



House of Commons  
CANADA

## Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

---

CHPC • NUMBER 002 • 2nd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Monday, February 9, 2009**

—  
**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

Monday, February 9, 2009

• (1530)

[*English*]

**The Chair (Mr. Gary Schellenberger (Perth—Wellington, CPC)):** I'd like to welcome everyone here today to meeting number two of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. We're very pleased to have Minister James Moore with us today.

Thank you, Minister, for coming. We're really pleased that you feel you should come at the beginning of the session rather than the end. Sometimes we've had trouble getting ministers here, so I'm very pleased about this.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), this is a briefing on departmental activities and plans. I would ask you, please, if you'd like to make your presentation.

The Honourable James Moore, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Peterborough, CPC):** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, we have a notice of motion before the committee. Can you just instruct the committee as to when we'll deal with that motion, please?

**The Chair:** At five o'clock we will recess. We'll deal with the committee business after five o'clock.

Minister, there will be your presentation and then questions and answers until five o'clock.

**Hon. James Moore (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for the opportunity to be here today. I appreciate the opportunity to meet with all of you. Many of you are new members of the House, while some of you I have known for quite some time. I'm looking forward to working with all of you in this session of Parliament.

I've had the opportunity over my four terms in Parliament to be a member of many standing committees, some good, some less than good. The heritage committee has a reputation of being one where folks can come together and have good, frank, and honest discussions and work productively for the betterment of all Canadians.

I want to start by saying that this is my first visit to the committee. It certainly won't be my last. I look forward to this session and working together in the future.

I'd like to begin by sharing with committee members the work that has been ongoing since I was appointed Minister of Canadian

Heritage and Official Languages in the fall. I'd like to talk about my meetings with stakeholders and what I've learned since becoming minister. I welcome the opportunity to discuss how we can work together to be proactive in shaping the arts and cultural scene in Canada. I will also be very happy to answer questions that you may have. I hope that today's session will be the first of many productive meetings.

[*Translation*]

Building stronger communities has been a priority for our Conservative government since day one. It is stable, vibrant communities that will provide opportunities for individuals and contribute to our great country's health and identity. That's why we've committed to our Roadmap for Canada's Linguistic Duality.

This investment of \$1.1 billion over five years will be spread across 13 government departments and agencies. This amount is unprecedented and includes \$14 million to preserve and promote linguistic duality in the arts and culture sector.

This year is the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Official Languages Act. This is something to celebrate and which all Canadians can be proud of.

We are also investing in festivals and historic commemorations. Our programs provide opportunities for Canadians to become involved in their communities and to have access to arts and heritage. For example, in our first three years, we increased funding through Arts Presentation Canada by 37%. With Budget 2009, we're continuing that strong track record by investing another \$100 million over two years in marquee festivals and events.

We are investing in communities right across our country. We invested in Quebec City last year to commemorate its 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary. We are investing \$2 million through our Cultural Capitals of Canada program to help Trois-Rivières celebrate its 375<sup>th</sup> anniversary. These milestones are of national significance, and we know the local economic and societal benefits achieved from these events.

•(1535)

[English]

Just two weeks ago, I had the opportunity to visit Halifax to announce that our government is investing more than \$160,000 in the Atlantic Jazz Festival and the 2009 Scotia Festival of Music. We're also investing in the Lockport Children's Festival in Manitoba, and in the Festival du Bois in British Columbia. Festivals and commemorations bring communities together, make them stronger and richer, and in turn contribute to the well-being of our entire country.

Another priority for our government is doing our part to support museums. That's why we've invested \$100 million in our national institutions since 2006. We're ensuring that our national museums have the resources to maintain and operate the buildings—and the collections they hold—on behalf of Canada.

In December I had the privilege of joining the Prime Minister and Premier Gary Doer in Winnipeg for the groundbreaking of the Canadian Museum for Human Rights. This was done through an act of Parliament, and is the first investment in Canadian history for a national museum outside the national capital. This is record funding, and it is an example of a project where we're working with various partners, including the private sector, the Government of Manitoba, and the City of Winnipeg.

Let me also mention the work we have done with aboriginal people to celebrate and strengthen their culture. We support the National Aboriginal Achievement Awards, which recognize the outstanding achievements of members of the community in various fields.

Arts and culture is another area of this diverse portfolio. I would like to reiterate our firm commitment in this area and our recognition that cultural creativity and innovation are vital, not only to a robust Canadian culture but also to our economy. I also know, through my travels and consultations across the country, the importance of arts and culture and how closely associated they are to our heritage, identity, and quality of life.

Since coming into office in 2006, we have increased spending by 8% for the arts and culture sector. Our government has made significant increases to programs across the department. We've doubled the funding for Cultural Spaces Canada for the coming year, and extended the program by an additional year. We've increased funding for arts training by 42%, and for museums by 28%.

Our government is continuing our record of increased spending in budget 2009. We're continually working to meet the concerns of the creative community. We're doing this by sustaining cultural funding with \$540 million in this budget. This includes investments in training programs for young artists and creators.

Many of you will have personal memories of, or have heard of, the remarkable impact of the celebration of the country's centenary in 1967 and the impact it had on our pride and sense of identity. Canada's 150th birthday is now approaching. I believe it can and should be a landmark event where we shine as a country and invoke in each and every Canadian a sense of belonging to our country.

This committee may wish to play a role as we look forward to 2017. Canada fifty years after 1967 is in many ways a very different country. I would ask this committee if it would consider how we could build momentum toward 2017, and finally how to mark 2017 itself. I would welcome such work from this committee, because I think it would be of interest to all Canadians.

[Translation]

Our government is promoting Canada on the international cultural scene. We invest \$21 million annually on international promotion and export through organizations such as the Canada Council for the Arts, whose budget we have increased by 21% since 2006. The Canada Council for the Arts now receives over \$180 million a year; this means more money is going directly to artists.

[English]

Add to this our new investment of \$25 million for arts prizes, which will showcase Canadian artists to an international audience. This will cement Canada permanently as a cultural hub in the world. We believe that Canadian artists are the best in the world, and that's why we have made these investments.

Our government recognizes that when we invest in culture, we get a lot back. The Conference Board of Canada estimates the cultural sector generated \$46 billion to Canada's GDP in 2007, and it supports more than 650,000 jobs in our economy. However, as we all know well, while culture generates compelling economic data, it is about much more than that. It is an intangible yet powerful part of what holds us together as a country. Based on values we hold dear, our culture is fundamental to our way of life.

Creativity and innovation are vital, not only to an enriched Canadian cultural life, but also to Canada's economic future. Our government recognizes the importance of arts, culture, and heritage, and has devoted more than half a billion dollars to it in this year's budget. This includes \$100 million for festivals and events, \$60 million for local theatres and small museums, new money for national arts training.

Sport is part of our Canadian identity and is an important work in my department as well. Physical activity is part of a healthy lifestyle, and sport is part of a healthy society. This is one of the reasons why we are the largest contributor to sport in this country. Our investments are supporting participation in excellence from the playground to the podium.

We know an investment in culture is an investment in our future, and that's why we have committed more money to arts and culture than any government in Canada's history.

In 2008-2009 our government's investment in the Canadian sports system will have grown to an all-time high of \$166 million annually. This is a record level. Canada has a sport heritage we can all be proud of. As someone who calls British Columbia home, I'm obviously particularly proud and enthused that we will be hosting the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games.

Right from the outset, when it was announced that Canada would host the 2010 games, I began to attend as many games-related events as possible. And I am pleased to say that our government's \$55-million "Own the Podium" initiative is helping to ensure that our athletes have the financial support they need while they prepare for the games.

With one year to go, I am sure members of this committee, and indeed all Canadians, share our enthusiasm. Our communities gain tremendously from these and other high-stature sport events, from improved sport facilities to increased volunteer capacity and sport participation. The social and economic legacies of the 2010 games will benefit the country for many years to come.

This opportunity of a lifetime extends beyond athletes and spectators and into the arts and culture community as well. We will have a wonderful occasion to showcase our Canadian heritage to an international audience. It is estimated that 3.2 billion people around the world will be watching the opening ceremonies of the 2010 games.

Recently, not far from my home in Port Moody, the Cultural Olympiad 2009 opened in metro Vancouver. It's a six-week-long festival that will feature 400 performances and exhibits featuring 120 artistic projects taking place in close to 70 different venues. Our investment in the Cultural Olympiad is just one of many events we have been able to fund through our government's 37% increase in the arts presentation Canada program.

We are also investing \$24.5 million in the Olympic torch relay, as approved in last year's budget. This incredible event will see the Olympic torch travel more than 45,000 kilometres over 100 days across this country. It will go to over 1,000 communities in this country and is the longest torch relay in Olympic history.

We've set aside \$12.5 million in funding for community celebrations at stops all along the way and we'll be engaging francophone and minority language communities as we do this. This will showcase real local artists on the ground as part of these torch events and is an example of how sport and culture can work together to improve the quality of life of Canadians.

Since I was appointed Minister of Heritage and Official Languages last fall, I have been working hard to meet the needs of artists from across the country. I have enjoyed visiting small towns and cities alike and touring institutions such as the *Musée d'art contemporain*, Wychwood Barns, the Art Gallery of Nova Scotia, and many more. I've spoken to all my provincial and territorial counterparts and I've met with the heads of organizations like the Canada Council for the Arts, *l'Union des Artistes*, Orchestras Canada, and the Vancouver Art Gallery, to name a few. My goal was,

and it continues to be, to connect with the arts community and establish a relationship that will be beneficial to all Canadians.

While I've been able to see first-hand that the cultural sector is innovative and dynamic, I also recognize there are tremendous challenges ahead. First and foremost is the global economic situation. Cultural business and not-for-profit organizations alike are feeling the effects of the credit crunch. Rapidly changing technologies are having a huge impact on the sector; they are bringing challenges, but also, of course, opportunities.

• (1540)

There are now more ways to reach more audiences. For instance, there are social networking websites like Facebook and MySpace. In fact, 34% of Canadians under the age of 20 use such sites to discover new art and new music. The cultural industry is reaching them there and is building artists' profiles online instead of advertising through traditional means like flyers, radio, and television.

