chair:** Mr. Simms.

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.):** I just have one quick note to make. Following the film study we did last session, a lot of the conversations were about independent productions, which is something we could explore at Banff as well, because a myriad of issues came from that in terms of how we tackle it. Is it script development and funding Telefilm and the others? But I think as far as independent productions go, from my understanding—though I've never been there—it is quite a place where most of the independent producers gather once a year. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** Yes. We could even hold hearings there, if we wanted to.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** For that reason, I would agree.

**The Chair:** Mr. Warkentin.

**Mr. Chris Warkentin (Peace River, CPC):** As one of the new members of the committee, I appreciate the discussion it's had about Banff, and certainly I think there's obviously a convergence of important folks there.

Being new to the committee, I'm just wondering how we would go about this and what type of dollar figure we might be looking at in terms of having all of us head out to Banff. I certainly don't think people would consider it a junket at the best of times, but certainly with our having just arrived here, and finally moving forward in the committee, I would have a difficult time going back to my constituents and telling them that I had just spent.... I think the number that has been thrown out there has been over \$70,000 to take us to Banff to take part in the proceedings there. So I'm just concerned that if I go back to my constituents and tell them that I've just spent \$70,000 of Canadians' tax dollars for this type of thing, I would have a difficult time communicating that to them.

It's funny, because as this number came up, at the same time, I'm being appealed to by community members who have special projects with regards to museums and any number of things. I have a community near where I live, the town of Mayerthorpe, where last year they experienced a horrible massacre of some of their RCMP members—four of them. The community is really trying to rally together and raise some funds for a memorial there, and they've appealed to all of the different departments and are getting nowhere. They're looking for just over \$100,000. They've collected what they can from the community, and certainly I would have a difficult time saying that we spent \$75,000 travelling when they're having difficulty even putting up this type of a memorial in their community.

That's just my sentiment, but I'm new here.

**The Chair:** Mr. Kotto.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** I understand my colleague's hesitation, but I also understand the importance of participating in such a festival, particularly for the new members of the committee who are not accustomed to the feature film world. Films are talked about, decisions are made. Telefilm Canada is an important organization that manages public funds. If we do not understand the system from within, what will happen?

The Banff Television Festival is an event that may, as an initiation, be very important. I come from that environment, therefore I do not have much to learn, but if we cannot come to an agreement, I suggest that we send researchers to do the necessary work through a questionnaire and that they return with the relevant information, which could potentially be organized in the form of questions.

•(1615)

[English]

**The Chair:** There's one thing we can do to bring this back: the procedure that a committee usually goes through for travelling, for these things. We would prepare a proposal, we would ask our staff to create a budget, we would have to take it to the Liaison Committee, and then we'd have to get House permission.

So again, would there be some meetings put in place when we're in Banff, and do we try to find a place to do that? I suggest that we have to have some validity to be there, and not just meeting on occasion those people in the industry.

I know how some of our meetings went as we went across the country last year in the feature film industry, and we were meeting with television people also at that time. I think it's very important that we do have meetings set up at the same time. But we can ask for the budget to be brought in.

Yes, sir.

[Translation]

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** First of all, I would definitely support such an approach. If my colleague has seen a budget, I, for one, have not. I do not know therefore what figures he is referring to.

Secondly, it is not uncommon for a committee to travel to some convention outside of Ottawa. This happens regularly, particularly

when the meeting in question is directly related to a subject being studied by the committee.

I had a preliminary discussion with the Banff Television Festival's director, who told me it would be a pleasure to coordinate the meetings. We could go to Banff for three or four days and have a series of meetings we could all participate in, meet with independent producers and Telefilm Canada, who are usually there. In fact, we could meet with all the people we would like to speak to both formally and informally. It is a beehive of activity involving the people in the industry.

I am back on this committee after a three-year absence. I have to get up to speed, and it would be the ideal opportunity for the new members of our committee who wish to do so to see these people over three or four days. These are full working days, it is not a vacation.

