



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

CHPC • NUMBER 008 • 2nd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Monday, March 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, March 9, 2009

• (1530)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Gary Schellenberger (Perth—Wellington, CPC)): Welcome, everyone, to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, meeting eight. Pursuant to Standing Order 108 (2), we are here for a strategic review of arts and culture program expenditures.

Today, during our first hour, our witnesses will be as follows: from the International Exchange for the Performing Arts, Alain Paré; Conseil québécois du théâtre, Martin Faucher; Canadian Dance Assembly, Shannon Litzenberger, executive director; and La La La Human Steps, Édouard Lock, artistic director.

Welcome. We will ask each of you for a short presentation, please, of around five minutes, if we can keep it to there. Then our questioning will be in five-minute segments.

Mr. Paré, would you like to go first, please.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Paré (President, International Exchange for the Performing Arts): Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. Thank you for inviting me to share my views on this important subject.

Let me introduce myself. I am the Chief Executive Officer and co-founder of the International Conference for the Performing Arts, known as CINARS, a not-for-profit organization that was founded 25 years ago, with the aim of assisting the export of Canadian performing arts.

As experts in the field and as a rallying organization, we undertook a study last December on the impact of the abolition of PromArt and Trade Routes—two essential programs for the export of the performing arts. The results of that study can be found in the folder entitled « The Performing Arts in Peril », which you have in front of you. PromArt and Trade Routes were cost-effective and efficient. Every available government study or report has confirmed that fact. Not only were these programs cancelled without any justification, the resulting funding cuts are leading artistic companies to bankruptcy.

At the time we undertook our study, it was already one minute to midnight. The foreseeable consequences were already disastrous for the 61 professional or artistic companies that took part in our survey. In the next three years, 327 international tours would be compromised, representing some 3,395 shows across the globe and losses of more than \$24 million. Today, it is a quarter past midnight. The house is on fire and it's time to call the fire

department. Companies are living through a real nightmare. They can no longer undertake tours, or they must run a deficit. Foreign talent buyers are now turning to other countries to fill their show calendars. In the long term, Canada is putting itself in a position from which it will be very difficult to recover.

Let us look briefly at these two programs, so as to better understand their purpose. I invite you now to look at the summary diagram which can be found in your folder, in French and English.

First of all, PromArt comes under the Department of Foreign Affairs. It was a program designed to assist Canadian exports. The grants allocated in 2007-2008 amounted to \$4.8 million, 70 per cent of which was for the performing arts, for a total amount of about \$3.3 million. That amount is divided into two parts. The first is dedicated to assisting international tours, which represents \$3 million, 90 per cent of which is earmarked for the performing arts. The second part is dedicated to assisting the process of inviting talent buyers from other countries to attend Canadian festivals and other international events.

Trade Routes is a Department of Canadian Heritage program. It assists export development. In 2007-2008, we estimate that this program represented approximately \$7 million in funding. Of that amount, \$2 million was paid out in the form of direct contributions to artistic organizations, including \$500,000 to the performing arts sector. These grants provide assistance to Canadian artistic companies to allow them to participate in foreign festivals, conferences, and so on. The major component of the program, in the amount of \$5 million, represented funding to pay for the services of trade experts based in Canada and abroad.

Taking a bird's-eye view of the situation, it is clear that the most significant amount to have been distributed to our artistic organizations was through PromArt's international tour support component, which had a budget of \$3 million administered through the Department of Foreign Affairs. This amount covered the transportation costs involved in putting on a series of shows abroad—in other words, plane tickets for the artists and the cost of transporting equipment such as sets, backdrops and other technical material. That assistance is needed because the vast majority of foreign talent buyers do not pay those expenses. This is an international standard or practice. Without this assistance, companies simply cannot seize the opportunity provided by foreign buyers, and therefore find themselves deprived of significant revenues. Above and beyond the fact that this assistance is necessary, the money invested in PromArt is cost-effective. Every dollar invested by PromArt in an international tour brings in \$5.50 in independent revenues, on average, for Canadian artistic companies. The rest of the funds distributed directly to the various companies were earmarked for export development. PromArt and Trade Routes provided annual funding of \$800,000 for the performing arts for that purpose.

• (1535)

As in any industry, market development is essential for increased sales. This is long-term work and is part of the relationship-building process. Today, we are urging that federal funding for international touring and export development that has been cancelled be reinstated and increased, in order to save Canada's artistic companies, as well as Canada's international reputation.

In the very short term, we are calling for the immediate reinstatement of this funding to allow the tours that are planned for 2009 and 2010 to take place, so as to avoid any interruption in terms of our presence on the international market. The Canada Council for the Arts, through programs that are already in place to support international tours and market development, would be in the best position to manage these budgets.

For the medium and long term, we are calling for an increase in the budgets dedicated to the export of the performing arts, a profitable sector of our economy which is in particular need of support in times of crisis. This must be an ongoing priority for the government. Only then will we perhaps have evidence showing that the Government of Canada properly supports its artistic companies.

Up until now, Canada has been recognized around the world as an innovative, dynamic and creative country. But, how will we be perceived a few years from now?

In closing, I would like to quote an excerpt from a letter addressed to you, the members of this committee, which can be found in the folder we have provided to you. It is from the Van Baasbank & Baggerman agency in the Netherlands, one of the largest European agencies and the organization that represented many Canadian performing arts companies in the last 15 years. It says, and I quote:

If the Canadian government persists in its policy of cutting touring grants, [...] Canada will lose its leading role in the field of contemporary performing arts [...] The cancellation of the touring grants will not only have serious consequences for performing opportunities available to Canadian companies, but it will have a significant impact on the good name of Canada in general.

Thank you for your time.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you for that.

Mr. Faucher, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Faucher (President, Conseil québécois du théâtre): Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

My name is Martin Faucher and I am a stage director. I am also Artistic Advisor to the Festival TransAmériques in Montreal. Today, however, I am speaking to you as President of the Conseil québécois du théâtre.

A product of the States General on Professional Theatre held in 1981, the Conseil québécois du théâtre, or CQT, was officially established in 1983. The mission of the Conseil québécois du théâtre is to rally and represent Quebec's professional theatre community.

International exposure of Quebec theatre provides a means to promote and present our art and our culture to others. It means naturally extending the life of our theatre works and fostering artistic encounters that often are the starting point for new projects.

Thanks to the creativity of artists like Robert Lepage, Denis Marleau, Wajdi Mouawad, Suzanne Lebeau, Michel Marc Bouchard—and I could name dozens of others—there has been a remarkable increase in the number of Quebec theatre productions being shown around the world in the last 20 years. That success is due to the tireless work of high-level artists and cultural workers.

By expanding opportunities to present theatre works and working on co-productions with solid foreign partners, Canada gives artists and cultural workers a chance to increase their income. The Canadian market for theatre is very small. Thus, tapping into world markets is essential to the prosperity and longevity of many Quebec theatre companies. On average, about 30 Quebec theatre companies have performed year after year on five continents, either through invitations to appear at prestigious festivals, or as part of the regular season.

The Canadian government has primary responsibility for the theatre arts sector, which has both an artistic and economic component, and thus it must take appropriate action to ensure that our artists have a significant presence on the world stage.

The unflinching efforts of Quebec artists and cultural workers over more than 20 years have helped build networks that require effort to maintain. International outreach is the result of work carried out over an extensive period. Any absence from the world stage—even for just six months—would jeopardize those networks.

The *Festival d'Avignon*, which is considered the most prestigious theatre festival in the world, has invited Wajdi Mouawad, the Artistic Director of French Theatre at the National Arts Centre, to be an associated artist at this summer's festival, in 2009. This extraordinary honour will enable Mr. Mouawad to present two major works during the festival. As a result of this invitation, other Quebec theatre and dance artists will also be performing at the festival. These feature performances by Quebec companies in Avignon are the culmination of ongoing support from the Canadian government's cultural diplomats.

Without a program in place to support international performances by its artists, it is unthinkable that the Canadian government would be in a position to keep the current momentum going. Every industrialized G-8 country provides strong support for its artists by fostering international outreach. The examples that spring to mind are England, with Arts Council England, Germany, with the Goethe Institute, and France, with Culturesfrance.

Until recently, with resources that can best be described as modest, Canada supported the international activities of Canadian artists and artistic companies through the PromArt and Trade Routes programs. Despite the inadequacy of the available funding, no theatre company ever complained about those two programs—quite the opposite. What, then, is the rationale for abruptly cancelling the PromArt and Trade Routes programs? On the basis of what criteria was the decision made to eliminate them?

Furthermore, the top priority of the Government of Canada's International Strategic Framework is international cultural promotion and cultural trade development. Why, then, would the federal government want to abolish these two programs, PromArt and Trade Routes, which were specifically aimed at meeting that key priority?

We also want to take this opportunity to remind the committee that international arts festivals, such as *Le Festival TransAmériques*, *Les Coups de Théâtre de Montréal*—a festival aimed at children and youth—as well as *Le Carrefour international de théâtre de Québec* complement the international touring program and thereby foster the growth of Quebec theatre.

Funding for these festivals is provided under a number of programs, including *Arts Presentation Canada*, whose budget will be sharply cut, by almost 50 per cent, starting in fiscal year 2010-2011.

• (1540)

This would also be a disaster for the international development of Quebec theatre.

