



House of Commons  
CANADA

## Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

---

CHPC • NUMBER 005 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Wednesday, November 17, 2004**

—  
**Chair**

**Ms. Marlene Catterall**

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

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

## Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

Wednesday, November 17, 2004

• (1535)

[English]

**The Chair (Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.)):** I call to order this meeting of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

Our first item is future business of the committee. Our staff took what the committee had to say two meetings ago and put together an agenda that takes us from now until the holiday recess. You also have another report in front of you. It lists all the topics that members raised. If you want, we can have a look at starting to schedule what we expect to be doing shortly after the break.

Mr. Clerk, you said there was a problem with the sixth.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Jacques Lahaie):** Yes. On the sixth, two members cannot attend.

[Translation]

We could change our agenda. We will ask Minister Owen to appear before us on the 13th instead of the 6th, and we will ask Mr. Beaudry from the National Capital Commission to take Mr. Owen's spot and appear before us on the 6th. Further to that, CBC/Radio-Canada representatives will appear on the 15th.

**The Chair:** Is it because CBC Radio-Canada senior officials are not available on the 13th?

**The Clerk:** That's correct.

[English]

**The Chair:** So we would start with the Telefilm bill...

I'm sorry, let me go back to November. We've had Mr. Rabinovitch. We're now on November 17. We have the minister scheduled for next Wednesday, and Mr. Chan will be here on November 22. Then we're scheduled to spend the November 29 meeting on supplementary estimates of the department.

Is there any disagreement with that? My only concern, frankly, is that the Telefilm bill has been passed through.... My only concern is whether we shouldn't be getting to the legislation sooner.

Monsieur Lemay.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marc Lemay (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Madam Chair, my question is in regards to Bill C-18 concerning Telefilm Canada. Are we going to sit on December 1, given the fact that is the day of Mr. Bush's visit? If you will allow me, I would suggest that we consider Bill C-18 on November 29 and the supplementary estimates the 1st or the 8th of December, depending on the agenda

for Mr. Bush's visit. If Mr. Bush is here the 30th and leaves on the 1st at twelve noon, we could meet.

• (1540)

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.):** I believe the estimates have to be adopted before the 30th. Am I mistaken?

[English]

**The Chair:** There is a problem: the estimates have to be reported to the House by Thursday, December 2. So if we did that on the Tuesday, that really wouldn't give time for our staff to prepare a report.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** What report are you referring to, Madam Chair?

**The Chair:** The report on the Supplementary Estimates.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** When must it be tabled?

**The Chair:** Before December 2.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** I would then suggest that we study the Supplementary Estimates next Monday, the 22nd, instead of hearing from the Minister. It seems like an urgent matter to me and one that we should attend to before November 30 or December 1.

**The Chair:** We could also plan for an additional meeting. No? All right.

[English]

The other possibility is that if we wanted to—I agree that legislation from the House should be the priority—we could plan a longer meeting on the 29th, have a supper of some kind, and continue until, say, seven o'clock.

Any disagreement with that?

**Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP):** I will defer if we must, but one thing I just would like to make clear here is that because I have committees every day of the week, I cannot accept any changes in scheduling at all. They did that to me in agriculture this week, and it's caused a real disaster for us. I am the only New Democrat sitting on these committees. I have nobody else who can fill in. I would go for that extra two hours, but unfortunately, with my schedule, I work into the evenings just getting prepared. Again, I'm the only New Democrat who sits at these.

I'm not wanting to cry tears about the extra two hours, and I will do it if I have to, but it makes it a lot more difficult for my staff.

**The Chair:** Which is more important for you to be at, the supplementary estimates or Bill C-18? Whichever is more important to you, we could schedule first.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Madam Chair, I would defer to you on that; you have more experience on what's important. I think the estimates are important, and we need the committees to be there.

I would have supported my colleague's suggestion of moving the minister of state from the 22nd so that we could get down to it, but....

**The Chair:** That might mean waiting until after Christmas.

• (1545)

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** That's fine for me.