Fewer people are buying CDs because they want more flexibility and choice. Instead of buying a whole album, they want to pick and choose their songs. This is something the industry is starting to deal with. They need to do more, of course, and I will continue to work with them to ensure that we have a sustainable policy framework to adjust.

[Translation]

In this rapidly changing environment, we need to take a careful look at how we invest in culture. We need to re-examine our cultural policies because many of them are rooted in traditional approaches that may not fit anymore.

I believe we need cultural policies that respond to our unique heritage and put Canadians' interests first, as citizens, creators and consumers. Canadians want and should have information about the world through books, magazines, films and exhibitions. We want to see films telling our stories, like *Passchendaele*, and *Ce qu'il faut pour vivre*. We want to read books like Guy Vanderhaeghe's best selling *The Englishman's Boy*, or Marie Laberge's trilogy *Le Goût du bonheur*.

As well, we need policies that focus on innovation so that the cultural sector can continue to be a strong driver of economic growth.

I believe the National Film Board is on the right track here. In honour of its 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary, the Board has put the better part of 900 films on line free of charge. Day or night, anywhere in the country, Canadians now have access to this important part of their cultural heritage.

We want Canada to continue to be a global leader in developing video games. Among the top-selling video games in North America, 20% were developed in Canadian studios. In fact, this innovative sector had estimated revenues of \$2 billion in 2007.

•(1545)

[English]

Last but not least, we need policies that help our creators to showcase their ingenuity, build their brand, and contribute to Canada's image outside of our country. We have a small domestic market and many of our artists owe their success to strong international sales. For example, the rock band Nickelback has sold more than three hundred million dollars' worth of CDs internationally over the past ten years.

When we see Cirque du Soleil or Céline Dion appearing around the world, not only do Canadians feel a sense of pride, but it also helps build our reputation abroad as a strong, competitive country. This image is central to attracting tourism and investment to Canada and stimulating economic success across all sectors.

I want to review our existing cultural policies with a view to modernizing them. I hope that this committee, in establishing its agenda for the coming months, will consider some of these issues as well. In the coming months we have much to do, and we will prioritize, starting with the implementation of budget 2009.

I also want to reiterate our commitment to the television and interactive digital industries, with investments of \$134 million over the next two years. It is through these investments that we are helping to strengthen the economy and create jobs for Canadians. We believe that sectors of broadcasting and new media will continue to contribute to the economic welfare of Canada. We are aware of the hardships the industry has experienced and, rest assured, I am closely following its evolution.

[Translation]

In closing, let me say that our government understands that support for arts and culture is not a want, but a need. I have been very clear on this since my appointment as Minister of Canadian Heritage last fall. The mandate of the Canadian Heritage portfolio and specifically arts and culture is important for our government.

[English]

I see great opportunity for all members of this committee to work together to make change possible in this time of fast-paced innovation in the cultural sector. The needs should be considered not only in a productive way, but in one that is respectful to the economy and to the challenges that we face ahead.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here. I look forward to hearing your questions.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Minister, for that presentation.

May I remind all the committee members that our questioning is for five minutes? I will try to be fair. Please keep a little bit of an eye on the chair every now and again. Over the years, I've noticed how people getting close to the five minutes cannot look at the chair. I might have to use the gavel.

We'll start off with Mr. Rodriguez, please.

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

Minister, welcome. Thank you for sharing with us your action plan. As we all know, you will also do things that are not in the

action plan. For example, your predecessor, when she tabled her action plan, never said, for example, that she would use government powers to censor culture, which she did. We don't need another surprise, certainly not like that one. Can you confirm today to the members of this committee, to our artists and creators, and to our fellow Canadians, that you will never use government powers to censor culture?

**Hon. James Moore:** I think you're referring specifically to Bill C-10 in the previous Parliament. I will not be reintroducing Bill C-10 or a copy thereof.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** In terms of the latest budget, how much new funding is allocated to the cultural sector?

**Hon. James Moore:** New investments amount to \$276 million.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** On page 217 of the Budget, there is a chart that indicates that you decided to invest massively in your priorities in order to stimulate the economy. Some \$18 billion and \$15.5 billion are projected to be spent in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 respectively. That is the government's action plan to stimulate the economy, which can be found on page 217. That amounts to approximately \$34 billion over two years.

You have confirmed that there will be \$276 million in new cultural funding, out of a total investment of \$34 billion. I calculated the ratio, and it comes out to approximately one eighth of 1%. How can you say that, on the one hand, culture is important when, on the other, the government's total investment to stimulate the sector amounts to less than 1%? Given that culture represents approximately 7% of GDP, the government should have invested 7 times more.

•(1550)

**Hon. James Moore:** First of all, you are only referring to new spending over the next two years. However, you must keep in mind that our government is investing \$2.3 billion this year in arts and culture. That is the largest amount ever in the history of our country.

Between 2006 and 2009, our government has spent more for the arts and culture than any other government in Canadian history. There will be an additional \$276 million in new funding. These are good investments that will greatly benefit Canada's cultural sector.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** I agree that cultural investments are important. This is something we could discuss at length. I do not want to debate the issue or create any confusion. However, my impression is that the government is so used to cutting cultural spending that, when it maintains funding levels, it is as if it is making new investments. In a sense, that is the impression that one has.

Obviously, I am interested in new investments. The amounts are there for all to see, but we hope there will be no budget cutbacks. You have confirmed that for the next two years.

Judging by all the new measures, this is indeed a spending budget. The government has decided—and rightly so—to invest in economic stimulus. There have been job losses and business closures. Our priorities must receive funding. Your government has tabled a \$34 billion action plan for the next two years—I have even heard of as much as \$40 billion. But there is something that doesn't seem quite right. A decision was made to invest massively; it is said that this is a spending budget and that culture is a priority. However, less than 1% is invested in culture, which accounts for 7% of the GDP. This to me is contradictory. You cannot claim that culture is important and then invest less than 1%.

Do you follow me?

**Hon. James Moore:** Somewhat, but allow me to comment on what you have just said. Investments in the arts and culture largely exceed those made last year or at any other time in the past. This budget includes new investments: \$100 million for marquee festivals and events; \$60 million for theatres, libraries and small museums; \$20 million for the National Arts Training Contribution Program; \$25 million for the Canada prizes for dance, music and drama; \$30 million to support access to Canadian magazines and community newspapers; \$28.6 million for the Canada New Media Fund; and \$200 million for the Canadian Television Fund.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** The Canadian Television Fund is not a new fund. Funding is being extended. Please continue.

**Hon. James Moore:** The total amount is \$530 million. I am simply pointing out that each of those investments was announced in Budget 2009. If the budget is not adopted by the House of Commons, those funds will not be allocated, and those who depend on them will suffer. These are key investments for the cultural sector.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** And we want them to reach their recipients. I was only hoping for a greater amount, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. James Moore:** We are investing more than ever before in the history of our country, and that is something we are proud of.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Lavallée, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Minister, I have a question that has been nagging at me since you were appointed and made your first statements: do you appreciate artists and the arts?

**Hon. James Moore:** Absolutely.

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** You appreciate them, but you do not understand them. Since your appointment, nothing you have done for Quebec artists meets their needs or addresses their concerns. As you know, seven programs were cut, which stirred up a major controversy during the last election campaign in September. Artists demanded that the funding to those seven programs be reinstated. These are not exorbitant amounts.

Among the questions I put to you in the House, I asked you what you had done with artists' money. That was on Thursday, November 20th. You answered, almost word for word, that the money had been transferred to the Olympic Torch Relay.

Last week, a study sponsored by the Department of Canadian Heritage was released showing that artists were living below the

poverty line. They have no money and are generating no income. Besides, they have not chosen to become artists in order to make money, contrary to what you have said in your document. You want to invest in culture. Indeed, some areas are profitable. CINARS has recently demonstrated that in its special report entitled "Performing Arts in Peril": some programs are profitable, particularly the Trade Routes program. However, profits do not drive artists to engage in their art, give performances, create and tour the world. They are passionate about what they do. Simply put, culture does not exist for the future, but in and of itself.

You say that your government has made unprecedented investments in the arts and culture. I would also remind you that no other Canadian government has spent as much as yours for national defence and military missions abroad. In my view, that is not a criteria. Of course, you are increasing spending, and that is all fine and well.

Furthermore, you are investing \$25 million for the Canada prizes for the arts and creativity, which are intended to reward foreign artists.

I want to come back to the program. I have gotten carried away, and I want to give you some time to respond. I want to know where to find the analyses. I am asking you to provide us with the analyses that justified those program cuts. Because, once again, you have made drastic and unjustified cuts.

● (1555)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Minister, you have roughly two minutes to answer.

**Hon. James Moore:** Fantastic.

That was like when you see U.S. presidential debates and they say "The world is falling apart at the seams, can you please take your 30 seconds to respond?" But here we are.

[*Translation*]

Kevin Garland, Director General of the National Ballet of Canada, said that he was very glad to see that we had a strong minister and that the budget has dedicated two of its pages to art. As far as he is concerned, this is a first time occurrence.

I am very much in favour of the arts and I understand the needs of artists. Clearly, our investments are unprecedented in the history of our country, and we are more efficient than we were in the past.

My colleague said something about drastic arbitrary cuts. However, the Canadian Memory Fund contained \$12.7 million.

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** Please tell us about the Trade Routes program.

**Hon. James Moore:** All right, let us talk about the Trade Routes program. This \$7 million program took \$5 million in order to generate \$2 million in benefits. Clearly, those who received the \$2 million were not happy. Nevertheless, if it costs \$5 million to generate \$2 million in benefits, I think that my electors as well as yours could well believe that this degree of inefficiency is unacceptable in a federal government. We must spend and invest our money more efficiently to meet the needs of the cultural communities.