In conclusion, in an international environment where trust is the basis for any relationship, it is essential that companies be in a position to honour their commitments, ensure reciprocity within international artistic presentation networks and continue their efforts to take their works beyond our borders.

The Conseil québécois du théâtre therefore recommends that:

- the Department of Canadian Heritage restore the PromArt and Trade Routes programs as quickly as possible, so that companies do not find themselves without the means to tour internationally after April 1, 2009;

- that the funds cut from the PromArt and Trade Routes programs be reinvested as quickly as possible in the Canada Council for the Arts, an exemplary federal agency that is soundly managed and has the absolute trust of the Quebec theatre community, and that this funding be increased and earmarked exclusively for international touring support;

- that the role of international theatre festivals as a catalyst for the international exposure of Quebec theatre be acknowledged and that such festivals receive adequate recurring funding.

Thank you very much.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you for that.

Ms. Litzenberger, please.

Ms. Shannon Litzenberger (Executive Director, Canadian Dance Assembly): Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the committee, for inviting me to speak to you today.

I'm the executive director of the Canadian Dance Assembly, the national association representing Canada's professional dance sector. Our membership includes over 350 professional dance organizations and individuals from all regions of the country, including performance companies, training institutions, presenting organizations, dancers, choreographers, educators, agents, and managers. We are a founding member of the Performing Arts Alliance and a member of the Canadian Arts Coalition and the Canadian Conference of the Arts.

I'd like to speak specifically about the sector-wide impact of recent cuts to PromArt, Trade Routes, and the Canadian arts and heritage sustainability program. As you know, decisions to remove or reduce investment in these and other programs were made without consultations with the stakeholders that they impact.

In the case of PromArt and Trade Routes, claims of the programs' administrative inefficiencies in no way support the conclusion to retract investment from critical areas of activity that enable dance and arts organizations to remain competitive in a global economy. For many dance organizations from Vancouver to Moncton, international export is a vital component of a sound business strategy that ensures the investments made in the creation and production of Canadian works will leverage revenue returns through business development in foreign markets.

Since it is an art form that is not connected to another major commercial cultural industry, touring is the only form of distribution for dance. Touring internationally provides added work weeks for artists and production staff and leverages revenue returns through performance fees that are substantively higher in foreign markets than they are domestically.

As you've already heard from several witnesses, the impact of these cuts means cancelled tours, stalled contract negotiations, lost work weeks for artists, and the ultimate disappearance of Canadian art from the world stage.

Furthermore, these cuts have sent a clear message to foreign buyers, whose ability to present Canadian work is compromised by the fact that Canada will no longer cover travel and shipping costs for their artists to perform abroad—a universal industry practice among exporting countries.

This government claims to be investing \$13 million in touring through the Canada Council for the Arts. I'd like to clarify for this committee that in fact the council invests primarily in domestic tours through programs that were designed in complement to PromArt and Trade Routes. It was not until very recently that the council introduced a pilot program that distributes a very modest level of investment to support international touring, in response to reductions to cultural export investment by the federal government in 2005 and in 2006.

To reinforce this point, I've compiled some figures to help illustrate the real situation in dance. In 2007-08, dance companies received less than \$400,000 in total support for international touring and foreign market development from the Canada Council for the Arts. In the same year, PromArt and Trade Routes invested a combined total of over \$1.3 million in support of over 650 dance performances abroad. As you can see from these numbers, failure to reinvest funds cut from PromArt and Trade Routes effectively evaporates support for international export and the promotion of artists abroad.

As we are all well aware, the economic environment has drastically shifted since the time these cuts were made. The government articulated in the January throne speech that old assumptions must be tested and decisions must be rethought. Like the government, the priority of the dance sector is to protect jobs and to ensure that companies can remain stable and sustainable over this volatile period and beyond. The demand for Canadian cultural product abroad during this period of recession is a testament to the excellence of Canadian artists and their work. Preventing this sector from responding to this demand by retracting funding is both irresponsible and illogical.

But I'd like to stress that we do value this government's expressed commitment to arts and culture, in particular through recent investments in the Canada Council for the Arts, national arts training, cultural spaces, and festivals. We do recognize that levels of investment have increased and we know that the government must make choices. However, despite these good efforts and intentions, I am here to tell you that failing to replace investment in international touring will compromise the effectiveness of other funding commitments and the ultimate viability and sustainability of the sector as a whole.

On behalf of the professional dance sector, I am therefore recommending to every member of this committee that you advocate for a minimum of \$12 million in new federal investment specifically to support international touring and foreign market development, enabling arts organizations to remain competitive in the global economy.

● (1545)

I also wish to recommend that this committee support renewed federal commitments to organizational sustainability measures, through the Canadian arts and heritage sustainability program.

Specifically, I recommend the renewal of the endowment matching program and renewed investments in capacity-building measures for small and mid-sized organizations.

The capacity building program, which was cut by \$1.8 million, has allowed dozens of primarily small and medium-sized dance organizations, such as the Mile Zero Dance in Edmonton, Sampradaya Dance Creations in Mississauga, and the Atlantic Ballet Theatre in Moncton, to take important steps forward in their development, building organizational capacities not otherwise possible through regular operational revenues.

Finally, I cannot leave today without reinforcing the need for new substantive investment to the Canada Council for the Arts. The Canada Council is the most effective deliverer of federal investment for the arts, and I recommend that this committee advocate for \$100 million in new permanent investment to the council.

Thank you.

● (1550)

The Chair: Thank you very much for that presentation.

Now we turn to Mr. Edouard Lock, please.

Mr. Edouard Lock (Artistic Director, La La La Human Steps): Hello, everyone.

[*Translation*]

My name is Edouard Lock, and I am the Artistic Director and founder of La La La Human Steps. I would like to thank the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage for inviting me to appear today. I intend to primarily address the impact on the performing arts community of the cancellation of the PromArt program.

My company, La La La Human Steps, began in June, 1980 in a small theatre, *Leskabel*, in Saint-Henri in Montreal. The theatre had 75 seats and the run lasted three weeks. After that, we presented the same show in New York, for an additional week, in a similar sized theatre, but one which, at the time, was a hub for contemporary American dance. In all, we had three weeks of local performances and one week of international touring. Twenty-nine years later, touring has increased from one week to two years. We now perform in theatres such as le Palais Garnier and le Théâtre de la Ville in Paris, and Sadler's Wells Theatre in London. The theatres where we now perform have between 1,500 and 3,000 seats, and one dancer now earns ten times more than the company's entire budget back in 1980. But those are just some statistics intended to illustrate the impact that international touring has had on our development.

What I came here to talk about is the process that led to this, what I have observed along the way, and the effects of the cancellation of the PromArt program on myself and my colleagues. An international career is built through a coming together of many subtle influences: the international community's response to an artist's work; the reaction of artists and the media in the cities where the performances occur; box office success; the feedback provided to presenters and promoters by spectators and subscribers; the personal tastes of presenters and their own observations with respect to how well the show is received in their community.

Then, over time, a dialogue develops and leads to better recognition of the artist's work and his history. That, in return, makes it possible to develop long-lasting relationships that mean a steady touring schedule. This process takes time and, in our case, as for many others, it has taken decades to achieve. On this tour, we reached an audience of close to 140,000. When one thinks back to the first international tour by our company, where *The Kitchen*, in New York, was the only presenter, you can see just how far we have come. The investment in both time and resources is staggering. Yet, if Canadian artists are unable to continue to move these relationships forward, everything that has been achieved will be lost, and the world will forget us. That loss will in turn lead to stagnation among some of the most successful arts organizations this country has produced: its dance companies and dance artists.

In order to avoid that, integrating the work of our artists into the broader context of the global cultural community is vital. The mark of any civilized country is its ability to have a dialogue with other cultures. Our artists are windows into who we are, and what we believe in. Distinctive and unique Canadian perspectives are precisely what international presenters are looking for. Believe me, invitations from leading international presenters are not just paternalism. Their invitations are not designed to support us; they invite us because nothing equivalent is available at home. Inviting an artist from another country to perform is an expensive proposition that can only be justified by the quality and uniqueness of what the guest artist has to offer.

We know that money is tight, and that more grant money for many companies and young artists will be difficult to come by—hence the importance of maintaining access to international markets and foreign investments. As touring has increased for us and other companies, investments from abroad have become *de facto* forms of subsidy. Amounts generated through co-productions and performance fees amount, in our case, to more than the total amount of operating grants we receive from the three levels of government—federal, provincial and municipal. Therefore, to lose access to these revenues would be disastrous.

Another point I want to raise relates to the fact that most dance companies do not have long local seasons and therefore depend on international touring to maintain their revenue streams. Although national tours are pivotal, there are not enough performance opportunities to compete with extensive international tours which, once again, confirms the need to preserve them. It is clear that money alone cannot guarantee the success of an artistic endeavour and money alone cannot create an artist. But when success does occur, it must be recognized quickly and encouraged. And that is precisely the beauty of the PromArt program. That program does not

create success; it supports and rewards success. It does not create opportunities; it lets the artist and presenters do that. It does not have to wonder about an artist's potential; it lets the international experts determine that and then responds based on their judgment.

● (1555)

It is a fundamentally smart program, in that it doesn't burden itself with subjectivity; rather, it lets the world's cultural institutions do the work and then facilitates the artists' access to the opportunities they themselves have generated through their talent and hard work.

Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll have the first questioner. Please try to keep the questions and answers as short as possible. You have five minutes.