**The Chair:** Look, let's try to find out, first of all, if the House will be sitting as normal on Wednesday. If so, we'll go ahead with Bill C-18 on Wednesday, December 1. Otherwise, we'll double-book and have a longer meeting on November 29, if that's okay.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Madam Chair, we are assuming that Mr. Bush's visit will force us to cancel our meeting. From what I understand, Mr. Bush's visit on the 30th will have no impact because he is leaving on the 1st, before the Committee meets. Can someone look at this straight away, but in my opinion, it will have no impact.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** Can we do it right away?

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** I suggest someone phone. Do you have a number?

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** The Prime Minister's Office, Mr. Martin: 613...

[English]

This is the best, Madam Chair.

[Translation]

If we could look into this immediately, it would be very helpful.

**Mr. Maka Kotto (Saint-Lambert, BQ):** Monday or Tuesday, I believe.

**The Chair:** I am certain Mr. Bush will be delivering his address in the House on Tuesday and not on Wednesday.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** The 30th.

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** That's the Tuesday.

[English]

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger (Perth—Wellington, CPC):** If he's here the 30th, then I don't believe there would be a problem.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** There's no impact, I'm almost 100% sure—almost.

**The Chair:** But I have that option if it does turn out that there is a problem on December 1. Otherwise, we'll proceed with this, then, with the amendment suggested by our clerk, that we bring Mr. Beaudry in on the sixth, Mr. Owen on the thirteenth....

So it will be the Minister of State for Sport on December 6, Mr. Beaudry on December 13, and CBC on December 15. Is that okay?

[Translation]

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** So, we will bring in Mr. Beaudry on the 6th of December, Mr. Owen on the 13th and the senior officials from Radio-Canada...

[English]

**The Chair:** Hang on a second. If we leave Mr. Owen on December 6, and put Mr. Beaudry on December 13—

**An hon. member:** No.

**The Chair:** Oh, you don't want the sixth. Okay.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** No.

[English]

On the sixth it's impossible—I'm in Montreal. And I want to be there.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** [Editor's note: inaudible]

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** We will be sitting five days over the week of the 13th.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** The week of December 13?

[English]

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** I have good and bad news for you. The good news is you'll stay in Ottawa for five days, from the 13th to the 17th.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** That's great news.

**The Chair:** It's okay for you guys. You're not the ones who decorate the tree and buy the Christmas presents, I bet.

We'll send you the revised schedule, then.

Do you want to look now at this report, which gives you the others who will come in the new year sometime?

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, CPC):** Put in there: time for the Liberals to go.

**The Chair:** So now we have to decide what is most important and what we want to spend time on.

Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** It is an excellent list, unfortunately, because it shows how much work there is to be done.

I would make three suggestions I have concerns about. One is in terms of the mandate of English and French CBC, because of the issues we talked about that came up the other day with a regional plan and with the cutbacks coming. I think we are going to have to be in a position as a committee to look at what's coming and at how we, as Parliament, and the government can support that plan. So I think one day will not be enough there.

I think the issue with CRTC, as well, with one day...because there are a lot of issues outstanding from last summer, and we are probably going to want to have more. I know it was raised in the last Parliament, but there are still a lot of issues that weren't looked at. We are probably going to want to have a good game plan on that to look at the issues.

The third issue is concentration of media. It is a big issue. I don't know if one day could address something of that magnitude. In a way, I would prefer not to look at it at all if we give it only a cursory look, because it is such a major issue. I definitely would prefer to spend the time needed on that. Where we cut—

• (1550)

**The Chair:** I would just point out he's put a number of days beside each of these items.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Yes. That's why I noticed “concentration of media”, one plus.

**The Chair:** So you think that would need more.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Yes, and the same with the CRTC, one plus; and CBC, one plus. I think each of those would require a number of days.

**The Chair:** Then we have copyright reform. I don't know that we have a good feeling yet of when we'll get that legislation. The minister may be able to help us with that.

Monsieur Lemay.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** When the Minister of State for Sport appears before us on December 13th, we could also discuss the Olympic Games in Turin, Beijing and Vancouver. That is item number 10. Perhaps we could have that discussion on the same day.