You said that there had been arbitrary and drastic cuts amounting to \$45 million. From that amount, \$12.760 million were intended for the Canadian Memory Fund. This program accomplished its objective; it was successful. Do we need to repeat this? We invested \$4 million in the Internet Culture.ca website on a yearly basis, but no one ever used it. Do you want us to put the site up again under the pretext that it was arbitrarily removed? If we take these funds and reinvest them in the Canada Council for the Arts or in festivals, it is not an arbitrary cut. That is where the money is going. In fact, the funds are also meant for the Olympic Flame Relay. This is supposed to be the biggest relay in the history of the Olympic Games. I am sure that this event will also take place in every one of the ridings held by members of the Bloc Québécois, and that the same members will be proud to be present at these celebrations, even though while you are here, in the House of Commons, you are condemning these investments.

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** This is mere speculation. Show us your studies and stop the speculation.

[English]

**The Chair:** Ms. Lavallée, you'll have another opportunity in the next round.

Mr. Angus, please.

• (1600)

**Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP):** Thank you.

Mr. Minister, let me congratulate you on your position. I've congratulated you privately, but this is our first time at committee and I'm very glad to have you here. I'm very glad that we are discussing arts funding. I think it is very, very important.

When looking at what you're bringing forward today, I'm thinking of it as being sold as an economic driver, an economic stimulus package. That's my major question. There are a lot of opportunities for some excellent photo ops, and I'm sure that all members of the government side will be out this summer getting their pictures taken at all of the various festivals to show how much they love artists, but I'm not sure how much of the money being promoted as new is not just existing funds. For example, the Canadian Television Fund is at 1996 levels. The New Media Fund is basically the same.

When you're looking at economic drivers, your key drivers are going to be in areas like film and television. Those are areas that are facing a major economic crunch right now, because credit is drying up. Why was the decision not made to put more money there on a short-term basis, that is, into the Canadian Television Fund and New Media Fund, because we're basically dealing with 1996 dollars?

**Hon. James Moore:** We've renewed the Canadian Television Fund, as you know, for two years. This is a lot of money.

I actually think that the bigger concern that's been expressed to me by industry, and also by the Auditor General, as you know, is the issue regarding the management thereof and the governance thereof.

So on the issue of new media and the Canadian Television Fund, we've renewed it for two years. It is at high levels. Obviously there can be an argument about how much more we should spend, how much more we ought to spend, but it is at high levels.

I can just let you know that the chapter on this is not closed, that we'll have some more information coming soon. We're continuing to look at the questions that have been raised in the past about governance and at how the money can be spent as effectively as possible.

I did want to take the chance, though, and be very specific. In this budget, the sunset programs, like the Canadian Television Fund, are being renewed, and all of them combined amount to \$540 million. The specific new amounts are \$276 million over two years of investments.

You're right, to be honest, this is something that our government across different departments is wrestling with. We want to make sure this money gets spent, and gets spent effectively.

I'll give you an example: \$60 million was announced in the budget for cultural spaces. It's a \$60 million shot in the arm over two years for cultural spaces. We want to make sure that the money gets spent as quickly as possible. It doesn't do Canadians any good to be paying taxes and having money sitting on a balance sheet but not getting spent. So we want it to be spent properly.

One of the things we're considering with this fund, and we haven't determined it yet, is to make sure this money for cultural spaces goes, frankly, to more folks than is usually the case.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Sorry, I only have five minutes, and it is fascinating.

**Hon. James Moore:** Fair enough. You would like to know how we're changing, but that's okay.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I'm certainly interested in what you said, that the other shoe on the Canadian Television Fund hasn't dropped yet.

There's been a lot of concern about the recommendations at the CRTC to split the fund, which is being demanded by the cable operators but universally opposed by industry. Do you have plans on changing the governance structure and how the CTF is being funded?

**Hon. James Moore:** Not in terms of how it's being funded, no, but of course the governance models are, as you know, a source of debate and controversy, and I know that this—

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Do you have a timeline on when you'll be coming back with dropping this other shoe on the television and film industry?

**Hon. James Moore:** We anticipate making an announcement soon.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Excellent. The Luminato prize—I guess I had to scratch my head on that. I have nothing against prizes to artists, but I'm thinking about \$25 million to promote international arts. Certainly you could make an argument for it as an economic stimulus, but I'm asking why this. Why this and not, for example, the fact that the National Film Board is down at \$67 million when 15 years ago it was at \$81 million? I think every single Canadian in this country can name five or six National Film Board films they've seen, and everybody internationally has probably seen at least one National Film Board film. So we're looking at a major Canadian institution that's been really ground down in terms of the funding it has, and yet we have the Luminato prize.

Who did you meet with? How was the decision made to support an international prize out of Toronto and not support the National Film Board?

**Hon. James Moore:** I really don't think it's a question of this or that.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** But it is. You have to make those decisions. That's what a budget is about.

**Hon. James Moore:** Yes, you have to make those decisions, but I wouldn't say it's quite as stark as that. We're investing in the National Film Board. It's an important institution. We're continuing with those investments and making sure those investments are done in an effective way.

With regard to the Canada prize, I would just say wait for the details to come out. As I say—and I only have, I'm guessing, a minute or something here to answer—the idea of having the largest multidisciplinary prize in the world and to have it on Canadian soil is something that is being very well received by the arts and culture community. Certainly there are some who think the money should be spent elsewhere. That's always the nature of a budget.

• (1605)

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** That is, I guess, the question. Far be it from me to not support galas that rich people go to, as the Prime Minister said, or medium and poor people, but we're looking at the National Film Board. There aren't new investments. You're down at \$67 million. It's a major drop from where it was 15 years ago. You add inflation to that and this is hanging by its fingers. Ask any Canadian whether they're going to be more interested in the international Luminato prize, which is going to go to international artists, or whether they want their money to go to the National Film Board. Why did the National Film Board get left out in this?

**The Chair:** Mr. Minister, give a short answer, please.

**Hon. James Moore:** I would just disagree that the National Film Board has been left out.

**The Chair:** Mr. Del Mastro.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Minister, for agreeing to appear before us today. Obviously it's a great opportunity for the members of the committee to get to know you and to discuss this important department.

There has been a lot of confusion around the strategic review process. Obviously we are very proud of the fact that we have done nothing but increase investment into the Department of Canadian Heritage since taking government. That said, there are a number of programs highlighted under the strategic review that were found to be not as effective a use of money as others. Could you outline those and give us some cause as to why those programs were highlighted?

**Hon. James Moore:** I can. There's been a lot of information about this and about what happened last summer with regard to our government and arts and culture funding. Madame Lavallée raised the issue, and she's used the language “savage cuts to arts and culture”. As I was trying to say, the way the strategic review works is that the department is asked to find the 5% lowest-performing dollars spent by the department, identify those 5% lowest, and reallocate them to other areas of higher priority or of higher responsibility for the government. That's what strategic review does. So you identify the areas where money is being spent this year and where it can be reallocated for next year. That's not cutting. That's called reallocating money into higher and more effective purposes for taxpayers.

Within the envelope of this \$45 million, for example, was the Canadian Memory Fund. This was a project supported by federal institutions to digitally preserve and present cultural heritage artifacts. The project was a success. It was sunsetted. It was a \$12,670,000 amount that was spent last year that's not going to be spent this year because we really didn't think we needed to do the exact same project twice. I think duplication is something we ought to avoid, so that \$12,670,00 was then available for other projects.

The northern distribution program supported the analog transmission infrastructure—antennas, basically, in the north. We really didn't think we should continue to sustain antennas in the north past 2010, given that digital conversion is going to happen, so we took the \$2.1 million that was going to antennas in the north that nobody was going to use, and we decided to put it to other purposes like festivals, music programs, more money for museums, and more money for the Canada Council. Culture.ca was a website. Nobody was using the website. It was a virtual ghost town online. It was going to receive \$3.8 million this year, so instead of putting the money towards a website that nobody was using, we took that money and we reinvested it back into other arts and culture programs. And I have every single—

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Can you confirm for me, Minister, that was running about \$7 a hit, culture.ca—

**Hon. James Moore:** No. It was less than that. It was about \$1.98 a hit, but again a ratio that would not be tolerable by any private sector institution in the country.

The Canadian Cultural Observatory, Culturescope, provided an interactive online hub for policy researchers and it was outpaced by other technologies online. Nobody was using it. So we took that \$562,000 and we reinvested it into the general pool of resources that we have at Heritage Canada and we spent it on other arts and cultural programming. Even Trade Routes, as Madam Lavallée raised, is a \$7-million program. It cost \$5 million to deliver \$2 million worth of benefits. That's a ratio of ineffectiveness that I think Canadians would want us to shy away from, and so we have.

Another example is the PromArt program, which is another part of the international promotion of the government. The problem with that program, when you put it together with Trade Routes, was the inefficiency of the program. The idea of establishing cultural attachés and embassies around the world is an interesting idea, but the problem with it is that it's very static, and new markets might emerge for different performers and different artists but you'll have old infrastructures in place in different embassies that may or may not fluctuate in terms of their demand for Canadian artists abroad. So we've changed that and we're investing the money elsewhere.

There are all kinds of other examples I have here as well, where money was for lower purposes and redirected into higher-value purposes. Again, the Bloc wants to castigate this as savage cuts. I think not spending \$13 million to accomplish something twice isn't a savage cut. I think it's good government.

•(1610)

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** We've also made an awful lot of record investments in this budget. Can you just verify the two amounts? I think you had an amount that was over \$500 million that was for the arts, of which almost \$300 million was new money. Can you just reclarify that for the committee?

**Hon. James Moore:** The amount that's at stake in this budget is \$540 million, that's the global amount. Of the \$540 million, the new money is \$276 million, and within that is \$2 million for the Manège militaire in Quebec City, \$75 million for national historic sites, \$14 million for arts training and professional artistic careers, \$25 million for prizes, \$60 million for cultural and heritage infrastructure—museums, the Toronto library identified in the budget speech—and \$100 million for festivals and marquee events across the country. So that's \$276 million in new dollars. That's a lot of money. That's more than a quarter of a billion dollars in injection into arts and culture in this country as a way to push the stimulus forward, and I think it's being well received by Canadians.

**The Chair:** Thank you for that.

We now go to Ms. Dhalla, please.

**Ms. Ruby Dhalla (Brampton—Springdale, Lib.):** First of all, I want to say thank you to the minister for taking the time to come to the committee today and share some of his views.