Mr. Rodriguez.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): As always, Mr. Chair, *merci beaucoup*.

[Translation]

Good afternoon and welcome to all our witnesses. I am very pleased that you have been able to join us here today. I only wish that the circumstances could have been different.

I have a great deal of admiration and respect for the work that each of you do. I would have liked to be able to talk about dance, theatre, Quebec and Canadian success stories overall, and international touring, but instead, we have to talk about cuts. That is why you are here today—to talk about cuts that I, personally—I have said this before—describe as savage and unjustified, and which I am very upset about. They hurt our artists, and they hurt us as well, in terms of our international reputation.

To begin with, I would like to know whether any of you were consulted with respect to the review process and the cuts that were coming. Did you in any way participate in the process that led to these cuts?

No one was consulted.

Many of your competitors or competing countries—the international networks—have this type of support program, which often represents only a small portion of the budget. Do you not have the sense that, by virtue of the fact that you no longer have access to these programs, you will be fighting with your hands tied behind your back?

Mr. Edouard Lock: Our hands are already tied behind our back with the budgets we currently have to live within, compared to what is available in Europe. If, on top of that, we can no longer perform in Europe, benefit from their investments and present our work in their theatres, there is no doubt that now, we will have not only two hands, but a foot as well tied behind our back.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: A foot as well; that is bad news! Mr. Lock, I have a great deal of admiration for everything you have accomplished over the years. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that the Canadian market simply isn't large enough for you and your company.

Mr. Edouard Lock: The Canadian market does represent a certain percentage of our touring, but Canada just doesn't have the population density to sustain the kind of touring that the international stage as a whole can provide to dance companies here.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: So, for you, the international component—

Mr. Edouard Lock: It is very important; it represents almost 80 per cent of our revenues.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Then it is more than important; it is absolutely key.

Mr. Edouard Lock: Yes, definitely.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Paré, you referred to 327 international tours that have been cancelled, or delayed, which represents almost 3,400 performances. You talk about losses of almost \$20 million. That is enormous in the performing arts sector.

Mr. Alain Paré: Yes, it is enormous and, at the same time, our figures are very conservative, because only 64 companies out of a possible 244 responded to our survey. So, if you multiply that by two or three, the numbers are likely to be even higher than the ones we have now. However, we only presented our actual figures.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: You said earlier that the house is on fire and that it's time to call the fire department. What are you looking for in a way of an immediate solution?

Mr. Alain Paré: Right now, we are asking that the money that was cut from the PromArt and Trade Routes programs be restored and made available as quickly as possible, so that Canadian companies can put on their tours and honour the commitments they have made for the 2009-2010 season.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: If it was reinvested in or managed by the Council, rather than by...

Mr. Alain Paré: The Canada Council for the Arts.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Yes, exactly, that is what you are suggesting.

Mr. Alain Paré: Yes.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Everyone is suggesting that.

[*English*]

Shannon, you suggested we increase the budget by \$100 million per year. Is that what you said?

Ms. Shannon Litzenberger: I was speaking about the Canada Council for the Arts.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Exactly. So we would bring it from \$180 million to \$280 million, generally speaking.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Paré: It is an independent organization. The peer jury and staff are already well acquainted with what international touring involves.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Are you aware of the announcement made today with respect to Les Grand Ballets Canadiens? Is there a direct impact?

• (1600)

Mr. Alain Paré: That is proof and direct confirmation of the fact that many companies, like Les Grands Ballets Canadiens... One

company has come out and said so publicly, and I am convinced that in the coming days and weeks, many Canadian companies will find themselves in the same situation or will be forced to honour the agreements they have signed with foreign producers, even though that means incurring a deficit at the end of the year or being forced to shut down or fire staff.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: So, we can expect some closures, and perhaps even the demise of some—

Mr. Alain Paré: Absolutely.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: —groups that are very important to us, as a result of these budgets cuts.

Mr. Alain Paré: Exactly.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Okay.

As regards La La La Human Steps, at this point, have you had to cancel projects, are you afraid there could be short-term cancellations or do you sense any concern on the part of your international partners?

Mr. Edouard Lock: Certainly, any tour takes two years to plan. As a result, it is pretty well impossible to factor in budget cuts that came about only a short time ago, compared to the two-year period over which our international touring schedule was developed. No, we have not cancelled anything so far, but there is no doubt that if it is more difficult to obtain funding to respond to opportunities that are available, we will also have more trouble honouring our commitments.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: That is what could happen.

Mr. Edouard Lock: Yes, absolutely.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Lavallée.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Carole Lavallée (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Thank you very much.

First of all, I want to thank all of you for being with us today. It is wonderful to have you here.

We are here to talk about the Trade Routes and PromArt programs. The Minister of Canadian Heritage has often said in the House that these programs are ineffective. He has also made that statement to journalists in several interviews. And yet, the only two studies that exist on the Trade Routes and PromArt programs praise them to the skies, saying as well that it was too bad more could not be done. I believe 95 per cent of respondents said that if they could, they would make more use of the Trade Routes program, and 70 per cent were extremely satisfied with it. All agreed that this program had allowed them to explore new markets.

It was the same for PromArt. Departmental officials said that the program was very good the way it was, but that it might be a good idea to add an additional component to it, whereby they could make proposals, rather than simply waiting for grant applications to come in. As you can see, we are far from the kind of ineffective program Mr. Moore is talking about.

Mr. Rodriguez asked if you had taken part in any studies or if you had been consulted. Their response was a chorus of nos.

Is there any other program available through Canadian Heritage or another department that could make up for the cancellation of Trade Routes and PromArt?

Let's begin with Mr. Paré.

Mr. Alain Paré: Are you referring to existing programs?

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: Yes. Do you have access to other programs that could compensate for this loss?

Mr. Alain Paré: At Canadian Heritage, no. There are no other programs available at this time.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: None?

Mr. Alain Paré: No.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: Mr. Faucher, are there other programs out there for the theatre community?

Mr. Martin Faucher: There is the International Theatre Program administered by the Canada Council for the Arts, but it has only a tiny budget. The structure of it is fine, but financial resources are woefully inadequate.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: What is the current budget for that program?

Mr. Martin Faucher: It is approximately \$100,000 at this time.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: And we are talking about replacing \$7 million in funding. Is that correct?

Mr. Martin Faucher: Yes.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: Ms. Litzenberger, would you like to comment?

[English]

Ms. Shannon Litzenberger: There aren't any programs accessible through Canadian Heritage, but as I mentioned, the Canada Council for the Arts have introduced a pilot program with a very small budget, acknowledging the fact that they were not accorded new revenues to support that activity.

[Translation]

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: Mr. Lock?

Mr. Edouard Lock: I am not aware of any.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: So, there is no other program available to replace the one you had before.

Another argument was made as well. Mr. Paré, you said that for every dollar of grant money that you receive, you leverage \$5.50 in spinoffs. Yet Mr. Moore says that it costs \$5 million for administration just to distribute \$2 million in funding. Is that an accurate criticism?

Mr. Alain Paré: Mr. Moore is talking about waste under the Trade Routes program. If there is an issue, it relates to departmental management of the program. The \$2 million given to artistic companies produce enormous financial spinoffs. That money allows them to explore new opportunities and organize missions abroad, in order to secure contracts. The PromArt program was there to shore up budgets or applications aimed at seeking additional revenue streams. Based on the study we conducted, every dollar invested by

Canada yielded spinoffs of \$5.50. Also, the program allowed companies to stay afloat and maintain jobs.

• (1605)

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: I am not sure I understand. The budget for Trade Routes was about \$8 million. Mr. Moore said that it costs \$5 million to manage the program. He said that \$5 million amounted to bureaucratic waste and that the remaining \$3 million, if I understood your explanation, was distributed to cultural organizations that were really eligible.

Mr. Alain Paré: To artistic companies.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: But, what was the \$5 million used for?

Mr. Alain Paré: That amount was used for the infamous trade commissioners that Heritage Canada appointed or sent to work in certain Canadian embassies abroad. In reality, they were duplicating the work carried out by cultural attachés or advisors who didn't have the budgets or necessary resources to promote Canadian companies on the ground. And that does not include the trade commissioners that were operating in certain Canadian cities. The cost of that was enormous. The funding was used to help Canadian companies develop, but it was not really necessary. The money was not used appropriately.

In 2001, when I was a member of the task force, the plan that we brought forward provided for this funding to be paid directly to Canadian organizations, associations or companies for them to look after their own development and promote their own creative work and productions abroad. That recommendation was not acted on. Instead, the decision was made to put trade commissioners in Canadian embassies abroad, at tremendous cost. In my opinion, this was a source of waste within the department.

Now Canadian companies are being penalized in terms of their future development. No rationale has been given for that decision, in terms of the \$2 or \$3 million that was paid to Canadian companies.

[English]

The Chair: The time is up

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: I have a short question.

The Chair: No, we are almost at six minutes.

[Translation]

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: Already?

[English]

I can't believe that.

The Chair: You'll have an opportunity. Yes, time just flies.

Mr. Angus, please.

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

I'm very pleased to have your presentations before us today.

It has been very interesting to try to work our way through this. I was quite surprised that when our government was going to cut programs in the arts, it would cut on exports and the promotion of export culture, because I thought there were certainly other ways, if a government wanted to attack arts or cut programs, they could do that. Why would they focus on the export sector?