I think that one hour with the Minister of State for Sport would be sufficient, even if we include the issue of the Turin, Beijing and Vancouver Olympic Games. Let's not get carried away. With all due respect for Mr. Owen, I don't think we'll be spending two hours with him. Given the issues we want to look into, I think one hour with Mr. Owen will suffice. We could set aside another hour for something else.

[English]

**The Chair:** Okay.

[Translation]

But under sport.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** Yes.

[English]

**The Chair:** Okay.

[Translation]

Would you like some senior officials to be here for the discussion?

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** Yes. When the Minister of State for Sport comes, I'd like senior officials from Sport Canada and the responsible deputy minister from Canadian Heritage to come with him. Everything will be covered.

If my questions have to be ready in advance, they will be.

[English]

**The Chair:** Monsieur Obhrai.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** In this study of multiculturalism, are we going to have 10 to 20 meetings, plus travel?

**The Chair:** If we were truly going to do a thorough job.... How long is it since that act's been reviewed? Not since it was implemented. That's 20 years.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** So we travel across the country?

**The Chair:** This is what we have to decide, really. Is it an urgent thing? We may have a better idea after we meet with the minister.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** That would be a good idea.

**The Chair:** So let's leave that for now, and we can make that decision later.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** That sounds fine.

**The Chair:** Are there other comments?

Mr. Schellenberger.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** I'd just like to comment on one thing on the copyright reform. Do we go into the medium-term part of the copyright reform? There was short term, medium term, and long term. Do we go into the long term before we get a report back on the short term?

**The Chair:** You seem to be suggesting we should wait and deal with the short term. We will have the legislation, apparently.

• (1555)

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** That would be my thing. If it's not satisfactory, if it has to come back to the committee and we have to work on it, then it's going to take some time. I would suggest...again, it's down near the last two things—copyright reform and WIPO ratification. Those things definitely would not be before we get a report back.

Is the report to come back to us in April? It wouldn't happen.

**The Chair:** The deputy minister indicated there would be legislation in the spring, so we'd probably want to deal with that first.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** I would suggest, rather than get too many things on our plate....

**The Chair:** One thing I would like to make a bit of a pitch for is a study of the feature film industry. I think it really is almost at a crisis stage; we're starting to lose some excellent talent in this country. If we're going to put a bit of effort into studying a particular area, that may be the most urgent.

Yes, Mr. Simms.

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.):** I was the one who suggested the part about the grey- and black-market satellite television, but it's so intertwined with industry I don't know how we can effectively study it. But what I would propose is through seven, eight, and perhaps even the third-language signals as well, encapsulate it into a broader issue of foreign services themselves coming into this country, when it comes to conventional and satellite television.

It seems to me that four to five days on satellite television, legal or illegal, is just going to be a bit of a waste. That would be my suggestion. If we're looking at two, three, or four meetings on this issue, we should encapsulate it into a much broader issue, such as the foreign services. I guess this would include third-language services coming into this country as well, in regard to CRTC.

**The Chair:** That's not a bad suggestion.

Mr. Kotto.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I've gone over all of the points and I see the same ones that we raised the time before last. However, there are two important points missing. We had raised the idea of a joint committee when we were discussing the taxation of artists. An important issue that might blow up in our faces if we don't deal with it immediately is the World Film Festival and its crisis with Telefilm Canada. We had expressed the desire to hear testimony from these people to avert a potential crisis.

In addition, point 4 has to do with the future of the arts, but it is also crucial to talk about funding of the Canada Council, because there are huge problems with that.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I would like to second your support for looking at the film industry. We were on the verge of something a few years ago, when the Canadian film industry was so strong, and it's been devastated. The American legislators are moving continually to shut down what's left of some of this cross-border film business.

I don't know if we could do 15 days or 20 days, with all this stuff, but we have to look at it in this Parliament and come back with something. People are really looking to us to have a plan. So I support you on that.