[English]

**The Chair:** Okay, before we go on much further, can I receive a motion that we have our staff propose a budget? I will then take it to the Liaison Committee—the Liaison Committee meets the first Thursday of each month—June 1. We can make sure we get those things in. We'll ask for the budget to be brought forward and I will take it there, and we can go from there.

**Mr. Ed Fast:** On a point of order, it seems to me you wouldn't be taking anything anywhere until directions have been given at this table. Am I correct or incorrect? There would first have to be a motion.

**The Chair:** That's what I just asked for, direction from this table that we propose a budget. I'll take the yeas and nays on that, on proposing a budget for the Banff film festival.

**Mr. Ed Fast:** Can we debate that motion first?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Ed Fast:** Sylvie was before me, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC):** I am also a new member. I am not against drafting a motion to see if the necessary funds are available. I find the idea interesting, particularly as I do not know that world and there is a lot of talk about it.

I am a neophyte who has just arrived in this illustrious place. Would it be possible to divide the group in two? For example, five or six people could go to the Banff Television Festival and meet with the representatives of Telefilm Canada, and others would go to the Montreal festival. We could therefore participate in both events. They are two different worlds, but we would probably find the same people in both.

Am I right, Mr. Kotto? I ask him because he knows the milieu. Would it be possible to proceed in this way?

•(1620)

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Simms.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** I would have to disagree, because you'll find that the world of television and the world of film.... Based on my experience of being in the last session of this committee and our film study, I won't call them mutually exclusive, but they're different worlds in the sense that you have language but also....

I am very interested in French television and French movie production in Quebec. I would be interested in going to Montreal. Although not entirely different, there are many different themes involved when it comes to the different languages and perceived cultures.

So I would like to go to both.

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I just thought it was important, because Mr. Warkentin is new. I certainly didn't run in an election to talk about Telefilm, or culture and arts; I ran to represent people in my riding. But when I came here I was given a portfolio. As a legislator I have a national obligation to deal with issues that are much beyond those of my riding. I'm dealing with people back home with mine injuries who are looking for compensation, and they don't understand that I'm here talking about the CRTC. But that is my role. My role is to make sure we represent national policy around this table. So at times we are called to go, to understand.

Now, it's not mandatory to go. I know some MPs who never go on international trips, and that's fine. But if we are going, it's because it's the best opportunity for us to understand an issue and come back. At the end of the day, it's probably cheaper than trying to track all those people from all across Canada.

You mentioned the need for a memorial for the Mounties. It's also important to remember that the role of this committee is not necessarily to be advocating for individual projects in our ridings. I'd love to, and I take up those individual projects with the minister whenever I can. Our job is to try to work as collaboratively as we can. It's a good committee for that, in terms of collaboration on national issues and national problems we're dealing with in culture and arts.

When people back home see me doing that work, they start to understand and they say, "Obviously you are there as a legislator, and that's your role."

**The Chair:** Mr. Fast.

**Mr. Ed Fast:** What's the timeframe for this trip? Is it two days, five days, or a full week?

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** People will be there for six days, but the festival itself is from Monday the 11th.... The reception is on Sunday night, but it's really from the 12th to the 14th. So there are three days of intense meetings. The two days before, the 9th and 10th, are for new media. So a new media festival is developing.

There are a number of producers from Quebec and from francophone communities outside of Quebec who also participate in this festival. You don't get them all, but Telefilm, which is involved in both linguistic productions, is there in fairly significant numbers, as is the CBC, incidentally.

**Mr. Ed Fast:** Mr. Chair, I wasn't finished. I was just starting to question. My apologies.

I'm not categorically opposed to travelling to various parts of the country to better understand the television and the film industry. For me, the timing is poor. We've just started our work on the Hill.

We, as government MPs who don't have ministerial responsibilities, sit on two committees. We're getting our feet wet. Quite a number of us are rookies. I don't have enough time right now to get all the things done that I need to get done. On top of that is quite an ambitious government agenda. If you cobble all of those together, for me there's a problem there.

On top of all of that, we have the optics. I wouldn't classify this as a junket; the public will likely classify it as a junket, especially so soon after the election.