When we got our first answer, it was from the Prime Minister, who said this was just taxpayers subsidizing galas for rich people. Yet what I'm hearing from you is that these were costs to cover freight and flight for dancers and artists.

Are you aware of any other government in the G8 that doesn't meet what I consider to be this relatively meagre standard for promotion of tours, to just pay for flights and pay to make sure the gear actually gets there? Is that standard? Is that at least what all other G8 countries do? Is there any other G8 country that doesn't see the value of exporting cultural product?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Paré: That is normal practice. As Mr. Faucher was explaining earlier, the Goethe Institute in Germany, Culturesfrance, Arts Council England and the Japan Foundation are some of the many organizations that support international touring by their artistic companies by defraying the costs of travel for personnel, as well as technical costs. That is an international practice followed by all countries. Some, France in particular, even pay performance fees to companies to promote their country through its culture and through the work of their artistic companies, whether we're talking about books, film or the performing arts. So, this is really a way of gaining increased visibility for their country. It is common practice.

Mr. Martin Faucher: I am part of the Festival TransAmériques de Montréal. This summer, we will be hosting a German dance company that will be presenting a major show. There has been very significant collaboration with the Goethe Institute, to make it possible for the show to be presented in Ottawa and Montreal. Also, a Chilean company will be presenting two small shows. Now, one can hardly say that Chile is a rich country. Yet it has just created an organization whose sole purpose is to promote its artists on the international scene. It provides very significant funding so that these performances can occur.

When we go to all these festivals, we meet up with our international partners and work on securing venues and presentation opportunities for artists and their works. All countries contribute to ensuring those opportunities exist.

•(1610)

Mr. Alain Paré: It is important to remember that the money given to Canadian companies to cover international transportation costs is paid to Air Canada, a Canadian carrier. That money is not spent abroad; it stays here in Canada.

[*English*]

Ms. Shannon Litzenberger: Could I add to that?

As you can imagine, Canada is geographically distant from much of the foreign market, and so it is particularly important that this investment be made for Canadian companies and artists. Also, it is a reciprocal policy that when festivals like Luminato invite companies from abroad, those companies pay for the travel of their artists to come to our festivals, and so we need to be able to reciprocate that.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm going to follow up on this, because not only is Canada distant from foreign markets, Canadian companies are also distant from their own markets. It's very expensive to travel in Canada, and Madam Litzenberger, it might have been you who said there just isn't a big enough domestic market to ensure viability of operation.

Let's consider your theatre company, which began in 1980. If we were looking at the same situation today of a small dance or theatre company, given the fact that many of the arts programs have been cut over the years, in terms of the viability of an operation that you say had 140,000 attendees on the latest tour, how could you grow a company like that without having an international market?

I offer that to you or to anyone else who would like to speak.

Mr. Edouard Lock: It wouldn't be possible. In a way, I think it's really something that permits the outside or other countries to invest in Canadian talent and Canadian artists.

[*Translation*]

We have the sense that grant money is provided for the creation of cultural products, that artists are asked to set up their own companies and create these works, but that after that, nobody wants them to be exported or for them to have a chance to be seen elsewhere. That really makes no sense whatsoever, considering that much of that grant money is compensated by the revenues that are generated when our products are exported.

[*English*]

Ms. Shannon Litzenberger: Because dance companies are not connected to another major commercial cultural industry the way music is to the sound recording industry, for example, we can only generate revenue from live performances, so access to as many markets as possible is critical.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll move now to Mr. Del Mastro, please.

Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Peterborough, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, witnesses, for appearing here today. I appreciate your taking the time to make your presentations to the committee.

The first thing I want to make clear is that we've heard an awful lot of discussion about PromArt. As you're well aware, PromArt is not a file within the Department of Canadian Heritage, it's a Foreign Affairs program. It's not within the scope of the study before us. That said, I appreciate hearing your comments on that.

Mr. Paré, I wanted to come back to you. I've done some research on CINARS, and I pulled up the funding history on CINARS going back to 1991. I found CINARS had received about \$1.1 million, roughly, in total federal government funding since 1991; \$405,000 of that is in the last two fiscal years under our government. So up until the point we were government, you averaged \$47,000 per year and you've averaged a little over \$200,000 under our government. Yet you've been a harsh critic, I think it's fair to say, of our government.

Do you think maybe you're not being fully open with folks when you're talking about the level of support you're receiving from our government, from the government in general?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Paré: I am not criticizing your government. I am saying that Canadian artistic companies do not have the necessary funding to tour internationally. I am grateful to the Canadian government for supporting our organization, because our mandate is, in fact, to support and assist Canadian companies to export their products.

The funding received from the federal government for our event—which is held every two years—generates between \$12 and \$14 million in revenues for Canadian companies. Once again, this is a cost-effective investment and the economic impact is considerable. We are asking that this funding be restored or that it be used to help Canadian companies carry out their international touring activities.

•(1615)

[*English*]

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: Okay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

[*English*]

The Chair: Very, very short.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Before Mr. Del Mastro goes back to his questions, I would just like to comment on the way we operate in committee in terms of questioning witnesses. This is quite a sensitive matter. I don't know whether he is referring to the funding each group has received, but the impression could be left that the government is engaging in a form of blackmail, in terms of providing grant money only to people who share their views. I would not like that impression to be left.

I see no reason for there to be any discussion of individual funding.

[*English*]

The Chair: I'm going to make a ruling here. I think we've let the questioning go the way of the opposition parties. I don't see that this puts anyone in jeopardy or puts any words in anyone's mouth. All I heard were some positive things put forward, and I respect that. As chair, I have allowed the opposition to put its points forward: I will now allow the government side to put its forward.

Yes, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: On a point of order, I think it would be good to have a general ruling that we don't want the government having access to or going through requests for funding and then being able to use it here at committee. I think it would only be fair to specific companies speaking before us that the government is not pulling up their file and saying, well, we're looking at how much money we gave you. I think that would be inappropriate.

I don't mind the general question of arts; that's certainly a fair question, but for the parliamentary secretary to refer to any individual, organization, and how much money they're getting, I think, has no place here.

The Chair: I'm going to go to Ms. Lavallée, and then to Mr. Bruinooge.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: I fully agree. Indeed, I think it would be unfortunate for the witnesses we have invited here today to have the amounts of money they have received thrown up at them. When money is given to cultural organizations, it is for the cultural work that they perform, for artistic development. That is why they are given the money. It is not so that they can agree with the ideology of the government providing the funding.

[*English*]

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: On the same point of order—

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: I would ask everyone at this table not to engage in that kind of questioning.

Thank you.

[*English*]

The Chair: Before I take the next points of order, and if we're going to carry this on until 4:30, there will be no more questioning of our panel. In all fairness to the panel, to our witnesses, we've brought them here to hear what they have to say, and we will respect the distances they have come. If we want to keep on with the points of order, I'll stay on that until 4:30 and then we'll recess.

Mr. Bruinooge, Ms. Dhalla, Ms. Glover, and then Mr. Del Mastro.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge (Winnipeg South, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I tend to agree. This is starting to delve into a bit of a debate.

That being said, when the parliamentary secretary acknowledges publicly available information about government allocations of funds, I think it is germane to this discussion, in light of the fact that this discussion seems to be focused on a reduction of government support for the arts. When compared with the facts, it doesn't seem to be, in my opinion, actually holding true to reality. So I think Mr. Del Mastro's point is fair, and as such, in light of the fact that it is public information, I don't see the concern that's been expressed by a number of the members.

The Chair: We'll go to Ms. Dhalla, Ms. Glover, and then Mr. Del Mastro. And hopefully we can carry on.

Ms. Ruby Dhalla (Brampton—Springdale, Lib.): Not to belabour the point that my other colleague just said, I just hope that, moving forward, the other witnesses we have coming to the committee do not feel intimidated in any way, shape, or form, in that if they are receiving any type of funding from the government they do not have a right to speak out. I would hope that this was not the intention of the parliamentary secretary in terms of bringing forward the information. A number of organizations receive funding from the Government of Canada, but they do have a right to have their opinions, whether or not they're in the favour of the government.

The Chair: Ms. Glover.

Mrs. Shelly Glover (Saint Boniface, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to touch on this subject very briefly.

The opposition parties, with all due respect, want to be able to put forward negative lines of questioning. And any time our respected witnesses want to give credit to the government, as Mr. Paré did during the question from the parliamentary secretary, immediately points of order are made. It doesn't seem fair to the witnesses that they're not able to provide their positive reinforcement of what the government has done. And I want to remind people under the previous Liberal government, the number was brought forward of how much was made. It wasn't a reflection on the witness but rather a reflection on the previous Liberal government, which only gave \$47,000. The NDP will never be in government. They continue to vote against any kind of inflation toward arts and culture.

And so we're simply putting our position forward so that the witnesses can comment.

• (1620)

The Chair: Mr. Del Mastro, please make it short, because we have only about seven minutes left.

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: On the point of order, if I'm not able to reference money, when this is about money...? Is this not about money? Haven't the hearings I've been in been about money? What are we talking about? Cuts? Cuts to what? Apparel? Cuts to what? Cuts to money. So if I'm not allowed to reference money to point out how we're spending more money.... And maybe none of you like that because you're all trying to misrepresent the numbers. The numbers are what they are. Math only indicates that addition means addition. You can't do addition by subtraction. Therefore, if I'm not allowed to talk about money, since it's about money, what are we even here for? It's ridiculous. Of course I'm allowed to quote what's been awarded. This is public information. And the fact that we're even into this point of order is an absolute waste of time.

