

House of Commons CANADA

Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

CHPC • NUMBER 022 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, October 5, 2010

Chair

The Honourable Michael Chong

Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

Tuesday, October 5, 2010

● (1535)

[Translation]

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Richard Dupuis): Good morning. I see that we have a quorum. I will therefore proceed with the election of the chair.

The chair must be a member of the government party.

I am ready to receive motions for the position of committee chair. [*English*]

Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Peterborough, CPC): I nominate Mike Chong.

[Translation]

The Clerk: Mr. Del Mastro moves that Mr. Chong be elected chair of the committee.

[English]

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare Mr. Chong duly elected chair of the committee.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

The Clerk: If there are no objections, I will now proceed with the election of the first vice-chair, who must be a member of the official opposition.

[English]

Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.): I would like to nominate Pablo Rodriguez.

[Translation]

The Clerk: Mr. Simms moves that Mr. Rodriguez be elected first vice-chair of the committee.

[English]

(Motion agreed to)

[Translation]

The Clerk: I declare Mr. Rodriguez duly elected first vice-chair of the committee.

Voices: Hear, hear!

The Clerk: We will now proceed with the election of the second vice-chair, who must be a member of either the Bloc Québécois or the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Drummond, BQ): I nominate Madame Carole Lavallée.

The Clerk: Mr. Pomerleau moves that Madame Lavallée be elected second vice-chair of the committee.

[English]

(Motion agreed to)

[Translation]

The Clerk: I declare Madame Lavallée duly elected second vicechair *in absentia*.

The Chair (Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC)): Thank you everyone for placing your trust in me and for electing me chair of the committee.

[English]

I want to tell you that I'm thrilled to be here. I'm very much looking forward to chairing the Canadian heritage committee and working with all of you.

[Translation]

Welcome to the 22nd meeting of our committee.

I've asked committee members if they want to discuss our upcoming fall agenda.

[English]

I want to seek consent here to go into committee business to talk about what we're going to do this autumn so you can give the chair and the clerk some direction as to how you want the next 13 meetings to unfold.

Before I go to Mr. Angus and then Mr. Del Mastro, I'll just point out that we left the committee in June with the unfinished digital media study. That's one item we need some direction on, as to whether or not you want to continue that, how many more meetings you want on that, and when you want to wrap that up.

The second two items are that we have two motions in front of the committee—one moved by Monsieur Rodriguez, and one by Madame Lavallée—concerning the CBC and the marquee tourism program respectively.

We also have in front of our committee a private member's bill from Mr. Norlock, which I understand he would like us to deal with. I don't think it would take more than one or two meetings.

We also have an order in council that has been distributed to all the members of the committee concerning the appointment of Mr. Jim Silye, of Arnprior, Ontario, to the board of trustees of the National Museum of Science and Technology. If the committee wants to review that, it's another option.

That's all the business in front of the committee.

We'll begin with Mr. Angus.

● (1540)

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

On behalf of the New Democratic Party, congratulations. I think you have a great reputation in the House for your work as committee chair. This is one of the great committees, I do believe, because we tend to actually make a plan and we tend to stick to it generally, and we tend to actually come out with some usable reports. So your hand will certainly help us.

There are definitely a number of outstanding issues. I'm wary about getting into our motions today without Madame Lavallée here, because I don't think it's fair to entertain one and not the other. They both pertain to where we're going.

In terms of the emerging digital media study, I would make perhaps two recommendations. The first is that I think we need an overview of what committee business has been done for the new members and for us, who probably have been swamped with a million other things in the intervening months.

Then I think we need to have perhaps a planning session around that, because we are going to be dealing with copyright. Much of the digital media study was getting very much sidetracked on the issue of copyright, as opposed to issues of broadcast, on where we're going in terms of a digital media strategy for culture. Perhaps we're going to need to reassess that study and whether or not we have to pare it down to address or to focus in on the digital distribution of works, as opposed to the larger issues of digital culture; whether we are even close to getting to that point and we're going to just decide to continue with meeting after meeting; or whether we hear some more witnesses, maybe suspend final judgment on that report until after the copyright bill has come in, and then we can see if we're missing something. I think we need to spend a bit of time strategically thinking about that digital media study, because those recommendations are important. With us being caught between that study and copyright, we might not do ourselves justice.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Del Mastro.