As we go across the country in some of these tough economic times, I and many of the other MPs around this table will appreciate the fact that the government does have to make choices, does have to take serious consideration in regard to seeing what programs are effective and provide the most efficiency. You were talking about the Trade Routes program, the cost of delivering the program being \$5 million and having a \$2 million benefit. I can tell you there are a

number of people who did see advantages in that, and that \$2 million also did provide substantial investments.

So you went across the board, did the analysis of the programs, made the \$45 million in cuts. When programs like Trade Routes or PromArt were cut, what types of programs have you put in place in your new program investments to help these new emerging artists and other artists who utilize these particular programs?

**Hon. James Moore:** I appreciate the question. I have to confess, when I went across the country and I visited with different and varying arts and culture groups, the needs of our artists internationally are quite wide and varied. For some it's just straight support in order to get them into other markets, for sending them and their instruments overseas, their plane tickets, shipping, and so on. For other industries, for example, on museums, they need support from the government with regard to insurance. So if they're going to have exchanges of collections, they need the government to support them with the insurance costs.

We have a small domestic market—linguistically fractured. We are excelling in arts and culture in this country, and in order for us to really succeed—

**Ms. Ruby Dhalla:** What types of programs are put in place?

**Hon. James Moore:** We're doing a number of things. Of course we've increased spending for the Canada Council, for arts and culture, and we're helping them abroad by \$13 million.

**Ms. Ruby Dhalla:** And that will provide the opportunity for Canadian artists to go across internationally?

**Hon. James Moore:** In some cases it will, but not entirely. We are continuing to work with arts and culture groups to make sure the needs they have are going to be taken care of.

You asked for programs. We have \$1.9 million for Telefilm, \$1.8 million for Factor/Musicaction Canada, \$900,000 for the National Film Board, and \$4.8 million for the Association for the Export of Canadian Books. These are programs.

**Ms. Ruby Dhalla:** It would be very helpful for all committee members, because we are inundated with e-mails and phone calls from people who did utilize both of these programs across the country. It's great to have the dollar values, but people want to know that on the ground they're going to get access to the funding, to the resources they need to ensure that they're able to go out there and perform if they are actors or actresses. There were comments made in September 2008 by one of the spokespeople for Minister Emerson who said that individuals like Gwynne Dyer and Avi Lewis should not be entitled to taxpayers' money. These are people who have done a great amount as writers and made great contributions to Canada. People on the ground felt, and continue to feel, that some of the cuts that have been made have been made not for the purposes of efficiency, but actually have been made against people or organizations that spoke out against the government. I think that is an issue that needs to be addressed to ensure that the cuts are not based on ideology but are being made in the best interests of improving efficiency and effectiveness for the organizations.

• (1615)

**Hon. James Moore:** Of course they're not. We're spending \$21.6 million in these funds that I just described. That's more than any government in Canadian history, more than ever before, to support artists on the international scene. We've increased the budget for the Canada Council. The criticisms that you described about whether these cuts are ideological in terms of who gets them.... I don't decide who gets money from the Canada Council.

The Canada Council is arm's length, independent of the government. We've increased their budget by 17% to \$181 million this year. This is an independent organization of artists helping artists, and who they give their support to and who they finance internationally or domestically with their needs as artists is entirely arm's length from the government. So the idea that somehow we're picking and choosing these things is of course not true.

**Ms. Ruby Dhalla:** I'll ask this very quickly, because the chair tells me that I have about a minute left.

Mr. Angus was talking about the National Film Board having levels of about \$67 million at one point, whereas it used to be \$81 million. I think the prize for Canada may be in some respects a good decision, but our Canadian artists and talent do need to be promoted internationally.

When you take a look at this year's nominees for the Oscars, there is not one single Canadian artist. I think that shows a failure within our system to promote these individuals. You have organizations like the Canadian Independent Film & Video Fund, which had a budget of \$1.5 million and stimulated investments of almost \$20.4 million. They had a great benefit and impact. Their program wasn't restored. It wasn't replaced. We have to do as much as possible, regardless of which government is in power, to ensure that those artists get the resources and support they need.

Also, Mr. Minister, with all due respect, cultural attachés are incredibly important throughout the world to build bridges and to improve and enhance relationships with other countries.

**Hon. James Moore:** I certainly don't disagree with you. DFAIT continues to have services and investments to support artists internationally. They continue to have services in embassies.

Spending over \$2 million a year in salaries for cultural attachées in cities, frankly, whose economies may not be in great shape, where our artists may not want to go, and where there may not be value for Canadian artists is a kind of static investment, and it isn't the way to go.

I would just end with this, because I think we have to go to the next person: stay tuned with regard to the idea of the \$25 million one-time investment for prizes. It will benefit Canadians greatly.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Pomerleau.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Drummond, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Minister, for having come to meet with us and to share your comments regarding the new year, the investments that you will be making and their impact on the budget.

This is the first time that I am really sitting in the committee. There was another sitting, but it was spent on operational issues. This is the first time that we are receiving a witness, and this first witness is also the most important one. I am astonished to hear you say that in the entire history of Canada, your department is the one that invested more in culture than any other department did. I am thinking of the actions of the artists in Quebec during the last elections. There was a hue and cry that was unprecedented in Quebec history. I do not want to belabour the point, but let me say that this probably costs the Conservatives quite a few ridings in Quebec. People spontaneously stood up and spoke out against everything that was being done. Nevertheless, here we are told that they have never received such generous funding in their lifetime. These two points of view have quite a bizarre relationship.

Before tabling your budget, you travelled to various places in Canada and in Quebec to meet these people. We've heard and we also read in the newspapers that you were listening to them and that you were in favour of their cause. On the other hand, after the budget was tabled, the comments were even worse than the last time. I have some of these comments here. Raymond Legault, from the Union des artistes, said that he was worried about the future of the programs intended for creative artists. The Mouvement pour les arts et les lettres is disappointed because so few measures have been taken to help the cultural community. The Union des écrivaines et des écrivains québécois says that as far as the Canada Council is concerned, nothing was announced about the programs that were cut and that the federal government had promised. Mr. Paré, from the Conférence internationale des arts de la scène, explained why he was deeply disappointed. Roger Frappier, the film producer, finds that the Harper government is like an impenetrable wall, and so forth. These people are practically unanimous about this. However, you still go on repeating that you have never committed so much money to culture.

As far as I am concerned, I see a great divergence between these points of view. This is why Ms. Lavallée suggested that we should invite some of these people so that they can explain to us what is going on. What can we say to them? You said that studies were done before cutting certain programs that you and your team considered to be insufficiently productive and replacing them with other programs. Can you table these studies? Could we have a copy of the said reports?

• (1620)

**Hon. James Moore:** Among other things, it gives the reasons why the Canadian Memory Fund was not renewed. Before my deputy minister deals with the details and the documents of this case, I must say that people are not unanimous about this in Quebec. Some people do not agree with our policies. This is to be expected, and it does not matter very much. After all, democracy allows for debate.

And yet, we can read in *Le Devoir* that Luc Fournier, of the Canadian Festivals Coalition considers that the budget is very good news. Gilbert Rozon, from the *Juste pour rire* group, said the following: “By integrating arts and culture along with major events in his crisis policy, Prime Minister Stephen Harper recognizes the role that this sector plays in the national economy [...]”. It says here that the Canadian Museums Association warmly welcomes the investments made in culture. And there are yet other quotes. Therefore, people are not unanimous. We can debate the issues. I also know that in Quebec, Ms. St-Pierre and the members of the PQ held an important debate on culture. There is no unanimity of opinion in Quebec, but we can meet the needs of the artists. Now, the deputy minister will tell you about the documents and about the decisions that were made.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque (Deputy Minister, Department of Canadian Heritage):** Mr. Pomerleau, the strategic review done by the Department of Canadian Heritage was carried out in a way that was very similar to that adopted by all the other departments that had to undergo a strategic review. We studied all the expenditures and all the programs of the department to try to determine the 5% of the programs that are now out of date. The minister gave the example of the culture.ca website. The site was built before the arrival of Goggle and Yahoo, and it was quickly replaced by these search engines, which are much more efficient now than anything that the government could try to do. We really do not have the technology to keep up, as they do.

Therefore, these kinds of programs were considered. All these recommendations were submitted to the cabinet and the decisions were made by the cabinet. The documents as such are considered to be cabinet documents and we are not allowed to distribute them.

However, I can tell you that in many cases, decisions are based on studies and evaluations, and in other cases, on plain common sense. For instance, the fact was considered that very few people used the culture.ca site, and using it costs \$1.90 per visit. This is how we actually studied all the programs.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for that. Your time is up. It was almost six minutes.

Ms. Glover, please.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Shelly Glover (Saint Boniface, CPC):** First of all, Mr. Minister, let me congratulate you for having taken the time to come here today. As I am the mother of a young artist, I congratulate you. Your commitment and your love for arts and culture are truly impressive and I congratulate you for that.

As the Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages, I, just like you, am concerned about the conditions of minority official language communities. I know that our government has done a great deal for culture and also for official languages communities through the programs of the Department of Canadian Heritage.

In any case, I would like to know how we can help these communities culturally.

**Hon. James Moore:** Our road map has provided \$1.1 billion over five years for official languages. There are about 1 million francophones outside Quebec. Canada's linguistic duality is very important for us and for all Canadians. Maillardville, the largest francophone community in the west is in my riding; you, in Manitoba, have Rivière Rouge. I am highly aware of the needs of the francophone communities and also of the needs of youth. This is important.

Please just let me say a few words about my heritage.

• (1625)

[English]

My parents didn't really agree with Pierre Trudeau a whole lot—not shocking. They believed, in broad strokes, that Pierre Trudeau had it right about people having their right to privacy. They believed, generally speaking, that Pierre Trudeau had it right in his passionate defence of this country and that it was in the best interests of all Canadians to have their kids learn both of Canada's official languages.

My sisters and I were enrolled in French immersion schools right from kindergarten to the end of high school. Now one of my sisters works with Johnson & Johnson helping with French translation and customer service. My other sister is a French immersion teacher in Burnaby, and I am the minister of official languages. So all of us are using it.