**The Chair:** So is there some agreement on making that our kind of major study for the spring, knowing that if copyright legislation comes in we'll have to get to that fairly quickly too?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** We're going to need it, Madam Chair. I haven't had a chance to stay up on film the way I should, but from what I'm hearing about the United States, they're moving very fast on this. We're standing, letting an industry die.

**The Chair:** Mr. Khan.

**Mr. Wajid Khan (Mississauga—Streetsville, Lib.):** I agree with Charles. It has a big economic impact. I think that needs to be addressed.

**The Chair:** So let's make that a priority when we return after the Christmas break, and perhaps have our staff look at a list of potential witnesses: obviously Telefilm Canada, and the Canadian Television Fund, which is mostly industry financed.

Anyway, it seems to me there's general agreement that it's fairly important that we focus on both the economic and cultural sectors.

Mr. Schellenberger.

• (1600)

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** I'd just like to say one thing. When we talk about the third-language television, the grey and black market, and those types of things, the number of days that are down there might seem like a lot, but I'm quite sure there'll probably be a lot of witnesses who would like to speak to us on that particular thing.

I think that's what takes the time. If we don't listen to all the witnesses, then we can't make a fair judgment. Again, I'd far sooner have an extra day than be one day short.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** I'm not insinuating we should actually cut down on the number of witnesses, or anything like that; I'm just saying we should have just one theme, which is basically the foreign signals coming into this country.

I wholeheartedly agree that every issue here should be addressed, but it should be done within the same theme, and not all over the place.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** That won't be a problem.

**The Chair:** Yes, because they are connected.

**A voice:** The foreign signals, yes.

**The Chair:** Can I just ask the committee something? The CRTC may have come down with something on third-language television by the time we reconvene in February—the Lincoln report. What do we want to do about that? Anything?

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** We should have an answer from the CRTC before December 31.

**Mr. Scott Simms:** Should we have a meeting after that based on the issue, which is foreign services coming into this country—conventional and satellite television?

**The Chair:** Would we invite Mr. Lincoln here to talk about their report?

**Mr. Scott Simms:** I would suggest that.

**The Chair:** Would we invite the CRTC?

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Also, let's say the CRTC decides to open the air for those services; there are options that may or may not be acceptable to the

[*Translation*]

receiving communities, for example, the Italian community.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Oui.

Okay, so have we had enough discussion on that? We can let our staff take that and see how they can sort of schedule that, beginning with the week we are back in February.

Our meetings next week will be with Raymond Chan on Monday, and with the minister on Wednesday.

The next item is a report. Back to the schedule?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** Excuse me, Madam Chair. Have we received the Supplementary Estimates for 2004-2005? Are they in the thick blue volume? Or is there a separate document? Are these the documents that we are going to look at on the 29th?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** So we're to bring all of that.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Back to the schedule?

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** I'd like some clarification because I'm still not too familiar with the procedure. Yesterday, we had a debate in committee of the whole in the House. Wasn't that on the Estimates?

[English]

**The Chair:** That was on the main estimates.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** And what's the difference between that and what we're going to review at the other meeting?

**The Chair:** The focus will be on the supplementary estimates. A department may change the amounts allocated to certain programs. It may wish to allocate a bit more money to another program.

[English]

It's often the way departments do what they want to do, instead of what Parliament tells them to do.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** So yesterday's debate was on the overall budget. Had there been no amendments, the debate would have ended. However, Heritage Canada wants to make some changes for next year and these will have to be discussed. Is that right?

• (1605)

**The Chair:** Precisely.

[English]

On the CBC and Mr. Rabinovitch's appointment, you have a proposed motion on a report we might make to Parliament. I'd be interested in knowing if the committee wants to report in this way, or wants to make other changes or comments.

Mr. Schellenberger.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** I will speak to the report.

I feel we had a fairly good interview the other day with Mr. Rabinovitch. At this time, I again welcome the opportunity to at least speak to Mr. Rabinovitch, even if it's on his first day of his new tenure, or the last day of his previous tenure.