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I guess I'll pick up first where Mr. Angus left off.

I think a briefing by the analysts would be appropriate. We have a number of new members on the committee, and I think it might be a good opportunity for those of us who were here to catch up with exactly what we were working on. Perhaps we could plan on having that at the first meeting back after the break.

We are prepared to deal with motions. I think these have been outstanding for a while. We're prepared to deal with them. I guess it would be up to the Bloc if they wanted to move Madam Lavallée's motion today. Certainly we're prepared to support Mr. Rodriguez's motion. I don't see it as being controversial in any way.

The Chair: Just to clarify, what are you proposing for the first meeting back after the break?

● (1545)

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: I'm just getting to that. I apologize.

For the first meeting after the break, I'm suggesting that perhaps that would give the analysts enough time to be able to put a briefing together for members of the committee as to where we were at on the study we had been undertaking on digital media. I agree with Charlie that it's probably the best place to start with: where we go from there. I know we've had a number of other witness indicate that they'd like to come in and appear on that. Over the summer I've been contacted by a number of them.

What I would like to see happen, Mr. Chair, is this. There is a private member's bill that received unanimous support in the House. I believe we could deal with it in probably one meeting, since it's a fairly simple bill, which is Mr. Norlock's private member's bill. I can't see any reason we can't deal with that on Thursday. I know the committee is going to be bound to deal with it at some point here in this session, so we could dispose of it now. It did have all-party support.

In the first meeting back we could have that briefing and then have an open discussion about where we go from there. That's how I propose to move forward.

The Chair: If we do call a meeting for Thursday on this private members' business, are the witnesses available? Is Mr. Norlock available and are other witnesses available to appear?

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: I have taken the opportunity to speak to both Mr. Norlock and to a number of witnesses who'd be required to speak on the bill. I contacted them last week to ask them if they would be prepared to move as quickly as that, and they indicated that they would.

The Chair: Okay. That's good to know.

[Translation]

I will turn the floor over to Mr. Pomerleau first, and then to Mr. Rodriguez.

Mr. Roger Pomerleau: Normally, I would go along with Mr. Del Mastro. However, I'm not at all sure what Madame Lavallée has done in terms of contacting people and inviting them to testify in connection with Mr. Norlock's bill. I do not know if she has anyone in mind or whether some witnesses have already been contacted. Therefore, I can't speak for her. I cannot see us starting this study until we know where we stand on that.

However, after we return from spending a week in our ridings, that would be the best time, as Mr. Del Mastro suggested, to prepare an overview of the work that the committee has done, to bring new members up to speed.

I would prefer that we not get into Madame Lavallée's motion at this time. It is her motion and I don't know what exactly she wanted to say about it. She can speak to it herself.

The Chair: We will discuss Madame Lavallée's motion after next week's break.

Go ahead, Mr. Rodriguez.

[English]

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): First of all, congratulations, Monsieur le Président.

I pretty much agree with what's been said here. I don't see any problem, starting with the briefing and all of that.

We do have to decide how long we want to go on with the study, though, because we've been working on this for a while and we've seen a lot of people. I think we have to keep on doing it, but not necessarily for months. So we'll have to decide on something there.

Regarding Bill C-465, we would be planning two meetings, would we?

The Chair: Mr. Del Mastro suggested just one meeting, which is Thursday. It's a very short act.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: It is short, but if we're only going to have one meeting, could we have it on the Tuesday? It's tougher to have people come Thursday, late afternoon, than on Tuesday.

Would that be a problem? Or could we have two meetings?

The Chair: Well, Mr. Del Mastro said that the witnesses are available this Thursday.