I believe very passionately that the government's investments and support of official languages only serves to improve and help this country. It helps improve and unite Canadians, and it helps to serve and improve the quality of life of young Canadians. That's what our road map for linguistic duality is about. It's about \$1.1 billion over five years.

And I'll give credit where it's due. This was a project that was begun when Stéphane Dion was named minister of intergovernmental affairs after the 1995 referendum. He had his original *feuille de route*—I believe it was \$780 million or in that neighbourhood. That program had a lot of successes, and some failures. We can always learn from those and go forward. That's what we're trying to do with this *feuille de route*. It's an important investment for the future of this country.

There are over one million francophone Canadians outside the province of Quebec—in small towns like Hearst, Ontario, which is Charlie's riding, in Maillardville, my riding, which is the largest French settlement west of the Red River city of St. Boniface. Edmonton has a large francophone community of new Canadians, from Africa in particular, who are looking for services in official languages. So that's what this is about. It's about supporting young Canadians who are learning the official languages.

There's \$14 million within the plan for arts and culture in our official language minority communities. It's also providing services for Canadians whose first language is French, many of whom struggle to learn English but who still require government services in the official language of their choice. Often they're in small communities where provincial governments, frankly, aren't making the kinds of investments in those services that are required. That's where we, as the federal government, are stepping in with these investments for our road map for linguistic duality.

I think it serves the benefit of Canadians, and that's why we're doing it.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** I appreciate your comments. I have to tell you that as a mother of many children, our children are well served by your passion for arts and culture and for French immersion and the linguistic duality in our country.

Do I have time for one more short question, Mr. Chair?

I'd like to ask about something else that I personally find important, and that's the work we do regarding projects we fund with regard to aboriginal people. I'd like you to discuss, if you could, what your department's reach is in support of our urban aboriginal peoples.

**Hon. James Moore:** A very short answer, Mr. Chair? Okay.

I'll give you an example. Native friendship centres are an important part of our communities. I did my undergraduate studies at the University of Northern British Columbia. Along Fifth Avenue or something like that is the largest native friendship centre in, I think, the country. Aboriginals living in northern and remote communities in British Columbia, who in some cases are escaping some pretty desperate situations, are coming to the University of Northern British Columbia and getting their first crack at post-secondary education. They might go to the College of New Caledonia and then move on to the University of Northern B.C. This is their first shot at it.

So they come from pretty desperate economic straits, and they need that support. The first nations friendship centre in Prince George is a fantastic place. Everybody loves it. It gives first nations students who are getting their first shot at post-secondary education a place to stay that's affordable. They can go to school with people from their aboriginal communities, people coming in to the east from the Nass Valley and elsewhere. These native friendship centres, which we are supporting—I think it's a \$114-million program to support these native friendship centres—has really helped a lot of first nations people go to university, move forward, and have more choice in how they want to live their lives.

People often ask me—I'll be a bit partisan here—why I'm a Conservative. I believe in making decisions that allow people more

power, influence, and control on how they choose to live their lives. And these kinds of investments do that.

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

Mr. Simms.

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-sor, Lib.):** Thank you, Chair.

First of all, Minister, thanks for coming...

What's that?

**Hon. James Moore:** Don't ask me about equalization.

● (1630)

**Mr. Scott Simms:** I might.

I just want to start by saying thanks for coming. Then I'll dispense with the formalities.

You made one comment about \$1.95 per hit at culture.ca. You can answer this during your response, but you made the comment that no private institution would accept that sort of thing, at \$1.95 a hit. I believe Ms. LaRocque brought up the same.

I would suggest that if that's your only yardstick for your department, you may want to reconsider the answers in the future. For instance, if you used the yardstick of \$1.95 per hit as a way of judging the Canadian Television Fund, I think that would be an unmitigated cultural disaster, as is the case.

Now, before you answer, let me try to give my other questions in succession. I have quite a few here. Then I want to deal with an issue that will take about two minutes to talk about, and that's of course copyright. I meant that jokingly about the two minutes.

From October 2007 through to June 2008, in many speeches in the House you talked about copyright legislation introduction. Bill C-61 was introduced in June 2008. It died at first reading.

Now, in your election platform, you said—well, your party said—and I quote, that a re-elected Conservative government would strike the “appropriate balance”.

My question is when is the copyright legislation coming? Is this going to be a spring event or a fall event? Who owns copyright legislation? Would that be you or the Minister of Industry? And what will follow from that when or if it makes its way through committee?

Also, when it comes to the copyright legislation itself, I do want you to comment on striking that appropriate balance. What to you is appropriate balance? And don't forget my \$1.95-a-hit comment.

**Hon. James Moore:** Don't worry. Actually, though, it's \$1.98 a hit.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** But she said \$1.95.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Yes, he's right.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** I'm not the type to argue over 3¢, but where I come from, it means a lot.

**Hon. James Moore:** Okay.

You're right; if you put the same analysis toward the Canadian Television Fund, you'd be in some deep water, but of course the Canadian Television Fund doesn't serve that purpose. The only unique, specific purpose of the website is to attract users. That's not the only purpose of the CTF. So \$1.98 per hit is, I think, extraordinary.

How do you get that number? You just take the number of unique hits—it's not hard to do if you talk to a web programmer—and divide by the number of dollars it costs—

**Mr. Scott Simms:** No, I'm purely talking ideology here.

**Hon. James Moore:** There you are. Well, that's fine; I don't know which way you're going on that, but that's okay.

With regard to copyright, it's actually a joint responsibility between Minister of Industry Tony Clement and me. The timing of the legislation is something we're still determining, quite frankly. It will be either the late spring or fall, but more likely the fall.

We're taking a look at Bill C-61. I think part of the problem previously around Bill C-61 was that a lot of conspiracy theories were cultivated around that. I think not having legislation out there for people actually to discuss and talk about and sink their teeth into caused a lot of fears that I think were unfounded.

We want to move quickly on this. It wasn't just in our election platform; I think more precise language is in the throne speech, which was adopted by this House back in November. That throne speech made it clear, and had the support of this House, that we would come forward with copyright legislation.

So we are going to be doing that. It will be a shared responsibility between me and Tony Clement. That actually speaks to the balance you're describing, which is—

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Are you scheduling any more consultations per se?

**Hon. James Moore:** Certainly there will be conversations between now and then.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** I mean consultations. Will there be anything formal between now and then?

**Hon. James Moore:** I'll be having those conversations with Minister Clement.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Just so I'm clear, you're looking at the fall.

**Hon. James Moore:** Perhaps, but when we've made a determination we'll let you know. But it is something we are tackling, because our legislation is certainly quite out of date.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Would you say that Bill C-61 was flawed or had flaws that you want to fix?

**Hon. James Moore:** I don't pretend to be a copyright expert, but a lot of concerns were raised about it. By and large it clearly went in the right direction, but there were some concerns.

Let me just say this about copyright. Between this committee and the reputation it has engendered over the years and the industry committee and the reputation it has engendered over the years, copyright is going to be one of those really non-partisan issues in how it goes forward. It's an issue like the apology to first nations for

residential schools, and the creation of some programs under the Liberals like the Veterans Bill of Rights. It's very technical.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** It can be. I think time is of the essence.

**Hon. James Moore:** We should take a good run at it and work on it together. That's what we plan to do.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** As a non-signatory of WIPO, I strongly suggest that late spring would be better, but if you think it should be in the fall I guess we don't have much of a choice.

• (1635)

**Hon. James Moore:** I'll take your opinion under advisement.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** The postal assistance program is aimed at helping Canadian publishers, as you know. You mentioned this in budget 2009. Am I correct in saying that you'll announce a redesign during the week of February 16, or that some type of redesign of this program is coming up?

**Hon. James Moore:** No, the money that was announced in the budget is \$30 million over two years. It replaces the \$15 million per year subsidy that Canada Post has pulled out of.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** So what kind of financial shortfall will the publishers face in this situation?

**Hon. James Moore:** There will be none, unless the deputy minister wants to correct me in some way. I think the program will go forward. The idea is to have a seamless transition so that people can pretend the politics of Canada Post and what we saw in Parliament.... Our government had to give the directive in order for Canada Post to—

**Mr. Scott Simms:** So you're picking up what Canada Post left behind.

**Hon. James Moore:** Yes, that's the intention.

Judith.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** That's exactly right. We're making up the shortfall from the Canada Post contribution, so it should be seamless for the recipients of those dollars.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Uppal.

**Mr. Tim Uppal (Edmonton—Sherwood Park, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Minister, for taking the time to be here.

I'd like you to highlight some of the key investments the government is making in festivals and events. For example, we've seen that Canadian Heritage is the sponsor of the Silver Skate Festival, and the international jazz festival in Edmonton. Specifically in my riding, Canadian Heritage has been a sponsor of the Under the Big Top Festival at Festival Place in Sherwood Park, and Canada Day festivities in Fort Saskatchewan.

**Hon. James Moore:** I have an entire binder here that I carry with me of investments we've made almost exclusively in festival funding, broken down by province. We're making these kinds of investments because advertising revenue has dropped dramatically. It's down anywhere from 25% to 50% and in some cases 60% for a lot of these festivals. These advertising revenues are key for these events to go forward.

At a time when we have economic uncertainty—at all times, but particularly now—whether you're in the centre, the left, or the right, it doesn't matter what party you're from, the job of every member of Parliament is to make decisions that improve the quality of life of Canadians. That's our job. We can disagree about how we get there and do that—and that's what these forums are for—but our job is to improve the quality of life of Canadians.

I don't think there can be much debate about the fact that local community events improve the quality of life of Canadians. I think about where I'm from. You spoke about some of the experiences you have in your district. I think about the Golden Spike Days festival in Port Moody, which celebrates the final spike driven in the CP railway when Canada expanded west. We have the old station museum there, and every summer on Canada Day and two days after there's an amazing community event. It has grown into a huge community event that is all about kids and supporting Canadian pride. It's right around Canada Day on purpose, with the spike, as you can imagine.