The Chair: I'm making my decision that we're going to carry on. Nothing has been said in this line of questioning that is against any rules. We are talking, again, about some very serious things to a lot of people.

Mr. Del Mastro, carry on with your questioning, please. You have two and a half minutes left.

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

I'd like to reiterate that every dollar the government spends is competitively lobbied for from every industry in every department the government deals with. I was on the finance committee for three years, and I can tell you there is never a dollar picked up in strategic review or invested that isn't questioned by virtually every group that comes before the committee. It's very common. Government has only so much money to work with, but it has an infinite number of requests. That's where the parties disagree, but we have to deal with the facts when it comes to arts and culture.

Mr. Paré, we have announced \$276 million in new funds. That's a 10% increase to the overall department in budget 2009. Of this amount, \$100 million is for festivals. You indicated you thought that was all about tourism, with nothing going to the arts, but tourism is such an enormous part of what we're doing. I think when we're talking about international travel and promoting internationally, we

should also be trying to draw international visitors here to share Canadian culture and promote Canadian communities and identity.

I'm not sure I understand why the \$100 million we're putting into promoting festivals isn't wholeheartedly supported by the arts community here in Canada. Can you share that with me?

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Paré: The \$100 million that you have announced is for festivals. It is not for tourism; it is to attract people from abroad to participate in various festivals here in Canada. It has absolutely no impact on companies that tour abroad. These festivals present programming for the public, and thus there is no direct effect on what is known as outreach and assistance for foreign export of artistic creations and productions. The problem may be that you really don't understand that we are talking about two totally different things here.

[English]

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: I do understand. I'm saying that domestic festivals are under intense pressure because there is a drop-off in advertising revenue, and if that money wasn't there and domestic productions failed, the ramifications of that would be felt by more than just arts groups. It would be felt by virtually every industry in Canada, including restaurants and hotel facilities, in every small community that depends on tourism, and every large community, including cities like Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, Calgary, and Edmonton. If these festivals fail, it's a big hit to the arts community and to so many other business interests that are supported by this money.

Wouldn't you agree with that?

The Chair: Give a very short answer, please.

• (1625)

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Faucher: I would just like to add that, in Quebec, we have five major theatre—exclusively theatre—and artistic festivals. Of the \$30 million announced by Ms. Verner for prominent festivals, 0.10 per cent of the budget increase went to these artistic festivals, and the rest went to the other festivals. My comments are not in any way a criticism of those other festivals, but art festivals, which are an opportunity for our artists and companies to make a direct connection with their audiences, are receiving very, very, very little benefit from this increase. If there were a substantial increase in funding, I think that connection would be very strong. For the time being, that is not the case.

[English]

The Chair: Ms. Litzenberger.

Ms. Shannon Litzenberger: Investment in festivals will be rendered less effective if we can't reciprocate those relationships. Festivals are about bringing foreign cultural product to Canada, but if we are not sending Canadian product abroad, how do you expect us to maintain relationships with those foreign buyers? It's a reciprocal relationship, and you're disabling one side of that relationship.

The Chair: Ms. Dhalla, you have about two and a half minutes.

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: We know that the Canadian Television Fund, Telefilm, the Canadian Independent Film and Video Fund, PromArt, the Canada Feature Film Fund, and Canadian Culture Online were cut. Your organizations have also expressed frustration today about the cuts.

In the months leading up to these cuts, did you receive any type of consultation from the department itself that you would potentially have cuts made to your organizations?

You can just go one by one very quickly and state yes or no.

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: Perhaps they could indicate if they had notices of increases.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Paré: In our case, we were not consulted. We found out through the media, like everyone else.

[English]

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: You learned through the media, okay.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Faucher: Neither were we. We represent about 150 Quebec—both Anglophone and Francophone—theatre companies. We were not consulted at all.

[English]

Ms. Shannon Litzenberger: No, we weren't consulted.

[Translation]

Mr. Edouard Lock: No, we were not consulted.

[English]

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: Mr. Paré was saying that he found out through the media. Could the other individuals tell me how they found out that they would be having cuts made to their organization, despite the fact that they represent hundreds and thousands of artists.

Ms. Shannon Litzenberger: We found out via the website.

[Translation]

Mr. Edouard Lock: Through the media.

A voice: In the newspaper.

A voice: Through the media.

A voice: Through the media.

[English]

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: All of you who are here today, you all found out through the media that you would be having cuts made to your organizations?

Mr. Alain Paré: Yes. Through the media, yes.

Ms. Ruby Dhalla: The witnesses were talking about almost 327 tours being cancelled, 3,400 representations, and almost \$24 million in costs being lost as a result of the cuts, and I believe Shannon had just mentioned the reciprocal relationship being imbalanced and one side of it being cut. Could you please tell all of us on the committee here a little bit more about how the cuts are going to have an impact on Canada's international reputation by our not being able to send artists abroad to different festivals and different events?

Ms. Shannon Litzenberger: As I mentioned in my presentation, it's simply a lack of a presence of Canadian artists and companies abroad. So we're much less visible on the international scene and, again, unable to reciprocate trade relationships in culture on the world stage.

The Chair: I hate to interrupt, but our points of order took up some time here during this process and our hour is up. We will recess right now and wait for our next witnesses, please.

Thank you very much, witnesses, for being here today.

• (1625)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (1635)

The Chair: Welcome back to the second half of our meeting today. The meeting will be over at 5:30.

Our witnesses for this hour include Stanley Péan, from UNEQ; from INIS, Jean Hamel and Jacques Blain; and from RIDEAU, Colette Brouillé. Welcome.

We will start off with Mr. Péan.

[Translation]

Mr. Stanley Péan (President, Union des écrivaines et des écrivains québécois (UNEQ)): Mr. Chairman—

[English]

The Chair: And excuse my translation. Sometimes I'm not too good at it, but I try.

Thanks.

[Translation]

Mr. Stanley Péan: Mr. Chairman, no offence taken.

Ladies and gentlemen members of the committee, I would like to begin by thanking you for this opportunity to speak today on behalf of the Union des écrivaines et des écrivains québécois, in my capacity as president of the organization first elected in December 2004 in the first of three consecutive mandates.

To begin with, I would like to give you some background information about UNEQ, a professional organization founded on March 21, 1977 by 50 or so writers on the initiative of Jacques Godbout. The UNEQ represents almost 1,400 writers, poets, novelists, playwrights, essayists, authors who write for children and scientific and technical writers. The UNEQ's mandate is to work to promote and disseminate Quebec literature in Quebec, Canada and abroad, and to defend the socio-economic rights of writers. It was recognized in 1990 as the most representative association of artists in the literary community under the *Loi sur le statut professionnel des artistes des arts visuels, des métiers d'art et de la littérature et sur leurs contrats avec les diffuseurs*, L.R.Q, chapter S-32.01.

The UNEQ was also certified in 1996 by the Canadian Artists and Producers Professional Relations Tribunal, giving it the exclusive right to negotiate with federally regulated producers for the purposes of reaching a framework agreement setting out conditions of employment for self-employed professional writers.

I do not intend to discuss the direct impact of the PromArt and Trade Routes programs on the UNEQ, which was not one of the beneficiaries of these programs, for obvious reasons. Instead, I will focus on the international dissemination of the works of some of our members that is made possible through federal government support.

Among the cancelled programs, PromArt was the one most often used by publishers, who would receive assistance towards the payment of travel costs for writers invited to meet with their foreign readers at book fairs and launches, or any other activity connected to book promotion outside Canada. Only travel costs were covered under PromArt. This was, therefore, a shared-cost program which was deeply appreciated by both publishers and writers, as it lowered the cost of promotional campaigns and facilitated agreements with foreign editors who had translated the book, or with foreign organizations that invited authors to their countries. It is through the attendance of our writers and publishers at international meetings, symposia and book fairs that Canadian and Quebec literature can become better known internationally.

Last August, Pascal Assathiany, Director of *Éditions du Boréal* publishing house, pointed out that the PromArt program had enabled two writers whose works had been published by his firm to make a name for themselves across the globe, including Gil Courtemanche, author of *Un dimanche à la piscine à Kigali*, and Gaétan Soucy, author of *La Petite fille qui aimait trop les allumettes*, who subsequently saw their work translated into a number of languages. Through PromArt, these writers were invited abroad by Canadian embassies and several different countries, including the Netherlands, as the publisher himself pointed out to journalist Paul Journet of *La Presse*, saying, and I quote: "These invitations helped them see their work translated into more than 20 languages. Only about \$3,000 or \$4,000 was needed to pay for their plane ticket and their stay there, and to organize meetings." According to Mr. Assathiany, in the last five years, between \$25,000 and \$30,000 has been invested in promoting works published by Boréal. Even if we multiply that by the number of Quebec publishing firms whose writers have made a breakthrough internationally—a half-dozen at most—we would still be talking about modest, but at the same time extremely useful, amounts of money, as I am sure you will agree.

Again, the Association nationale des éditeurs de livres, or ANEL, generally benefited from the Trade Routes program. In 2008, it received approximately \$15,000 under the program, a grant that allowed the organization to take part in the *Escale du livre* in Bordeaux, in the Book Fair in London, and to successfully carry out a project in China which has had a direct impact on the career of writers whose works, on such occasions, benefit from exposure outside our borders.