I understand the sentiments, and I understand what the purpose of this trip would be. I just want to be very careful. At this point in time, I would not be supporting this particular trip simply because I personally have lots of work to do and I believe we can get the same amount of work achieved here.

I know that not all the same people will be able to come here, but to send 12 people or even half the committee, six people, to Banff, I'm not sure is the best investment of taxpayers' money right now.

• (1625)

**The Chair:** Mr. Kotto.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** We are not out of the woods yet. The arguments are solid, on both sides.

To respond to Ms. Boucher's question, as Mr. Simms was saying, film and television do indeed constitute two different worlds with different cultures. Those who work in these worlds do not speak the same language, nor do they have the same problems. Montreal, as we know, is an important hub in terms of feature film production, but it is an under-exploited platform because it does not always have the necessary financing.

But when we are far removed from those worlds, we cannot appreciate what their needs are, hence the necessity to get closer, to immerse ourselves in them, and to be in close contact with these worlds that are fighting the big Hollywood machine, Silicon Valley or New York. If we are far removed from it all, we cannot understand.

In time, what we will see is American hegemony, American cultural products. The Americans export 7 billion dollars' worth of cultural products; the British export some 8 billion dollars' worth. If we are not close to these people, to their problems and their crises, how can we understand them? How can we make any decisions on their behalf? How can we make decisions to move towards a new film or cultural policy?

If we stay away because of our fear of the public perception of the use of public funds... We toured the entire country within the framework of our study dealing with feature film policy. No one ever challenged that, because the work was justified. However, I understand that we have just been elected and that the idea of travelling right away poses a problem for you. On the other hand, we have responsibilities, as Mr. Angus was saying. And these responsibilities go beyond the boundaries of our ridings.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Kotto.

Mr. D'Amours.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

When we use the word "trip", we are not talking about a vacation. It is important to clarify that. I abhor talking about that as if it were an issue of expenses. These are not expenses, but rather investments that demonstrate a certain recognition of their work to these communities and groups. We must take the time to go and meet them on their turf to discuss the importance of what they do.

We are talking about an investment and not an expense, Mr. Chairman. I am not convinced that the word "expenses" should be the precise term used in this context.

My colleague on the other side made a comment to the effect that parliamentarians are very busy. During my first term in office, I realized that the right time would never come. As parliamentarians, we have certain responsibilities. One of them is to improve the lot of groups and communities.

There are only 24 hours in a day. I drive 2,000 kilometres a week, and it does not always suit me to do so, however that is the reality of my riding. Despite that, I find the time to meet my other obligations and I adapt my schedule as a result. As parliamentarians, we have work to do. We absolutely have to face that and accept the challenges. I believe it is one of the reasons why we go into politics and one of the reasons people vote for us.

• (1630)

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Warkentin.

**Mr. Chris Warkentin:** I want to clarify my position again. It wasn't that I have a concern about our travelling at some point. My concern is that we'll possibly have four meetings prior to going to Banff and then only two meetings following that before we break for the summer. My concern is that we'll be there for three days and I don't think we'll get full value for the money spent. I'm thinking if we went next year as opposed to this year, we might be that much further into it. The groundwork would be in place to be able to bring this information back. I think it would probably be appropriate to miss this year.

Certainly I don't want to make it sound as if I am opposed to ever doing it. I just think at this particular time it's been pointed out quite clearly that there's so much work that needs to be done. I'm not sure that heading out to Banff is the best way to get that work done.

**The Chair:** Mr. Scarpaleggia.

[Translation]

**Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.):** We might be able to reach a compromise in order to reduce the costs of the committee. Each of us could use our member travel points.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Abbott.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** Having listened to the debate, and I think it's been a healthy debate, perhaps.... Mr. Scarpaleggia and perhaps Mr. Bélanger—I can't recall—were you involved when we did the review on standards and broadcasting in Canada? I apologize, because I can't recall if you were involved on that review.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** You mean the report done by Clifford Lincoln? I was just joining the committee after three years.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** Yes, I'm sorry, I had forgotten that.