Seeing as there are no other candidates for us to interview, there's not much more.... I don't want us to look like we're rubber-stamping, by any means. Again, I go back to some of the recommendations that came out of the report of March or June 2003—the 870-page report, with 97 recommendations. I feel that the ministry has to give us a response on that report.

I know it was groundbreaking to bring back the other report. I don't know if we can rekindle the report that was sent back then. I think there were a lot of good recommendations. We look here at 15 and 20 meetings for some of these things. There were two years of meetings put into that particular report, and we got a six-page report, in both official languages—three in English, and three in French. I think it's a pitiful reply to a committee that put a lot of work into those things.

I think there are a lot of recommendations there, like the hiring of the president of the CBC. He's supposed to be recommended from an arm's-length committee. I don't think the committee is at arm's

length. But I do believe that the committee there right now made the recommendation that Mr. Rabinovitch be reinstated in that position.

So we on this side, the Conservative members, are in favour of this report. It has to be brought forward. We need a better reply. What is going to be the direction of the ministry from those 97 recommendations? Are they going to accept any of them, and those types of things?

I don't know how we get that back, but—

**The Chair:** Having carried the brick in both official languages into the House and retabled it, we're asking for the response of the government. That's already in process. They do have to respond again.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** To that earlier report?

**The Chair:** Yes. We've retabled it, so it's like a new report asking for a reply.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** Okay, so both of them have been—

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** Okay, then I'm very pleased with that, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** Are there any other comments on the report?

Mr. Kotto.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** When we left off with Mr. Rabinovitch last time, we said we'd like to hear from him again. We are new to this committee and haven't yet had the time to go through the pile of documents that we received two or three days ago, besides which we were not truly satisfied with the answers to the questions we asked. That's why we felt it was very important to have him back. If the majority of committee members agree, we would be most satisfied.

• (1610)

[English]

**The Chair:** Certainly there are outstanding issues, and we can have Mr. Rabinovitch back on those issues. They do go to what the CBC is doing with some very important issues, but I'm not sure they go specifically to his competency for this appointment. We do want to keep track of what he does with the CBC. As we said, we'll start with the two other senior officials before the Christmas recess.

Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Thank you, Madame Chair.

I've thought a lot about this since our meeting the other day. It was a great opportunity to meet Mr. Rabinovitch and hear him speak.

I am concerned, because this committee had asked for a regional plan. We have no regional plan. Perhaps there is a regional plan. I heard the media heard a bit of a regional plan, but I didn't hear about a regional plan. I think it is crucial to where we're going with CBC. I think Mr. Rabinovitch's record was very clear. He was not supporting regional CBC and he did not believe in regional CBC. That was very clear from the track record.

We are now coming into another era of major cuts to CBC, and we are going to be looking once again at where we're going with this corporation. I think we are at a very historic time again, unfortunately. It always seems to be historic for CBC and Radio-Canada, but we are here.

I believe the standard was raised in the big red book. I spent the summer reading it in my bathroom, and it's a document all Canadians should be proud of. Even my daughter has read it in the bathroom when there was nothing else to read. It's a fantastic document. It sets a standard, and I think we have to meet that standard. One of those standards was how we choose to hire people for our cultural institutions.

I know Mr. Rabinovitch is eminently qualified, but I feel very uncomfortable that, once again, when we have one candidate, we say, well, he was always here so why not hire him again? In private industry, that's a terrible standard. You would be out of business. I think we need to look at a hiring pool. We need to look for the best of the best. If we have to place him on an interim basis while we do that process, the CBC deserves it. Canadians expect it.

At this point, I would not support in any way a reinstatement of Mr. Rabinovitch. I can't do that.

**The Chair:** I just remind you that the mandate the Standing Orders gives us is not whether we agree or disagree with certain decisions he has made. Rather, it is whether we feel he has the qualifications and competence.