Notwithstanding the allegations made by the former Minister of Canadian Heritage, Ms. Josée Verner, allegations that continue to be made by her successor, Mr. Moore, to the effect that these programs were poorly managed and ineffective, for their part, publishing sector stakeholders believe that, even though grants provided were modest, the funding served its purpose, which makes the cancellation of these programs that much more regrettable, in their collective opinion.

Another comment made was, and I quote: "[...] most of the budget comes from Québec Édition, a partnership between ANEL and SODEC, and the Association for the Export of Canadian Books", this time by Pierre Lefrançois, Executive Director of the ANEL, when speaking to the same journalist from *La Presse*. He went on to say: "But, for an organization like ours, every penny counts."

Naysayers like to repeat that Quebec and Canadian publishing is oversubsidized. However, they may be interested in knowing that government assistance only represents 7 p. 100 of the industry's total revenues.

- (1640)

As for overall subsidies granted the publishing industry, they are infinitely smaller than those that benefit Bell Helicopter or Bombardier.

Given that our best writers have access to creative development grants provided by Canadian Heritage through the Canada Council for the Arts, the cancellation of programs that provide assistance for foreign exposure, as well as the promotion and export of Canadian works, sends a particularly paradoxical message. In the absence of new programs to support the international promotion of our literature, again, to quote Pascal Assathiany: "It would be a little like subsidizing Bombardier to produce airplanes, but not helping it to sell them on the international market."

Notwithstanding the alleged ineffectiveness of the PromArt and Trade Routes programs, their cancellation seems to consistent with a logic that I and my colleagues find worrisome. Since the Conservatives first took office, we have had occasion to deplore the dismantling of cultural services in our Canadian embassies, which is becoming increasingly difficult not to interpret as the expression of an ideology that clearly does not support international exposure for the craftspeople and products of an industry that contributes just as much to Canada's image as it does to its economic dynamism.

A statement made to the *National Post* last September by Minister Jim Flaherty, with respect to the cancellation of these programs, continues to haunt me: “We are a conservative government, and Cabinet ministers also wear that hat”, he said. This is not a bureaucratic process, but a decision made by ministers who sit on the Treasury Board and have their own ideas about these programs. I don’t have to tell you that I certainly hope I am wrong in fearing the worst.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your kind attention.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you.

Now the spokespeople from INIS, please.

[Translation]

Mr. Jacques Blain (Producer, Business Development, Cirrus Communications, Institut national de l’image et du son (INIS)): Thank you very much for inviting us, Mr. Chairman. I also want to thank the members of the committee.

I intend to share my five minutes with Mr. Hamel.

My name is Jacques Blain and I am a member of the Board of Directors of INIS. I am here today representing the Chairman of the Board and the Executive Director of the organization, both of whom are outside of the country.

Jean Hamel, who is the Director of Communications and Marketing, will make a brief statement, and I will have some final comments at the end.

Mr. Jean Hamel (Director of Communications, Institut national de l’image et du son (INIS)): Thank you very much.

My presentation this afternoon will, in fact, be a summary of the brief that we provided today, in both French and English, I believe. It is a short summary outlining our main points.

The INIS is a professional training centre that contributes to the development of the film, television and interactive media community in Quebec and Canada, by providing access to training programs for both individuals and businesses that respond to the demands and changes occurring in the audiovisual, communications and entertainment markets. Since its beginnings in January 1996, the INIS has trained some 381 professionals who work as screenwriters, directors and producers. The most recent surveys conducted by the INIS confirm that nearly 80 per cent of graduates are in positions directly related to the training they received—often in key positions. In addition to these graduates from the regular programs, there are several thousand professionals who have come to the INIS to upgrade their skills in the short and medium term.

The INIS is the only French-language institution of its kind in Canada. It belongs to a network of four training centres, including the CFC in Toronto, the NSI in Winnipeg and the CSTC in Ottawa. Since 1994, the federal government has provided grants of almost \$14 million dollars to the INIS to help it carry out its mission. However, on Friday, August 8, 2008, the INIS was informed that the National Training Program for the Film and Video Sector, funded by Canadian Heritage and administered by Telefilm Canada, would not be extended beyond April 1, 2009. This decision followed on the

heels of an evaluation which did not actually recommend that the program be cancelled. We are still unaware of the specific reasons for its cancellation, but its impact on the INIS is quite clear. For the Institute, the cancellation of this program will mean the loss of approximately \$900,000 annually, or almost 25 per cent of its operating budget.

In addition, if the INIS is no longer able to access the Canada New Media Fund, another program funded by Canadian Heritage, the shortfall in its operating budget stemming from the loss of the federal contribution will exceed \$1 million. The Institute’s funding structure is based on money received from both levels of government, and on contributions of both money and services from private enterprise. Since 1994, the share of government funding has been constantly decreasing. Indeed, it went from more than 90 per cent in 1994-1995 to 53 p. 100 in the current fiscal year, 2008-2009—in other words, we have achieved a near perfect balance between public and private sources of funding.

However, being deprived of as significant an amount of funding as \$1 million per year, the INIS loses one of the main levers allowing it to seek financial contributions from private companies and support through services offered on a “two-for-one” or “three-for-one” basis, for every dollar paid. The consequences of cancelling the program therefore include a decrease in independent revenues and the underfunding of the Institute, to the tune of some \$2 million in money and services. In concrete terms, the cancellation of the program compromises the very existence of the Institute. Were the INIS to close, we would be looking at the permanent loss of exceptional expertise that has been built up over a 13-year period and to which, it should be pointed out, the federal government has contributed some \$14 million. The closure of the Institute would also mean there would no longer be trained professional graduates able to successfully move into professional circles.

A simple solution to the problem caused by the cancellation of the National Training Program in the Film and Video Sector would be to immediately include the INIS in the National Arts Training Program. If the National Arts Training Program does not appear to be the appropriate solution, in the opinion of the federal government, it is urgent that the latter provide a clear response regarding its short- and long-term intentions for professional training in the film, television and interactive media sectors. The survival of a unique institution with a long track record is at stake.

● (1645)

I would now like to turn it over to Jacques Blain, who is a producer, and who can speak from experience about the Institute’s positive impact on professional activities in the film and television sectors.

Thank you.

Mr. Jacques Blain: I would like to complete our presentation with some final comments made without notes.

I have been a producer for 30 years. I take part in the everyday activities of the INIS as a member of the board and as a trainer, from time to time. I also benefit, on a daily basis, from the training provided by the Institute. I produced the film *C.R.A.Z.Y* and the series *La Vie, la vie*. We produce series such as *Naked Josh* and *Ciao Bella* in French and English.

The INIS is an organization with very deep roots in Quebec society, because all the trainers come from the community. They are not theorists; rather, they are practitioners who teach students who have been very carefully chosen. Indeed, 80 per cent of them end up finding jobs. In an environment where technological change is both quick and significant, the role of the Institute in our fast-paced society is absolutely vital.

There is also a lot of discussion about the new generation, which is of particular interest to me. Many baby-boomers, including myself, will soon be leaving the industry. If we do not train people capable of doing the job, we will be in very dire straits.

Canada and Quebec currently have a marked advantage when it comes to production. We export our expertise. A fellow who worked with us until last year is now the Director of Fiction for TF1, the largest French-speaking television network in the world. So, we export both expertise and productions.

I find it rather irresponsible, on the part of the federal government, to completely withdraw support. Federal funding represents 25 p. 100 of the Institute's operating budget. It simply is not possible to take that kind of action at a time when it is essential to excel in the world. We absolutely must find a way to restore the Institute's budget. The very survival of the organization is at stake—an organization that has been successful, since its creation, in providing Quebec with new directors, producers and authors, and in developing professional development programs that have benefited everyone.

I must admit that I am at a loss when it comes to the intricacies of government programs, but if another program comes forward that allows to compensate the lost funding, that would be an absolutely essential step in ensuring the survival of the INIS.

Thank you for your attention.

• (1650)

[English]

We're ready to answer your questions, in French or in English.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Now, Ms. Brouillé, please.

[Translation]

Mrs. Colette Brouillé (Executive Director, Réseau indépendant des diffuseurs d'événements artistiques unis (RIDEAU)): Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

My name is Colette Brouillé. I am the Executive Director of RIDEAU, the largest network of French-speaking presenters of artistic events in Canada. I would like to thank the committee for agreeing to hear the views of an institution from the performing arts sector.

After 30 years of existence, our organization has 150 members based in over 200 sites across Quebec, and three member networks in French-speaking Canada as a whole. In 2007, box office revenues totalled \$87 million in Quebec alone.

RIDEAU also operates at the international level. A leader in the presentation of the performing arts, it is one of the founding member organizations of the AREA network, which brings together partners from Canada, France, Belgium and Switzerland.

Every year, RIDEAU organizes the Bourse RIDEAU, the largest annual gathering of Francophone professionals from the performing arts. Our 22nd edition, which has just taken place, attained a new attendance record, with 1,400 participants. Among these, some 50 artistic companies showed their works to presenters from here and abroad, and 170 booking agents set up stalls at the venue. Over a three-day period, these stalls were visited by festival or theatre presenters intent on building their programs.