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: We could do clause-by-clause on Tuesday, if you want. It's not going to take very long to do clause-by-clause on a bill. But we could have Mr. Norlock and the witnesses here Thursday, which won't require any votes.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Larry Bagnell, who comes from the north, would very much like to bring a few amendments, but it's not possible for him on the Thursday; he's going back. Could it take place on a Tuesday, or could we do two days so that he has the option of coming?

The Chair: He's not here right now? He's not here this week?

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: He's here.

The Chair: Oh, but he leaves for the north?

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Yes.

The Chair: Well, it's up to you guys to tell me what to do.

Monsieur Pomerleau.

[Translation]

Mr. Roger Pomerleau: How would you feel if we proceeded in the reverse order, that is to say, if we had a briefing on the status of the study this Thursday, and undertake our study of Bill C-465 when we come back from our break?

[English]

The Chair: That's an option.

Let me confer with the analyst.

Are you prepared to brief us on Thursday about the digital media study?

● (1550)

Mr. Michael Dewing (Committee Researcher): Do you mean with an oral briefing?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Michael Dewing: You have an interim report.

The Chair: Yes.

There's been an interim report. Il y a un....

[Translation]

Mr. Royal Galipeau (Ottawa—Orléans, CPC): A status report. [*English*]

The Chair: —un rapport d'étape.

So we could discuss this and decide on this Thursday how much more time we want to devote to the digital media study. Then on Tuesday, when we get back, we could spend one meeting on Bill C-465 and then we're done.

Is that okay?

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I don't want to be a stick in the spokes of the wheel, but I'm concerned, because we have the two motions. Again, I don't think it's fair to do the one motion, because it is setting a course for our direction without the other motion being heard. I think we have to do it on Thursday so that it's out of the way. And I have no idea how long it will take to debate those, because I don't know whether they're going to be controversial or not.

I don't want us to try to quickly get through the briefing. We, especially our new members, really need to be brought right up to speed on the digital study, because it is a major undertaking that we're doing.

I would suggest that we do the motions and get them out of the way on Thursday, and if there's time for other business then, that's fine. Then on the Tuesday I support our going back to the private member's bill. Then, on that Thursday, we'll have been briefed and could have had even internal discussions by then. I think we need enough time to really assess whether we're going to put a lot more effort into this or not.

I'm worried that if we debate the motions this Thursday and doing so takes an hour and more, and then we're suddenly trying to figure out the future of the digital media study, we're not going to give it the kind of reflection that it needs.

The Chair: Okay. Well, nobody's moved any motion yet. We've been given notice of motions. So there are no motions on the floor yet. I think the consensus from Madame Lavallée's colleagues is that we not move her motion until she's here.

I leave it to Mr. Rodriguez to decide what he wants to do with his motion.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: We could do it right away, Charlie, in five minutes. It's not very complicated and there's nothing special in there, nothing threatening.

The Chair: Okay. Is it your intention or your wish, if this motion is adopted on the CBC, to begin that study after?

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: I would say within.... Can I explain it just very quickly?

The Chair: Sure, go ahead.

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: Is it part of the digital media study?

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Exactly.

So the way it's drafted is a bit weird, but it's within the digital media study to have CBC here and talk to us about what's the reality, especially if you consider the fact that CTV has been bought by Bell and it happened the same with Global, this and that. Within that new context, digital media and new platforms and this and that, what is CBC's reality, *la réalité de Radio-Canada aussi*?

So that's pretty much why it's there.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Angus, go ahead.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Can I speak to that?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Well, first of all, Mr. Rodriguez, can you move your motion, please?

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: I so move.

The Chair: Okay, the motion's in front of us.

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you. I was confused, because we had done a CBC study about a year and a half ago, and we put in a great deal of effort and we crossed from one end of the country to another, so when I read a motion saying we're going to study CBC, I thought, well, it's been done.