Mr. Scarpaleggia and I will recall that it took about a year and a half. There was a tremendous amount of travel, there was—I'll pick a number—half a million dollars, maybe more, involved in the travel. We ended up with an 800-page brick.

I think there is a lot of information there, but my point is, if we were talking about going to Banff as part of a constructed study, it would make some sense. For the expenditure, if it was \$50,000 or \$70,000, whatever the amount of money is, the amount of time for the committee members could be part of the consideration. But most importantly, if I may suggest for your consideration, the idea of getting this information, doing this networking, meeting these people, getting these ideas, adding to our corporate knowledge as a committee would be good if it were part of a larger picture.

I am a little conscious of the fact that out of film and broadcast and radio and museums and multiculturalism and youth at risk—and I can go down the whole list of our \$4 billion department—to pick one item, which would probably be a valuable thing to do—I'm not contesting any of the discussion here today—particularly within this timeframe when it's really isolated from all of these other things.... I'm just wondering about the value of it.

For myself, I would not be voting in favour of going on the trip. Obviously, as the government is in a minority position, we have to be conscious of that. I'm suggesting that doing this trip and getting this information is absolutely of value, but it should be done within a context.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** Mr. Chair, I understand there's a whole list of things that the Department of Canadian Heritage has a responsibility for, but it seems to me there are priorities. One of these priorities is broadcasting policy.

• (1635)

I value the work the committee has done in the past, the Lincoln report, and I also read parts of it—certainly the dissenting opinion I quoted today in the House, as you may recall. The fact that the government is talking about a review of the broadcasting industry at large and preparing to initiate a review of the CBC mandate is of extreme interest to most people in the industry and a lot of Canadians as well. I believe my colleague Mr. Angus has suggested that be our top priority. I totally agree with that. I suspect there are others around this table who agree.

Accordingly, the capacity to meet in three days with representatives from the entire industry, whether from government or the private sector, would be invaluable, Mr. Chairman. It's in that spirit this year, not next year—because by next year both of these reviews are likely to be done—that there's the notion of having our group mingle in a structured way and listen to the people who are there. I thought it would be quite appropriate and a great saving of time and money over the long term, because there is a concentration—they're all there—and it would give us a three-day window on the industry that you couldn't buy with the same kind of money by bringing these people here over a full year.

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus. Then Mr. Scarpaleggia.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I do believe we are moving towards something here. I understand the government has an ambitious agenda, but it is incumbent upon us in this committee to be ambitious as well. I will not sit in this committee and lock down the clock because we are saving people money. We have an obligation to set our own agenda here and get something done.

Mr. Abbott, I completely agree. In terms of going to Banff, it was suggested last year and we went to Banff. At the time it was like, well, it would be wonderful to go to Banff, and yes, we'd all learn something. But what would we really accomplish?

We need to be looking at Banff in terms of what you call the context. The context is that decisions are being made in terms of the future of broadcast policy, and as a committee we have an obligation to look at this. Broadcast is very much tied into the future of where we're going with television, how we're dealing with television policy, and how we're dealing with the CBC. We could look at every line item of the \$4 billion, or however much, worth of spending and accomplish nothing. I'm suggesting let's stay focused for a period of time and do something.

Going to Banff will allow us to meet with key people, and we can set up meetings. Of course, it only allows us two meetings afterwards. What I think can come out of this is that we went to stage one—we can't do much more. Let's take our final two meetings, wrap up, and then say, now we're going to have the summer and the beginning of the fall to start planning out where we need to go. It will give our committee the time. We can come forward with recommendations about where we need to go. I think we can use those final two days after Banff to reconvene and ask, is there a problem? Are there issues we need to deal with? Or are we going to be able to settle this in three, five, or fifteen sessions?

**The Chair:** Mr. Scarpaleggia.

**Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I agree with Mr. Abbott that there needs to be context, otherwise the value of such an outing would go up in smoke. I think the elephant in the room here—and I think Mr. Angus is slowly rearing that elephant out into the open—is that there are many members of this committee who are very excited about the prospect of dealing with some important and timely issues in the realm of broadcasting. We're at a critical juncture in this policy area.