In concrete terms, the Bourse RIDEAU is a market place for discussing business, signing contracts and making deals. It is a forum for commercial transactions, a meeting point for supply and demand, and an extraordinary showcase that brings together established and emerging artists, from every discipline, which has huge economic spinoffs for Canadian companies at various stages of their development.

Ten per cent of the artistic programming presented through the Bourse RIDEAU is made up of foreign content: productions which, for the most part, tour Quebec or Canada within two years of their presentation at the Bourse. This creates an opening onto the world stage for all of the audiences served by RIDEAU, as well as its members across Canada. The countries of origin of artists who perform at the Bourse RIDEAU, and then on tour, are responsible for international transportation costs, while we defray the domestic transportation costs and daily expenses during their stay.

A government's support for its exports is a guarantee of quality for the importing country. Without this support, business dealings become much more difficult. The cultural industry should not be exempt from these principles. Yet budget cuts imposed by the government, particularly to the PromArt and Trade Routes programs, effectively end this reciprocity, thereby destroying years of work and investments and adversely affecting our international image.

It is in this spirit of reciprocity that the Bourse RIDEAU hosts a delegation of foreign presenters. At the last edition, presenters from Belgium, France, Switzerland and Mexico came to witness, for themselves, the vitality of our artistic productions and, more concretely, to sign performance contracts with Canadian artistic companies. That is just one of many examples I could choose.

You will have heard some pretty big figures mentioned at your recent meetings. Ours are smaller, but just as convincing. At the 2008 Bourse RIDEAU, the theatre company *Le Clou* presented its latest work, entitled *Isberg*. Allow me to give you some details regarding the economic spinoffs of their participation in a single tour across France: 16 performances, which represent 33 per cent of the 2008-2009 season for that show; five designers and the playwright will receive residuals; a 33 per cent increase in performance fees and residuals for the actors; the production will be presented at seven different venues, including one of the most important festivals for young audiences, *Mélimôme*, which is an ideal showcase where other presenters can see their performances and include them in their own programming; independent revenues of some \$80,000, which represent 13 per cent of the company's independent revenues for the 2008-2009 season; and, finally, meetings that have already been scheduled with presenters, in order to develop co-production agreements for the company's next production.

That is just one example, compared to the 50 or so productions presented annually and 170 booking agents and artistic companies that attend the event. These spinoffs, it is safe to assume, can be multiplied accordingly.

Another remarkable initiative is that 10 foreign presenters invited to the Bourse RIDEAU got together and, in association with SODEC, created a \$40,000 prize for a singer, called the *Prix des diffuseurs internationaux*. The winner of the prize in 2009, singer-songwriter Caracol, will thus be able to take her latest show on a European tour involving no less than 10 performances in French-speaking Europe. In 2008, Andrea Lindsay, originally from Ontario, was the prize winner. This has enabled her to give 12 performances at 11 different venues in France, Belgium and Switzerland.

In 2009, support received by RIDEAU from the Trade Routes program totalled \$16,000. We found out in November, three months away from the event, that PromArt was withdrawing our financial support. The figures that have just been mentioned clearly demonstrate what an important economic lever these investments were.

How could anyone possibly have shown this kind of support to be ineffective, such that the program would be cancelled? If the program had flaws—flaws that we would like to see properly explained—it is important that they be analyzed alongside members of the artistic community, and that solutions be found quickly, based on a vision that goes beyond the effect of a single program.

•(1655)

For RIDEAU, it is essential that the networks which present artistic events, which affect the daily lives of people throughout Canada, have access to funding from the Department of Canadian Heritage, in order to maintain and develop their international relationships. Presenters of multidisciplinary productions are not part of the Canada Council's clientele.

Furthermore, we would be remiss in not mentioning the elimination in the medium term—in our view, unjustified—of the Skills Development program. According to studies, this program was effective, particularly in Quebec. With the challenges facing the new generation of presenters, it is critical that we continue to

develop and adapt business models in our sector and to fully support these initiatives.

In closing, I would like to point out that RIDEAU believes in cultural diplomacy—the process of forging ties with foreign countries with a view to increasing their understanding of the ideas and ideals of our government, of its institutions and the culture it represents. We believe that this diplomacy operates primarily through international programs focused on dissemination and education, as well as cultural exchanges.

Today, we are here to talk about the cancellation of inexpensive government programs, although we are still waiting to see evidence of their ineffectiveness. To say that these programs are a “waste” of public money, in order to justify their cancellation, reflects a deplorable lack of understanding of the real issues and of the extraordinary role played by our artists and cultural workers, who have done so much to enhance Canada's image at large. Whether by accident or as a consequence, is this image now not being tarnished?

Thank you for your kind attention.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you.

We have one half hour left, so try to keep your questions and responses within five minutes, please.

Mr. Rodriguez, first question.

[Translation]

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, would like to welcome you to the committee. Thank you very much for being with us today.

Ms. Brouillé, you concluded by saying that you would like to be given proof that these programs are ineffective. We would all like to see that proof. However, when we ask the government to show us why these programs are not working, it hides behind the fact that documents are confidential, and so on.

Mr. Chairman, to that end, I tabled a motion asking the government to provide the documents which were the basis for making the cuts by last Friday at noon. However, we have received nothing, with the exception of a two- or three-word e-mail. I am very anxious to receive those documents, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, the government is hiding behind documents that it promises to provide, but that we never receive. Furthermore, you and others have been telling us, week after week, that these programs are working, even though they do not have all the facts as to the way they are managed. They told us that the monies received had been used by artists, craftspeople and companies. Those programs have resulted in numerous success stories.

My sense is that this is a case where the baby has been thrown out with the bath water. These programs may not be entirely perfect, but rather than cancelling altogether, an intermediate solution could have been found. People have suggested that the programs be restored, and that they be managed by the Canada Council for the Arts.

Do you agree with that?

•(1700)

Mrs. Colette Brouillé: Presenters of multidisciplinary events are not part of the Canada Council's client base. We have to find another way of working. We fully agree that Canadian Heritage should be given a budget to manage for the purpose of meeting the needs of multidisciplinary presenters.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: That is a very good point you make: that people who could avail themselves of these programs previously now be part of the Canada Council's client base.

Mr. Hamel and Mr. Blain, you said that federal funding amounted to 25 per cent of your revenues, which is huge. Is there a danger that you will cease to exist?

Mr. Jean Hamel: Yes, that risk is real. A 25 per cent cut to our operating budget obviously has a very concrete impact. As I explained, that 25 per cent is on top of the money we will not be getting from the private sector. Very often, collaboration takes the form of technical services.

Let me give you an actual example. The company Technicolor is a major partner of the INIS and provides services at a rate equal to three for one. In other words, that company gives us \$3 worth of services for every dollar we spend.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: You say that the INIS is the only French-speaking institution to provide that kind of service and training.

Mr. Jean Hamel: Training at that level.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: At that level, yes.

Mr. Jean Hamel: I would just like to try and clarify the level of training provided by the INIS. One may be tempted to think there are other institutions of the same type out there. However, the training we provide is of a level comparable to what is offered in universities, for example, or other private training centres.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: So, there could be an important gap. You have trained screenwriters, directors, and people who work in production.

Mr. Jean Hamel: Yes, producers. As part of our regular programming, we train people in three different fields: screenwriting, direction and production. As part of our professional development programming, we provide training in all the professions.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Thank you very much.

Monsieur Péan.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: I know him. He specializes in literature for young people.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: I am very happy to see you here today, because we have heard a lot about people who work in the theatre, in music and in dance. You are here from the publishing sector, representing writers. I would like to ask you to tell us a little bit more about the impact on the people you represent. We have tended to think mainly about people in the film and dance communities in terms of these cuts. But I am very happy that you are here and I am interested to hear what you have to say.

Mr. Stanley Péan: Well, as I was saying, writers are affected in so far as their publishers secure invitations to book fairs or launches, where there is a translation agreement in place. It is in that respect that PromArt, for example, could benefit a writer, because he or she

would have his travel expenses paid to attend an event such as—and here, I am thinking of Gil Courtemanche or Gaétan Soucy—the launch of his book in foreign language translation. That applies to both of these two writers and to others as well who have seen their work translated into different languages.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: I presume that other countries provide those services as well.

Mr. Stanley Péan: Reciprocity is such that, when foreign writers come here, their cultural diplomacy service is the one that sends them. The example that comes to mind is France, which is a very significant partner for the Quebec publishing industry. When book fairs are held in Montreal or elsewhere in the province, writers are often invited to attend through the French cultural service.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Ms. Lavallée, please.

Don't forget to look my way. Then I can let you know that you're getting to the end of your time.

[Translation]

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: Yes, right.

What I was saying earlier, during Mr. Rodriguez' speaking time, is that I am surprised they don't know you, Mr. Péan, given that you are a major Quebec author specializing in literature for young people. I was just teasing my friend, Pablo.

Mr. Péan, I am going to go quickly because I have wasted some of my time making jokes. Can you give us an example of one author you represent who has sold several thousand copies of his books in Quebec and was subsequently able to go abroad and sell many thousand more copies, thanks to a small grant from the federal government?

•(1705)

Mr. Stanley Péan: There are the two authors I referred to earlier: Gil Courtemanche and Gaétan Soucy. That is what happened to them. I could also talk about Yves Beauchemin, Marie Laberge or Arlette Cousture. They have written books that have travelled around the world.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: How many copies of the book by Gil Courtemanche *Un dimanche à la piscine à Kigali* were sold in Quebec?