Now if we have a motion to study the change in broadcast because of digital platforms and include the sale of CTV and what's happening with Canwest, that's a different issue, because it's not just focusing on CBC. But we're actually now in a situation that's unprecedented and we're in very new terrain.

Whether or not these new television platforms, including Quebecor, are going to start—basically, are we looking at television becoming a mobile telephone device service, or is it traditional broadcast? That is definitely within the purview of our committee. But I think it is a study in itself, and I don't think it's just we throw it into the digital study. This is about broadcast and some of the dramatic changes.

So I would support a motion that is refocused on that and that it is a study in and of itself, as opposed to just trying to fit it in.

The Chair: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Rodriguez.

[Translation]

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: I think these two studies would be too similar. I have some concerns about the relevance of conducting a completely separate study on the integration of broadcasters—and that would include the CBC—and about having to wait until we have

finished discussing the future of media and new media. In my view, the two overlap.

Of course, as part of our ongoing study, we could hold a two-hour meeting to discuss the CBC and its future in this universe, as well as the implications of integration. We could cover this in our study on new and emerging media. As I see it, these two subjects are too closely linked to be dealt with separately. We could cover both as part of the same study.

● (1555)

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Del Mastro, go ahead.

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: Actually I agree with both of them, surprisingly. Because I think what Charlie is talking about is kind of the vertical integration of media platforms that is being proposed by new entrants. It's a reality that this is happening, and I think that's also what you want to talk to CBC about: how are they keeping up with this vertical integral of platforms and evolving media?

And I actually do think it fits within our new media study, but I wouldn't be adverse to suggesting that within that study we could have a carve-out that specifically talks about some of the challenges in the broadcast industry and how that's evolving. I do think it's evolving, because there are new media opportunities and new platform opportunities, and I do think it's critical that we talk about it within the context of what we're doing.

I don't think it's mutually exclusive to say that we can support this motion and then call on CTV and Canwest to appear and all of the other players, Corus, and obviously Quebecor. I think it would be incumbent upon us to call them all in on that context and certainly talk about it in the future.

But I don't think supporting this is mutually exclusive to doing that, Charlie.

The Chair: Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm going to have to play the hard man on this, in that we haven't decided what we're doing with our digital media study, but now we're going to start to bring in broadcast and fit it in.

I think the situation with CBC is distinct. It's distinct because CBC is now the only broadcaster left in Canada that is not part of a vertically integrated delivery service. Its challenges are going to be very specific to the fact that its main competitors are basically phone companies. So we have to get our heads around that.

I don't have a problem bringing in the CBC to talk at our digital media study about what it is doing in the digital platforms. That's great. But if it is being posited the way Pablo has said about the new reality, then that is something we have to address specifically, and it's not something we can just throw in.

We are on the verge of a profound change in the delivery of broadcast, and we're putting money through the Canadian Media Fund that is tied to the broadcast envelopes, when some of the producers are going to want to actually cut those strings and get out altogether. If we're going to phone applications and other digital platforms, everything is starting to change. We're going to at least have to spend a bit of time getting our heads around this.

I would oppose this motion at this present time, not oppose where we want to go with it, but I think we have to deal with this digital study, and we have to look at this. To me they are separate entities.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Rodriguez.

[Translation]

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: On the contrary, I think this study is directly related to the future of the CBC. It is entitled "Digital and Emerging Media: Opportunities and Challenges". It is clear that Canada's public broadcaster, which broadcasts programming in both official languages, is directly affected by a study of this nature and by the new reality that is emerging. At the very least, I would like to have CBC officials appear before the committee to discuss the corporation's future and how it will be impacted by digital and emerging media. At the same time, we could also discuss vertical integration. Given the unique universe in which the public broadcaster is evolving, I would like to hear from these officials and get their take on the corporation's current situation and needs.

[English]

The Chair: If there is no further debate, I'll put the question, and then we can sort out after how we're going to do this in terms of the digital media study.

If there is no further comment on Mr. Rodriguez's motion, I will put the question.