If I'm not mistaken, we believe we shouldn't be working on some kind of study or project relating to that, in which case a trip to Banff would be an opportunity to hold hearings and be sensitized to some

of the issues we have to deal with from the myriad of interests and players assembled there. I think that's the issue, if I may.

● (1640)

**The Chair:** Okay. We've had quite a discussion. I think everyone's had the opportunity to air their side, and then some. So again, I will put to a vote the proposal that we ask our clerk to proceed to set up a budget for this committee to attend the Banff film festival. When that is completed, we'll bring it back to this committee. I will then proceed to the Liaison Committee with the request, and then we'll seek House permission. That is the suggestion.

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

**The Chair:** We will ask the clerk to prepare a budget for working meetings to be held in Banff.

Is there any other business at this particular time?

**Mr. Scott Simms:** In addition to that, for the sake of clarity, here we are moving a motion that they look at the budget for this, so we should probably accompany it with a reason as to why we're doing this. That should probably precede the budget issue. I'm assuming, at this point, from the consensus that we're going to study the television and broadcasting industry. Accompany that with looking into how much it would cost the budget.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Abbott.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** I want to do everything I can to stay away from anything that would break the collegiality that we have here. I don't like the word “consensus”, because I think the Conservative members were not in favour of this. We're not going to make a big deal of it at all, but I just wanted it to be on the record that this is the decision of the majority of the committee, which is fine—we absolutely accept that. But at the risk of speaking for my colleagues, I'll say I think we have some concerns about it.

**The Chair:** I used the wrong word. It wasn't consensus, but a majority ruled in this committee today.

So we will add that this committee will be taking on a study of the TV and broadcasting industry. Am I correct? We're preparing a proposal for the study of TV and broadcasting, a budget to go to Banff....

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** That's a whole different debate.

**The Chair:** Would someone write out the proposal that you would like.

**Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia:** I think what we want to do here is prepare a budget for a possible trip to Banff as part of a possible study of the broadcasting industry, but we need to create a mandate before we know where we're going.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I think the language should read that it's part of a proposed study of television and broadcasting “policy”. I think it's the “broadcasting policy” that has to be in there, not just “broadcasting”. We're not just going to be talking to CAB and radio. We're looking at broadcast policy—and where we're going in terms of that—and television together.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** Mr. Chairman, I'm having a little difficulty here. What was the red brick all about? I mean, that was the status of broadcasting in Canada as of three years ago. I know there have been some changes, but we went through a long process to come up with the terms of reference of that particular study, and to be just doing a kind of chewing gum and baling wire thing here on the back of an envelope, saying, well, I think we can call it this, that, or the next thing.... I think we have to be a little bit more careful than that.

• (1645)

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus.

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

I agree that what was done on the Lincoln report laid out most of the ground rules, and it was reintroduced in the 38th Parliament. I was actually going to suggest we reintroduce it in the 39th Parliament at one of our next meetings so we can use that as a guide, because it did lay out groundwork.

What's being discussed here, and what has been discussed, is that there are a number of issues affecting broadcast policy right now. There is the CRTC review of television, and that's going to include where we're standing in terms of domestic content. There are the GATS negotiations that are ongoing, the audiovisual service request in terms of drama, domestic content, tax policies. That's happening right now. We need to look in terms of changes to that.

As well, the government has mandated a review of the CBC, and we've had unanswered questions from the last session in terms of regional programming mandate and drama for Radio-Canada. We can look at what was done in the Lincoln report, but our study is going to be asking, what are the problems we're facing now, what are the policy changes that can affect the future of broadcast policy in Canada, first of all, but also what has affected the present health of broadcast policy in Canada?

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** Something to the effect that in view of the fact that the government is intending to initiate a review of Canadian television and broadcasting policy as well as the mandate of the CBC-Société Radio-Canada, the heritage committee travel to the Banff television festival—television and film festival, I think—in order to meet with the participants of the festival in preparation of these reviews. That's the purpose.