They are having a problem getting sponsorship for their event and getting those moneys coming in. Booths are getting smaller and smaller. About one-third or one-quarter of the booths are from industry groups or community groups. They establish booths to tell people about how they service the community. Rogers might do some face-painting, or Telus might paint the face of a child while they tell their parents about their very important cellphone program. It goes with it, and that's fine, but these kinds of things are being pulled back.

We want these festivals to go ahead, so we've put forward \$100 million over two years so these festivals can continue to go forward and be saved. It's really important for Canadians to know that when there is a failure in the economy to support these kinds of events with advertising revenue, our government is stepping into the breach to support them, because they're really important for Canadians.

**Mr. Tim Uppal:** We've highlighted, most of the day, how important this funding is, and it really is. But definitely, from talking to people in my riding, it's also important to know about accountability, about the checks and balances the department has to make sure that the funding is going where it's intended to go and is being spent properly. Can you highlight just what the department does to make sure that the money flows into the right hands and is spent properly?

**Hon. James Moore:** As you can imagine, this is important for Canadians. It's important for members of Parliament. We're making these record investments, and we're doing it at a very high pace with this budget and its increased spending.

We've learned a lot of lessons from the past. I don't know if the deputy minister wants to talk about some of those mechanisms.

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** Well, of course, we do regular audits and evaluations of our programs. But in the case, for example, of the festivals money, we actually did a pre-implementation test to determine how we would measure success at the end of the process and so be alert to the pitfalls we could fall into along the way. We pull selections of files and do spot checks. We do any number of things to ensure that the money is being spent according to the terms and conditions and all the parliamentary and Treasury Board approvals.

• (1640)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Mr. Tim Uppal:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Del Mastro, you can have a very short question.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Minister, you talked about doubling the funding to Cultural Spaces Canada. Can you just talk about the importance of Cultural Spaces Canada and why doubling the funding there was something you thought was necessary?

**Hon. James Moore:** It's very short. I was going to actually finish what I was saying to Charlie Angus about the funding formula we're thinking about implementing that would be beneficial to Canadians.

Let me put it this way. I've had the opportunity to travel a lot in my time as a member of Parliament. I've spent a lot of time in the United States and a lot of time abroad. I can tell you—you don't see this often in Canada, but I've certainly seen it in a lot of cities, which will remain nameless, elsewhere in the world—that there's nothing worse, frankly, than going to a city that has a strong, thriving economy but is culturally dead. Just dead. I mean, they have great jobs and great employment, but you go to the strip mall, and then you go home. People operate in their own personal spaces at home in front of a television or a computer, but there's no shared sense of space.

I think it's very important for cities to be alive. I love going to Quebec City and Montreal. There's nothing more alive in Montreal than the jazz festival, or even Montreal on St. Patrick's Day. In Quebec City they just, of course, had the Carnaval de Québec last week, and the Prime Minister was there. Cities that are alive are cities you want to live in. It doesn't matter how strong your economy is, quality of life is more than that. That's why we make these investments in cultural spaces.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We'll go to Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** The CBC renewal licence is coming up. We know that CBC, like the other broadcasters, has taken a major hit in terms of its advertising revenue. Given the pressures on CBC right now, would you consider, with the renewal of their licence, opening CBC Radio One and Radio Two to commercial advertising?

**Hon. James Moore:** CBC has, as you've said, a lot of pressure to have commercial advertising. We're working with Hubert Lacroix and people at CBC to really get a full sense of the scale of the problems they have. Commercial advertising is an option that has been talked about for some time. I would frankly consider anything, as long as the end result is a strong national public broadcaster that gives Canadians the best service possible.

CBC has some very specific concerns, and its mandate is unlike anything in the private sector. Often you'll see media commentators and columnists saying, "Look, CanWest is in this situation. CTVglobemedia is here. And CBC is over here." It's not apples to apples. The dynamic of the CBC and its mandate is not as simple and straightforward as that of the other broadcasters.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** So you would consider opening up advertising on Radio One and Radio Two. Has that been discussed?

**Hon. James Moore:** It has not been discussed with CBC Radio. It's not something I am looking at doing. But I can tell you that we are very conscious of the needs of the CBC and the pressures they are facing. I would certainly work with them on any option they think would work to best serve their mandate in serving Canadians.

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

I want to ask about the festival funding. You're probably one of the few members of Parliament who actually has to try to pay bills for traveling the Canadian festival circuit. And, boy, Mr. Minister, as you said, there are some excellent and amazing festivals out there. My concern is how the money rolls out.

We know that two years ago there was an announcement about festival funding, and it was much ballyhooed. In fact, it was the only arts funding announcement I can remember from your predecessor. Then the money didn't flow. Then there was the memo that Conservative ridings should pony up and get theirs out. Then the money still didn't flow. Then the minister said it could be used for all kinds of things, like midnight madness specials and other rather dubious and questionable activities.

This is a lot of money, and as I said, there's no easier way to get a lot of pork-barrel photo ops. How are you going to ensure that the money gets out and gets out fairly? What are the criteria, and who's going to oversee it?

**Hon. James Moore:** You're right. It is a serious challenge that we have, but beyond the new envelope of \$100 million over two years, the existing envelope for festivals is a lot as well. The assessments are ongoing. I can tell you that Minister of State Ablonczy, through tourism and industry, is involved in this discussion as well. We're going to have cabinet conversations very soon about how to get this money spent and spent as quickly as possible. As for some of the accountability mechanisms, I think my deputy can speak to that.

● (1645)

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** We're working with our colleagues at Industry Canada and at the Tourism Commission as well. They have some ideas as well. If you look at the specifics in the budget, it's quite linked to tourism initiatives. They're the experts in that field.

We're there to provide assistance to them in helping to get the money out the door, if that is how this unfolds, because you could do it through our programs or you could do it through programs at the Canadian Tourism Commission. Some of that detail is still being worked out, but certainly we would apply the same scrutiny and the same kinds of professional guidelines that we do in our department for the other festivals. We would want to get the money out the door while respecting all the due diligence requirements that are necessary.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I guess one of the complaints that people have with the federal department is the level of scrutiny, when there is scrutiny. Sometimes in arts programs it seems to take more than a year to get money out the door. Yet we have the Canada Council, which is at arm's length, as you say, and allows you to look very good and never take a partisan hit.

The question I would have is why not look at alternative models for getting this funding out? For example, there's the Ontario Arts Council. The Ontario Arts Council does its touring grants for all kinds of promotion. It's an arm's-length peer jury. I used to sit on those juries. It's an excellent process. The money gets out in a timely fashion.

Given just how easy it would be for people to turn something like a festivals fund into a pork-barrel fund, I wonder whether or not you would consider having an arm's-length peer jury for funding like this. That way, the big festivals are going to get their funding, the small festivals are going to get their funding, and the dubious ones are going to be weeded out. We won't have a taint of the pork barrel. Would you consider a move like that in terms of getting this money out in an accountable fashion?

**Hon. James Moore:** I agree with you that it's a concern. The Ontario Arts Council dynamic is not one we're looking at.

But you're right, it is a concern. We want to get the money out there and we want to get it out in a way that's accountable and effective, and also in a way so that new players are getting money. Part of the problem, to be honest with you, Charlie, is that a lot of the assessment is still going on in regard to festivals that are doing their own internal analysis about how bad this year might be in terms of the amount of support they're going to be getting from the private sector.

The Symphony of Fire in Vancouver is one of the largest fireworks displays. I think Toronto has one as well. This fireworks display attracts 250,000 people four nights per summer, downtown. It's a huge event. They've just cancelled this year. This was a big event that had a lot of support. The City of Vancouver and a lot of the business community supported it. So a lot of people are looking at that and thinking, "My God, if they can't make a go of it, then we need to start thinking about how we're going to make ends meet".

As we do these assessments in terms of finding out who exactly is in need and how much support they need, then, therefore, there is the analysis about how we get this money out and spent. You're right, though. Look, we want to make sure the money is spent properly. We've had experiences in the past with the Liberal sponsorship program, where money, in a lot of ways, was designed to go to reasonable ends, but in the end was spent in a dubious and ultimately criminal way. We want to make sure Canadians understand that this money is specifically for festivals and events that will serve the interests of Canadians, not the interests of the government.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I'm going to go first to Ms. Dhalla and then to Mr. Rodriguez.

Ms. Dhalla.

**Ms. Ruby Dhalla:** I'm going to be splitting my time with my colleague, Mr. Rodriguez.

I have a couple of questions. We all know that the broadcast industry is facing a tremendous amount of pressure, especially in light of the growing economic crisis that we have. There are people out there who are laying off some of their employees, some of their journalists, closing their doors, and also shutting down their stations. At the same time, there's also an incredible and mounting pressure on the broadcast industry to convert from digital to high definition. What type of support do you think the government will be providing?

We also know that the heritage committee here did a report last year that was called "CBC/Radio-Canada: Defining Distinctiveness in the Changing Media Landscape". At that time, the government stated that funding for CBC and Radio-Canada was a matter for Parliament. CBC, like the other private broadcasters, CanWest and CTV, will also be facing the same pressure to convert from digital to high definition. Can you please shed some light on what types of support or resources will be provided?

**Hon. James Moore:** As you know, the CRTC has indicated the conversion will take place August 31, 2011. For well over 90% of Canadians the conversion will take place and will frankly go largely unnoticed. There are of course other concerns. Part of the problem, to be honest, is the technological changes happening so quickly. I think many of the broadcasters themselves are making business decisions about how they want to go forward into this new environment.

The cost of things, if you look at the United States, where in May or June 2011.... President Obama has indicated their conversion is going to be happening at a different date. Part of the problem is that there's such a rapid change of technology and a rapid change of the cost of the technology that the idea we can make a quick, hard-and-fast decision right now in terms of what the needs will be in 2011 technologically is very hard to do. We're very conscious of it, but we have no plans to do a converter-box program like what they've done in the United States, with the coupons and so on. We have no plans to do that. This ought to be an industry-led solution, and the technology changes afoot right now are frankly very difficult for us to grasp. I'm not sure if the deputy may have more to add beyond that, but I can tell you we are very conscious of the pressures that exist.