(Motion agreed to) [See Minutes of Proceedings]

The Chair: As it stands right now, what I'm hearing from committee members is that on the Tuesday we get back after the break we will deal with Mr. Norlock's motion in that one meeting. Please submit your witnesses to the clerk, so that we can coordinate them and invite them well ahead of time. If you could get the witnesses to the clerk by the end of the week, that will give him a full week to coordinate the appearance of witnesses on the Tuesday that we get back.

Mr. Rodriguez.

(1600)

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Just for clarification, there will be two meetings, one for witnesses and one for—

The Chair: Frankly, I think we only need one meeting.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: So half of the meeting with witnesses? I agree with you. I think one meeting with a couple of witnesses—

The Chair: I think what we'll do is divide it into two panels of witnesses.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: What about clause-by-clause?

The Chair: What we'll do is have two panels of 50 minutes each and we'll devote the last 20 to 30 minutes to clause-by-clause.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: That could be tight. Can we have the first two hours for witnesses and—

The Chair: There are only three clauses in this bill.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Well, that's a lot.

The Chair: So it's not going to take more than half an hour. If you want to spend two meetings on it, I'm prepared to do that.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: One meeting is fine.

The Chair: We'll have two panels of witnesses from all the witnesses that wish to appear. Then we'll set aside the last half-hour of that meeting for clause-by-clause. So that's the meeting after we get back.

Now I need direction from the committee, because we have two different proposals here with respect to the digital media study. One proposal is to meet this Thursday to decide how many more meetings, to get an oral update and briefing from the clerk, and then to decide as a committee how many more meetings we're going to have.

Mr. Angus has suggested we push that to the Thursday after the break week, giving the clerk and the rest of the committee members a good two weeks to decide how we're going to finish this digital media study.

Tell me if you want to meet Thursday to decide this digital media study plan or you want to meet the Thursday after we get back from the break week.

Mr. Rodriguez.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: What's on Thursday, if we don't discuss this?

The Chair: Nothing.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: No committee meeting?

The Chair: There's no committee on Thursday.

[Translation]

Will Madame Lavallée be here on Thursday?

Mr. Roger Pomerleau: Yes.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: It's just that her motion would be the only item on the committee's agenda. There is nothing else on our agenda.

Mr. Roger Pomerleau: Could we wait until we're back from our break?

[English]

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: I don't think we should have a committee meeting for one motion, if that's the case, so we could debate that motion on the—

The Chair: Thursday, after we get back.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Yes.

The Chair: So that's what we'll do, then. On the Thursday after we get back, we'll debate Madame Lavallée's motion. We'll also map out the remaining meetings of this autumn session for the digital media strategy, and we'll decide how we're going to incorporate your CBC proposal within that digital media strategy. Is that okay?

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Tuesday's the bill, and Thursday of this week there's no meeting.

The Chair: That's right.

Is that the wish of the committee?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Okay.

I have two things to bring to your attention.

There have been a number of reports that have been tabled in the House. You have copies of the titles of those reports. I simply draw that to your attention.

Finally, the other thing I want to draw to your attention as chair of the heritage committee is that tomorrow is the twentieth anniversary of the *Canadian Encyclopedia*, which has been funded by the Government of Canada for twenty years. It's an all-Canadian encyclopedia and there is a big celebration at the *centre de conférence*, at the Government Conference Centre across from the Chateau Laurier, tomorrow at 5:30. It would be nice to see members of the committee there.

I sit on the board of governors of the organization that is responsible for this, so I told them I would draw it to your attention.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

An hon. member: Shameless self-promotion.

The Chair: Okay.

Without further ado, seeing no other comments or questions, this meeting—

An hon. member: He hasn't mentioned Justin Bieber yet.

The Chair: —is adjourned.

The meeting is adjourned.



Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

1782711 Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to: Publishing and Depository Services Public Works and Government Services Canada Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

En cas de non-livraison, retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: http://www.parl.gc.ca

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5 Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943

Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757 publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : http://www.parl.gc.ca