**The Chair:** We'll take that from the blues. That's what we will vote on. Can we vote on that right now? We did already? Then that's fine.

Does that satisfy you, Mr. Simms?

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Completely.

**The Chair:** Is there any other business?

[Translation]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate what I said at the beginning of the meeting, which is that we should make available to all committee members, and especially to the new ones, the papers, reports, copies and documents, as well as the motions on the referral of the Lincoln report to the House, for a response from the government, and motions concerning the reference of the Catterall report on Canada's film industry. This is a priority.

At the last meeting, we talked about discussing subjects today which might be a priority for the committee. I don't know where we stand as far as that is concerned.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the motions were tabled with the clerk on Tuesday. However, I did not receive them before coming to this meeting. I also asked my staff about the motions, but they said that they did not receive them. So this is the first time I see them. I realize that the problem is perhaps on our side. If that's the case, it's my problem and I will address it.

Have others received these notices of motion?

[English]

**The Chair:** No, the clerk didn't give it out. It hasn't had 48 hours. We will bring it at next meeting.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** That raises a question. Are we going to stick to 48 hours per se or two sleeps? Sorry, but it's important.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** Mr. Chairman, I want to come back on the fact that nobody received these motions. I would ask for the committee's consent to ensure that committee members get them as soon as possible. It's not complicated.

[English]

**The Chair:** I think if the committee is in favour, and with consent, we can deal with Mr. Kotto's motion.

• (1650)

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** No, I would like to have an opportunity to look at these and deal with them in due course.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Malo (Verchères—Les Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Kotto's motions deal specifically with the fact that at the last meeting we decided that we would choose which subjects would be studied at this meeting between now and the time the House goes into its summer break. If we put the discussion off until next week, the committee will have wasted another day during this session.

[English]

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I have one problem. It's on motion 3. I don't know the ins and outs of what this committee is being asked to discuss, which is that we review a film festival's criteria and selection process. I don't know, is that for film, for whatever?

I am very concerned about using our committee to interfere with festival direction. Now, I'm not saying I'm against it. Is it possible to get some documentation, a bit of a backgrounder that I can read before our next meeting? I'd feel a lot more comfortable knowing a bit of the context before being plunged in.

**The Chair:** Just one thing, if there's no consent, we can't proceed with the motion. There is no consent.

Yes, Mr. Malo.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Malo:** As Mr. Bélanger seemed to suggest, we could make sure that after we hear from our witness next Tuesday, we establish the work of the committee until the summer break.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** In any case, it's possible that we will sit throughout the summer.

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** I know that there is no unanimous consent as far as dealing with the motions is concerned. But I feel that we have followed the rules. The notices were sent out last Tuesday and today is May 11th. We even sent out the documents concerning the third motion which Mr. Angus alluded to. During the 38<sup>th</sup> Parliament, I raised this subject on several occasions. I asked that Telefilm Canada officials appear before the committee and that they tell us about potential problems associated with their idea of creating a new festival in Montreal. As it turns out, my fears were well founded, since the whole thing was a disaster.

Telefilm Canada must be held accountable, since it is funded by the government, in other words, by taxpayers' money. It must also be accountable to the Department of Canadian Heritage. As a member of this committee, I have a right to know what actually happened, because we have barely received any explanations on that matter.

In Quebec, an independent public inquiry shed a bit of light on what happened with the SODEC, which is the Quebec equivalent of Telefilm Canada. That organization admitted that it made mistakes as far as the call for tenders was concerned. These people created a festival in Montreal which was dead on arrival. So as far as this matter is concerned, we have to do our homework in Ottawa. If the committee abdicates its responsibility, at least we will have done our duty.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Bélanger.

[Translation]

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** Is the May 5<sup>th</sup> report you are referring to in your motion the one by Mr. Vaugeois and *E pluribus unum*?