• (1650)

**The Chair:** Mr. Rodriguez.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Mr. Minister, I would like to come back to the budget cuts. I know that this is something you are working very hard on. However, you have not succeeded in convincing us; in any case you have not convinced me.

We have asked specific questions on the issue and have requested justifications, but we are told that those are confidential documents that cannot be made public.

Moreover, stakeholders have told us that the programs were functioning properly, they filled a need and assisted our artists abroad. The stakeholders have informed us that those cuts will lead

to the cancellation of a number of tours. For the coming year, they are talking about having to cancel approximately 59% or 60% of tours, and as much as 90% over the next two years. Losses of revenue owing to the cancellation of those tours are estimated at approximately \$24 million. Many jobs will be lost. What is at stake is the credibility of our artists, industry and country.

I would like to believe you, but you are not giving me any proof. There is nothing concrete, neither study nor analysis. We are not given access to those documents. The only thing we heard when the cuts were announced came from Conservative Party supporters who said that people were using the money to go to Cuba or to present a documentary film at a gay festival. It was said, for example, that a left-wing writer would receive money. However, as far as I know, the Royal Winnipeg Ballet does not take its orders from Castro. The Montreal Symphony Orchestra and the Grands Ballets canadiens are well established organizations. They cannot be characterized as communist followers of the Che and Fidel.

If you cannot justify those cuts, isn't it because the decision to do so was ideological and because you do not like to control part of the people who represent us abroad?

**Hon. James Moore:** No, absolutely not.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Are you sure?

**Hon. James Moore:** I am certain.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Well then, prove it.

[English]

She wants the documents. We want to see them.

**Hon. James Moore:** As the deputy minister said, the decision made by my predecessor—I think my honourable colleague understands the concept of cabinet confidence in some of these decisions. I'm prepared to go through each one of the decisions that constitutes the full \$45 million of this strategic review. I went through half the list with Dean Del Mastro; I went through part of the list with Madame Lavallée. I can go through every single penny of it. I'd be more than glad to right here, if the time permits.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** So you'll come back to our next meeting then?

**Hon. James Moore:** I've already gone through half the list. I'm prepared to continue. These decisions were made in the best interest of taxpayers, they absolutely were. I have no doubt there were those who were receiving money under the old Trade Routes program who certainly benefited from this, but the responsibility of the government is to ensure all these dollars are being spent in a way that's beneficial to all Canadians, including artists.

Why in the world would anybody defend a program that cost \$5 million to deliver \$2 million worth of benefits? That level of exchange is not acceptable. So we took those dollars and reinvested into other arts and cultural programs. This year about \$22 million is going to support our artists internationally. I will continue as Minister of Canadian Heritage to work with these groups affected by the changes made in the past to ensure their needs are taken care of in the future. I will certainly do my best to do that, but it is simply not defensible.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** They're saying you were wrong to cut, that they want it back.

**Hon. James Moore:** Yes, and as I meet with more and more Canadians, they realize that when people say we cut \$45 million, they are wrong; \$45 million did not go to reinstate antennas that nobody was using or to re-establish websites that nobody was using. That money went to the Canada Council. We didn't continue a program that had \$5 million in costs for \$2 million worth of benefits because I think Canadians, in times like these, when taxpayer dollars are quite precious, recognize that's a level of exchange that's not acceptable.

• (1655)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Grewal.

**Mrs. Nina Grewal (Fleetwood—Port Kells, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Minister, for being here and making yourself available to all of us. We really appreciate it from the bottoms of our hearts.

I was very pleased to hear you reference in your speech the Olympics and Paralympics. On the surface, most casual spectators may look to the Olympics as a sporting event where the primary goal is winning bronze, silver, or gold medals, but it is really about much more than that, isn't it? It's about bringing communities and nations together through national pride.

Could you please elaborate on some of the work that our government has undertaken with regard to the Olympics and Paralympics?

**Hon. James Moore:** Sure.

The Olympic and Paralympic Games will benefit all Canadians. I remember back when we won the Olympic bid. There was incredible enthusiasm in the Vancouver area, where I'm from. There was a lot of enthusiasm in British Columbia. My sense has been that this enthusiasm hasn't been spread across the country, although it's coming up bit by bit. I think what Canadians need to recognize is that these are Canada's games. You have the Torino games, the Athens games, the Atlanta games, Salt Lake City games, but we want them to be Canada's games. Two thirds of the athletes for the 2010 games will come from the province of Quebec. It is in the interests of Quebec that the federal government have a strong role in the 2010 games.

That's why we've made investments—for example, \$55 million, as I described in my opening, for the Own the Podium program. We've invested \$24.5 million for the torch relay. As I said, the torch relay criss-crosses 45,000 kilometres of the country. I think 85% or 90% of Canadians will be within a one-hour to 90-minute drive of the torch at some point along the route.

I'm dating myself here, but I remember when Rick Hansen came to my community when he was doing his tour. I can't remember what grade I was in, but I was really young. I thought how amazing, incredible, and inspirational that was.

We want to make sure that all Canadians feel part of the 2010 games, and the torch relay is a part of that. So we passed the money in the budget last year, \$24.5 million for the relay, which will involve francophone communities outside of the province of Quebec. We

will ensure that there are artistic celebrations throughout the torch relay, which will go across this country. It's going to be a fantastic event. We're also spending over \$34 million towards legacies for first nations.

We really want the 2010 Olympics to be Canada's games, and we want it to be about bringing people together. Frankly, I can't think of a better time than now, when we have a lot of divisions in this country about the economy and people thinking very much about their family and the impact of the economy on their community and on their province and maybe their region. I think it's time we have these grand projects that unite us all as a country. If you look at the 2010 games and what we've been able to accomplish around those, the four host first nations are involved, enthusiastic, and proud to be hosting the 2010 games. We have support from municipal government for the building of the venues. We have incredible infrastructure projects. We are all working together, municipally, federally, provincially, and first nations, pulling on the same rope to host this incredible opportunity.

In a year's time—a year from this week, I think—when we have those opening ceremonies at B.C. Place stadium, 3.2 billion people around the world will turn their eyes to Canada. As a proud British Columbian, looking at Canada through the lens of British Columbia and across, I think it's going to be a fantastic event for the country.

We've made investments into infrastructure for delivery of services. We have the opening ceremonies, the torch relay, first nations, the Cultural Olympiad. This is going to be a great project for the country.

Do you want to add something?

**Mrs. Judith LaRocque:** I'd just add that this is the first time ever that venues are ready so far in advance of a game. It will give, we hope, our athletes a tremendous advantage as they use these facilities this winter and in the lead into the Olympics next year, so we're particularly pleased about that. All the venues are now open, operational, and being used by athletes.

• (1700)

**The Chair:** Okay, there's very little time left.

**Mrs. Nina Grewal:** Could I please pass my time to Mr. Del Mastro?

**The Chair:** No, I think we're pretty well to the point and we have shared that time. The time is up.

I must thank the minister very much and his support staff. It's always great to have our deputy ministers here and people who come along from Canadian Heritage. So again, thank you very much.

We'll take a five-minute recess and then we'll reconvene.

•

\_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

•

• (1705)

**The Chair:** If we could reconvene that would be great.

Our committee business, as we move on to the second part of our meeting today, is a motion from Madame Lavallée: That the committee discuss the recent elimination of federal government funding programs for arts and culture, and that the committee hold meetings on the recent elimination of federal government funding programs for arts and culture, and that the members of the committee send the committee clerk a list of witnesses no later than Friday, February 6, at noon.

I know we haven't discussed the motion yet, but the clerk has received those two lists of witnesses. There are two lists, one from the Liberals and one from the Bloc.

Madame Lavallée, would you like to have a couple of minutes to speak to your motion?

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** Mr. Chair, I want to make sure I have understood. We are currently discussing how to implement the motion. According to the information that I obtained from the clerk following last Monday's meeting, we had agreed to adopt the motion.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** No, no.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** I then checked with the clerk's office. Emails were exchanged with the clerk's assistant, and I again received confirmation that the motion had been adopted.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** No, it was not adopted, but I said that we could go ahead and get the witness list. I suggested that we get that list, so that when we adopted the motion, we could go forward from there. The clerk can confirm that. There was no adoption of the motion, but when we talked after the meeting, I think there was a suggestion that we would need to have a witness list. We have received those witness lists.

Today we will now decide how many meetings we will have and how we will go forward with your motion. We have to adopt your motion first, so the motion is put before the committee.

If you don't want to speak to the motion—

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** I'd like to speak to the motion, please, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Okay, Mr. Del Mastro.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the motion, of course. No motion can be adopted at committee when there hasn't been a vote held on the motion.

I'm very concerned with this, and I think all members of the committee should be. I think the committee should be forward-looking. I think we have a number of things that we can be working on, a number of very significant projects that we could undertake, a number of very significant studies that we should undertake.

We just heard from the minister today, and the minister was very clear on the strategic review items. I don't know what questions are remaining. There's no question that the minister was forthright in

talking about this thing. I'm certain that anyone who received funding from the former programs might be upset about it; this isn't news. In fact, we know that the most recent budget makes significant new investments. We should be talking about what impact this committee wants to have on these new investments and what types of studies we want to undertake.

This is looking backwards. I humbly suggest that the witness list before us is a huge witness list; we can't get through this many witnesses. I dare say that to get through this witness list, we'd be fortunate to have this study done by the first of May. Is that what the committee wants to do? Is that a good use of our time?

I would strongly suggest that it is not a good use of our time, that we are providing no service to Canadians whatsoever. We've heard from Mr. Angus in the past that he wants this committee to operate. I think this starts the committee down the path of conducting nothing but witch hunts. I've been on one of those with Ms. Lavallée already; it provided zero value to Parliament in a lot of cases. And I don't think that's what this committee should be doing.

So I'd humbly suggest to members that we vote against this motion. In any event, the motion would certainly need to be amended, because the witness list's date of no later than Friday, February 6, has passed. And I would suggest that perhaps Mr. Angus might have witnesses, should the motion pass, so obviously that portion of the motion is going to have to be amended.

I'll pass on to other members of the committee.