Charlie, can I suggest something? I thought there was a very good discussion on a number of issues that we will want to pursue. We may want to pursue the appointment process with the minister when she is here next. The extension is for three years, which is shorter than the normal five-year term. I think that was a bit of a compromise as well. What we might want to do, though, is ask our analysts to communicate further with Mr. Rabinovitch about the issues we raised and would like a further discussion on in the new year. Or we could request a further response on those if you would like.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Madame Chair, thank you.

I am aware of what the Standing Orders are. I guess that's what concerns me as well. If I have to put it down to his competency, then I feel I am put in a very bad light. I don't want to speak badly of Mr. Rabinovitch, but I didn't feel I was satisfied after two hours, and I can't support this appointment.

**The Chair:** Can I suggest that if we're going to talk about him personally, we might want to go in camera?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I have nothing bad to say about him; I just said I can't support it. I know it's not my position. I wasn't given that mandate by the minister, but I'm—

**The Chair:** It's not a question of the mandate by the minister, it's the mandate by Parliament.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** By Parliament. Well, then, I would have to say I can't support it.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Mr. Lemay.

**Mr. Marc Lemay:** You understand that it will be very hard for me to support Mr. Rabinovitch's appointment as CEO of CBC. Since 1999, there has been a drastic reduction in sports programming on national television, which is supposed to promote all forms of sports. We were told right here in committee—I have the text here—that sports was no longer a CBC priority, except for the Olympic Games.

You understand that the least I can do is to abstain from voting on this motion to renew his term of office. No solution has been put forward. The only thing that we've been told is that sports is no longer a CBC priority, except for the Olympic Games, and hockey when there is any. Obviously, I disagree.

•(1615)

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Rodriguez.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

We could discuss Mr. Rabinovitch's evidence or the CBC's priorities at length. I have my own preferences. I understand that Mr. Lemay is a sports fan. Mr. Angus was talking about the reduced regional presence. That too is important. We could continue this discussion and rehash the debate, but it was my understanding that we were to discuss Mr. Rabinovitch's skills and ability to run the CBC well.

I feel that I've had enough information about and interaction with Mr. Rabinovitch to make a decision and recommend his appointment. I believe that my colleagues are of the same view. There's no need to restart the process and the discussion, because we have enough information to judge his skill and ability. Let's keep the upcoming meetings for the priorities identified earlier.

[English]

**The Chair:** Monsieur Kotto, followed by Mr. Obhrai—and I'm not following formal procedure here. I'm just trying to facilitate a back-and-forth.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maka Kotto:** Madam Chair, when you talk about skill in a case like that of Mr. Rabinovitch, you're talking about his training and experience. However, in this particular case, there's a liability, or an activity that he engaged in while running the Crown corporation. That's another basis upon which to assess his skills. By looking at what he did during his term as head of the Crown corporation, we can readily identify things to think about.



That's why I was saying that we were unsatisfied with the answers to questions asked on the day he testified, because they didn't address the heart of the matter. That's why I have reservations. I'm have nothing against Mr. Rabinovitch. He is talented in what he's always done and he has the skills that he has, but are he and his vision for the management of this publicly owned corporation—it's not a privately owned corporation—in sync with the mandate of this Crown corporation? That's what I'm wondering. It takes more than 10 minutes of questions to find that out. From my standpoint, it would be irresponsible to question someone for just 10 minutes before confirming him in his position for three or four years.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Obhrai, and then Mr. Schellenberger.

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai:** Madam Chair, Mr. Schellenberger will speak on my behalf.

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** I'd just like to say we could debate this all day. I'd like to call a vote, please.

I can understand if there are dissenting people around the table, but again, we all have our opinions. I would suggest that you call the vote on the matter, please.

**The Chair:** Is that a call for a recorded vote or just a simple one?  
• (1620)

**Mr. Gary Schellenberger:** I have no problem with a recorded vote if people want a recorded vote. A simple vote's fine with me.

**The Chair:** As simple vote. Okay.

The motion is for the adoption of the report, and you have it in writing here:

Your committee has examined the qualifications and competence of the nominee and finds him competent to perform the duties of the position.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Is there any other business before I bang the gavel?

This meeting is now adjourned.

---





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

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

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

---

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

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