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** Mr. Vaugeois's report is the one on the SODEC. Telefilm Canada produced a report through its own services. The Telefilm report was made public two or three days after Mr. Vaugeois's report came out.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** I haven't seen that report yet. Are you talking about the report the minister received from Telefilm Canada and which was made public?

• (1655)

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** Yes.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** We should perhaps distribute it.

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** I believe the clerk has already received it. I've sent out all the necessary documentation.

[English]

**The Chair:** It will be distributed.

If it's the will of the committee, these motions can be dealt with at the next meeting.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** Well, actually, I think technically they have to be dealt with at the next meeting and that it's not a matter of the will of the committee, with due respect.

The second part, though, is that I think we would have to have an agreement—perhaps we could do that now—on how much time we would want with our witness and how much time would then be left

over to deal with these motions. We have a two-hour meeting and all of us have schedules, so we're presuming that at 5:30 the meeting will conclude. Of course we want to deal with the motions. I think we have to come to an agreement now, if I might suggest. How long do we want to have the witness for? How long is it essential for the committee to have the witness in order to make a good judgment as to whether they would recommend him for the job?

**The Chair:** Mr. Kotto.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** If we act in good faith and do not play games to make up for a lost time or to waste time, so we can deal with these motions very quickly.

The first motion also allows us to do this, given the fact that the minister of Canadian Heritage intends to conduct her own study on CBC/Radio-Canada, which would not involve committee participation. We know what is at stake, and things can happen very quickly.

I think it is indeed a good idea to review the mandate, but I think that we should look at all the crown corporations which report to the Department of Canadian Heritage. This is something we could eventually do as well. It's up to us to work out a schedule, an agenda. We have experience based on what we did in previous parliaments. It's not complicated.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** The question was, how long would we have for the motions and this person from Canada Council, right?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** We'd normally take, I'd say, an hour and a half. I think it should be fairly straightforward. That should leave us a good half hour for the motions.

**The Chair:** Okay, the motion is that we would have the witness here at the next meeting for the first hour and a half. That leaves us half an hour for the motions.

Mr. Fast.

**Mr. Ed Fast:** For the motion, could I ask Mr. Kotto to perhaps have available for the next meeting the number of senior executives and the number of directors on the board he was hoping to bring as part of that motion, just so we have that information for next week; otherwise we might be left hanging with motion number 3, where he refers to quite a number of witnesses.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** Are you referring to motion 3? Basically it refers to Telefilm Canada's executives and its board of directors. I believe that there are four people on the board of directors and that there are two or three executives. That would be seven people in all.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** In terms of that last question, it seems to me that when we do these motions we identify afterwards who exactly will come. I don't know if it's incumbent upon Mr. Kotto to give us a list, for the motion, of who's going to be there. If the motion passes, then we will have the appropriate people come, and we will deal with them at that time. I don't know if we need to have that for a motion. The motion is that we need a mandate to proceed, and then we worry about how we proceed after we have a mandate.

**Mr. Ed Fast:** Mr. Chair, the motion is quite open. It simply says "summon the senior executives" and "the members of its Board". That's inclusive or includes all of them. I just wanted to make sure that we know the number and if in fact the motion can be tailored down to say it's the chief executive, or...

• (1700)

**The Chair:** We can deal with that, but right now we're not dealing with—

**Mr. Ed Fast:** No, we're not. I just want to make sure we don't waste time in that half hour we have to debate three different motions.

**The Chair:** I think we can handle that at the next meeting; we'll do that then.

Mr. Bélanger.

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** Just a friendly *mise en garde*, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I don't know if the Bloc's opposition day motion is votable today. I expect that it will be deferred to Tuesday, which means 5:15 bells and a 5:30 vote, usually on Tuesdays. That would leave us with 15 to 20 minutes to deal with the motions. Just be prepared for that.

**The Chair:** Are you sure it's not 6:15 and 6:30?

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:** On Tuesday it's usually 5:15.

**The Chair:** Mr. Kotto.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** I would like to respond to what Mr. Fast said. We can certainly provide a list of specific names, which could be included in an amendment when we vote on the motion.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Is there any other business?

The meeting 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 Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada 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.**