● (1710)

**The Chair:** Mr. Rodriguez, and then Mr. Angus.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Mr. Chair, I am in favour of the motion. I think that we can find a way to work together on this issue. During the minister's appearance, I said that I was not satisfied with the answers given as to the reasons that led to the program budget cuts. I think this matter warrants debate, and we need to be able to ask questions.

That said, I agree with Mr. Del Mastro. I do not think that we should spend several weeks discussing the issue. I am in favour of the motion, but the committee could decide to limit the discussion to two or three meetings and agree on a witness list. Obviously, the list should remain open-ended, given that the motion was not adopted last time and Mr. Angus, myself, the Bloc Québécois and the Conservatives will want to add names to it.

I move that we adopt the motion, that we limit debate to two or three meetings and that we keep the list open in order to add names of witnesses.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus.

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

We had discussed this at the last meeting. My sense was that there was a general understanding that this was unfinished business from the summer. Like Mr. Del Mastro, I was a little shocked to see 60 witness names. That would, or could, throw everything we've done off until about May, and I don't know if that's necessary. I appreciate actually having a list that we can draw from.

I would be in favour of this motion if it were amended, where the amendment would say that the committee hold three meetings and then determine at that time if further study is required. We could choose from this witness list, we could hear...and the minister's office could give us a response. Three meetings would certainly allow us to deal with the substance of this study, and then we could move on. I'm uncomfortable moving forward with just a blanket motion that's not amended at this point, because with 60 witnesses listed it would certainly swamp our committee. If people were amenable to saying three meetings—and I think three meetings is fair—that allows us to make sure that it's adequately studied, and if people have a burning need to go forward then we'll re-address it at that point. So my amendment would be that the committee hold three meetings and then determine if further study is required.

**The Chair:** Ms. Glover.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I just want to say, as a new member, I had hoped sincerely that this heritage committee would be looking at things that would offer a future to our artists, a future to our culture. As far as I'm concerned, I believe the minister was very clear on what he said. Some of these programs have met their mandates. If I could use an analogy, it's like having a wedding, the wedding being completed, and then asking for more money to redo the wedding. Some of these things are absolutely concluded, and I believe the minister was very clear in saying that he is willing to discuss all of those. He's provided most of that information today, and to waste precious time could really provoke us into a future for our artists and the culture we're looking at.

I have to vote against this, because I want to move forward. I do not want to go back just to argue these things that have been very clearly stated by the minister.

• (1715)

**The Chair:** Ms. Dhalla.

**Ms. Ruby Dhalla:** I think it is important to have that spirit of cooperation and collaboration of working together. But at the same time, in light of what the minister said today, there was a substantial amount of cuts made that did have a great impact. I think that I, and I'm sure many of the MPs around this table, have been inundated with e-mails and phone calls from individuals, from organizations and stakeholders who suffered from the cuts. I think it's important to know where we were at, where the inefficiencies were, and what the government needs to do to really move forward to ensure that the funding that is provided in the future is focused, especially for the programs that were cut and what has been done to replace them, so that these artists and these organizations have the resources they need to really build our identity as a country and also to promote our Canadian artists.

I think, as Mr. Angus was saying, we could perhaps have a limited number of meetings so we don't focus all of our time on that,

and if Madame Lavallée were amenable to that she would find great support and consensus from everyone around the table.

**The Chair:** Mr. Rodriguez.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Ms. Glover is right on a number of elements. Some things will be easy to do. If some of the things are already concluded, the study will last exactly 30 seconds. However, there are other programs that still raise questions. I think that the study is worth conducting.

That said, are we now speaking to the amendment? Has Mr. Angus amended the initial motion in order to circumscribe it? If that is the case, I am in favour of his amendment. We could vote on it now and move on to something else.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Okay, we have to call a question on the amendment to hold three meetings.

(Amendment agreed to)

**The Chair:** The amendment carries that we will hold three meetings.

Now we will vote on the motion as amended.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** I have a question please, Mr. Chair.

Have we amended the date for submitting witnesses? Was that covered in the amendment as well?

**The Chair:** I don't think it's been covered in the amendment.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Would anybody like to move a—

**The Chair:** Could I make a suggestion? Are there any other people who have supplied lists of witnesses? Are there more witness lists to be presented? I have two lists in front of me.

Are you going to present a list, Mr. Angus?

Are you going to present a list, Mr. Del Mastro?

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** The only witnesses I might want would be the deputy ministers. I see that they're on the Bloc's list.

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I wasn't going to be adding witnesses, but my understanding is that in these three meetings it is implicit that there would be a chance for the department to respond.

I'd also like to see if it's possible to request the department to provide some of the analysis they gave, because it's certainly going to help frame the discussion. If they have information that could help us and if they could provide it before we start the study, it could move things along fairly quickly.

If we're breaking it into two groups per meeting, one group is going to have to be towards the end, and it will have to come from the department. As for whoever the department decides to send to respond after they've heard the various questions, I'm open to that, and I don't think we need to give those names now. I think it's an understanding that we'll reserve time for them.

**The Chair:** That's fine.

We will now vote on the motion as amended: That the committee discuss the recent elimination of federal government funding programs for arts and culture, and that the committee hold three meetings on the recent elimination of federal government funding programs for arts and culture, and that the members of the committee send the committee clerk a list of witnesses no later than Friday, February 6, at noon.

(Motion as amended agreed to)

• (1720)

**The Chair:** I'm going to make a bit of a recommendation about witnesses. We can't have everybody here, and I think it would be up to the list. I have lists of witnesses from the Bloc and the Liberals.

Maybe you could sit down together and decide on which witnesses you want. I talked to my clerk. We could probably have split sessions of three, with three for the first hour and three for the second hour. That would give us 18 witnesses. Again, remember that maybe the last hour or last day would be for government people to respond to what has gone on before.

Can I leave it to both the Liberals and the Bloc to decide on that? You could get back to the clerk.

Yes, Mr. Del Mastro.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** I was just going—

**The Chair:** Oh, sorry. Mr. Rodriguez is first.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** On our side we will prioritize this, from one to ten, let's say, and we'll sit down with the Bloc to make sure that it's efficient and it works, and you can invite the people as soon as possible.

**The Chair:** Ms. Lavallée.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** I can explain the presence of each name on this list. In fact, there are some priorities. Some organizations and some people have priority. Perhaps we could begin with CINARS, the Conférence internationale des arts de la scène, that made a study of the programs that were cut.

Mr. Clerk, I do not see the document here.

**The Clerk:** It is on the Liberal side.

**Ms. Carole Lavallée:** Since you put it on the Liberal side, we will leave it to them. We will discuss it. We are able to establish priorities. Perhaps some people will not be available and we will have to drop them from the list. Many people asked me personally to be allowed to testify. They have specific things to say. I could discuss this with the clerk and we will see what kind of grouping we can make, because, obviously we will not receive them one by one.

Do you agree with this, Mr. Chairman?

[English]

**The Chair:** I think that can be done, and I suggest that the first meeting we have will be the Monday after our break. That then gives my clerk a week and a half to put that list together and to make sure that the witnesses have proper notice and they can get here.

If that is satisfactory with you, sir, then if we do it that way, I think that's where I'd like to go.

Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** When you're done this, I wanted to address Wednesday.

**The Chair:** Okay. Mr. Del Mastro.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Charlie and I are of a common mind on that. I was just curious. On Wednesday, what will we be dealing with? I'd obviously like to talk about future business and get a timetable for when you're looking at commencing the study and when we look at completing it. Obviously I'd like to talk to the other members about some motions for some studies we could undertake. That would be a good opportunity to have a discussion about that.

**The Chair:** Okay, Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I was going to recommend that we just have a general discussion on Wednesday. I would prefer that we just go around the table and talk about ideas, allow them to percolate and come back on the Monday, and find the time then to start plotting it in.

I know a lot of people are new on the committee, so I don't want to jump anybody and say that I want this study done by this date. I think if we look at a calendar to see how many dates we have, to consider what some of the issues are, we have to be a little loose, because issues are going to come up that we are not expecting.

So I think if on Wednesday we just had a general go-round and try to set some priorities, that would allow our clerk to start looking at where we need to go and it would allow each of us to start getting our heads around it.

So that would be my suggestion for Wednesday.

**The Chair:** Ms. Lavallée.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** I am glad to see that we are talking about future work. I fairly well agree with what Mr. Angus said. However, after discussing the cuts in the subsidy programs, we should perhaps consider a wider study.

I must say that one of the subjects that I am specifically concerned with and that all artists are specifically concerned with, has to do with artists' living conditions. Last week, in fact, we consulted a report that had been mandated by the Department of Canadian Heritage regarding this matter. We could discuss that.

• (1725)

[English]

**The Chair:** Let's put that off to Wednesday. That's what Wednesday's meeting will be about, and you'll have all kinds of time to talk about it.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** All right. I would like to tell you that I tabled another motion this morning regarding the committee's future business, and it has to do with the testimony made by Mr. André Juneau, from the National Battlefields Commission, when he announced that he would reconstitute that which we Quebeckers call the defeat of the Plains of Abraham. I know that the committee wants to discuss this later on. However, I was just wondering, in good faith, if per chance we could spend an hour on Wednesday discussing future business and receive Mr. Juneau for an hour. This could be enough.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I'm going to make a decision. You've tabled the motion today. We don't deal with the motion until Wednesday. We are going to do the 48 hours and we're going to be back.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** I think if you sought it, you would find unanimous consent to deal with the motion immediately, the motion Madame Lavallée is discussing.

Do we have consent?

**The Chair:** Do we have unanimous consent, then? We don't have the copy. We don't have the motion here. We'll deal with that motion on Wednesday. It can be the first—

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** I have it right here in French and English, if you like. I'm happy to provide it to the chair.

**The Chair:** Okay, well—

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** I just want my motion to be discussed. I do not want it to be adopted hastily. We will discuss it on Wednesday.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I'm going to make a judgment here.

We're going to go with 48 hours' notice on this one, and we will deal with this motion on Wednesday first thing. Then everyone can have a couple of days to decide where they want this committee to go. I hope we do some very good, constructive work in this committee.

With that, I adjourn the meeting.

---







**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.**