Mr. Stanley Péan: In Quebec, about 30,000 copies.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: Fine. And abroad?

Mr. Stanley Péan: Well, we would have to multiply that number by a lot of different markets. At the present time, Gil Courtemanche has been translated into 26 different languages for a variety of markets. The book is considered an international bestseller. As you know, it was also turned into a film—a co-production with a foreign interest. So, we all know about the success of *Un dimanche à la piscine à Kigali*.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: Very good. I would now like to address a question to Mr. Hamel from the INIS. You referred to the National Training Program in the Film and Video Sector, a program with a budget of \$2.5 million. Four training schools were funded under that program, including the National Screen Institute in Winnipeg. Since then, additional funding has been provided to the National Arts Training Program. Additional funding of \$7 million is being made available for 2009-2010, and an additional \$13 million for 2010-2011.

Why not make use of that grant program?

Mr. Jean Hamel: The National Arts Training Program already existed. It funds training institutions such as the National Theatre School, the École Nationale de Cirque and, I believe, the Royal Winnipeg Ballet School—

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: Go on, I have only one minute left.

Mr. Jean Hamel: One possible solution suggested by the authors of the evaluation done of our program was to merge the National Training Program in the Film Sector with the National Arts Training Program. We think that could be an attractive solution. However, for the time being, our ability to apply under that program has not been confirmed. We are theoretically eligible, but we do not yet know whether our application would be accepted and analyzed.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: What is the deadline for applying?

Mr. Jean Hamel: Under that program, the deadline for filing an application is June 30.

Mrs. Carole Lavallée: In other words, last June 30.

Mr. Jean Hamel: It is the 30th of June that precedes the fiscal year. Therefore, we would theoretically have had to file our application by June 30, 2008 in order to be eligible for funding in the 2009-2010 fiscal year. That year is going to be particularly difficult for us, because it is the year when the cuts will be applied to our budget.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Pomerleau.

[Translation]

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Drummond, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief.

[English]

The Chair: You have about a minute and a half.

[Translation]

Mr. Roger Pomerleau: I want to extend my very sincere thanks to all of you for appearing today to comment on cuts to the programs we are currently reviewing.

My question is addressed to all of you, but particularly to Mr. Péan, because I really have no choice but to choose one of you.

All the witnesses who have appeared before the committee, without exception, have used the terms, in one form or the other, “irresponsible”, “illogical”, “incomprehensible” and “ideological”. No one has clearly explained why these programs have been cut. The witnesses all said that in the short, medium and long terms, this decision would jeopardize many different sectors of our cultural industries. They all talked about cuts that were not based on studies

and of which they had not been informed. Indeed, no one was consulted on this. Similarly, committee members have never seen such studies.

When you consider the amounts of money that are at stake—\$2, \$3, \$5 or \$6 million—it is clear that we are talking about peanuts. We are meeting here to talk about peanuts. Government budgets are in the billions of dollars—not millions. In English, there is a lovely proverb that goes: “penny wise, dollar foolish”.

Mr. Péan, do you not have the sense that we are considerably more penny wise than dollar foolish?

Mr. Stanley Péan: Yes, I do. These small amounts of money are vital in all the different disciplines, whether we are talking about theatre, dance or literature. That is particularly true for literature. As for the programs we are discussing now, literature was affected little, but the role of these programs was critical. The examples are there to prove it.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Angus asked if Mr. Davies could answer after the Conservatives today so Mr. Davies can get himself a bit around what's going on at this meeting.

It's my understanding that the next questioning will be split between Mr. Uppal and Ms. Glover. Mr. Uppal, please.

• (1710)

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

And thank you, everyone, for coming.

I know the opposition continues to use the word “cuts”, but this is reallocation of taxpayers' money; it's just a reallocation of funds. Nothing has been cut. It's actually been invested. We've actually invested \$276 million on top of what there was before. It's \$540 million in total. That's a huge investment into arts and culture.

It's interesting that there are a number of groups—I have a whole list who are very pleased with how the government has invested into arts and culture. *Magazines Canada* said it is delighted with this decision. The Canadian Conference of the Arts said this represents good news for the Canadian arts and culture sector. There's the director of the National Ballet of Canada: “We're really thrilled that there's a strong minister and that there were [two] pages in the budget devoted to the arts, which is a first in my history.”

In the *Toronto Star*, Mr. Knelman called the \$25 million investment for the Canada prizes “a huge breakthrough for the arts”. *Opera.ca* said that “the federal budget speaks eloquently to the place of culture in Canadian life”.

I have a question for Mr. Péan. Is the fact that we've invested hundreds of millions of dollars into the arts and culture in this country a good thing for the arts sector, really showing how much the government values arts and culture in Canada?

[Translation]

Mr. Stanley Péan: Yes, it is a good thing, but the redistribution you referred to left holes in the budgets of certain parts of the industry. There is nothing new about programs being cancelled, but we now have to be told where we should go for assistance when we are planning a tour or need funding to host a writer or a foreign theatre company, for example. That is the question the government cannot quite seem to answer. We applauded—and I myself did this in a number of interviews—what was positive in this budget, but we have an obligation to criticize what is bad.

[English]

Mrs. Shelly Glover: Thank you very much for coming today. I'm very glad to hear Monsieur Péan acknowledge that our government has done a number of very positive things for arts and culture, and probably more positive than artists have ever seen in previous governments.

I want to take a moment to address the collaborative opinion of all of you that the Canada Council for the Arts should be responsible for perhaps allocating some of these finances. I want to tell you that the Canada Council for the Arts has received an increase of 17% over two years from our government. In fact, Joseph Rotman, who is the chair of CCA, in *Le Devoir* last December said exactly this: proof exists that the federal government supports the arts through its funding to the Canada Council.

So I just want to go through a couple of facts about the Canada Council for the Arts. In the 2007-08 period, \$182.5 million has gone to CCA. Out of that, Quebec received \$51.7 million in funding, which represents 31.4% of total funding. Of that, because I know—

[Translation]

when you talk about writers, Mr. Péan,

[English]

writing and publishing, out of the travel grants to professional writers, they received \$117, 379. I can go through a number of places where we are investing in international travel.

I'll do that right now. Dance: international co-production for dance, \$277,500. Inter-arts program: travel grants to professional artists, \$78,000. I'll go to some larger numbers. Music: music touring grants, \$1,472,615; music travel grants to professional musicians, \$162,977. It goes on and on. Theatre: theatre touring and special incentive program, \$1,093,000. Again theatre, travel assistance for theatre, artistic directors, presenters and administrators, \$75,900. Theatre: theatre international programs, \$1,017,000.

There are a number of others. The total funding for travel assistance, I have to say for the people in the room who were here with the previous witnesses, is \$9.5 million from CCA and not what we heard from a previous witness earlier when he presented a chart that was, as he said, conservative. His numbers added up to just under \$3 million, and I'm telling you it's \$9.5 million from CCA.

So I want to thank you for acknowledging our government's commitment to arts and culture, and I want to thank you for coming here today. I wish you all the success in the future.

●(1715)

The Chair: I didn't hear a question, so thank you for that.

Mr. Simms.

Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.): I'm glad you're here today, and I'm going to do something legitimate for a change and actually make this hearing about you instead of about the political wranglings that happen in the House of Commons. How about that for a change?

I think we should be here to get some information from you. I'd like to point out to all my colleagues that this is the very reason why they're here, to do this, for us to extract the information to make future decisions.

Nevertheless, I'd like to ask you, Mr. Péan, about the situation you find yourself in. You made a comment that really actually interests me. You said something about the publisher you know who got two writers to be published because of the program that was available to them where they can promote themselves internationally. Could you go into more detail about that? I'm trying to explore how this program works. I understand the concept of foreign market development for our authors, for our artists, but how imperative is it for them to rely on a program such as this in order for them to publish material?

[Translation]

Mr. Stanley Péan: According to studies, 700 copies, on average, are sold in Quebec of books written by Quebec authors. When 2,000 copies are sold, we are talking about a bestseller. That gives you an idea of how small the market is.

When writers like Gaétan Soucy, who was the guest at the Paris Book Fair in 1999, or Gil Courtemanche, in 2001, are invited abroad and meet with publishers, it is an opportunity for them to be seen in other forums. And, as was the case for these two writers, who are the biggest success stories in Quebec publishing in the last 10 years, that can lead to the translation and export of their works. We're talking about books that have been translated into 26 different languages, in both cases.

That is why this support is important.

[English]

Mr. Scott Simms: I'm sorry, I hate to interrupt, but I don't have a lot of time.

So let me get this straight. You're saying that to have it translated into other languages leverages your material to a great degree, but in the absence of government programs to allow these people to travel, that falls through. Is that correct to say?

[Translation]

Mr. Stanley Péan: It is more difficult for publishers to pay for their writers' travel. That assistance allowed publishers to take writers with them on promotional tours.

[English]

Mr. Scott Simms: Okay, so for the most part the private sector does not facilitate a lot of travel for local authors?

[Translation]

Mr. Stanley Péan: These are shared-cost programs. PromArt and Trade Routes paid for plane tickets, but the publisher would defray the cost of their lodging while abroad.

[English]

Mr. Scott Simms: I guess what I'm trying to ask you is this. One dollar from the federal government to help promote your product internationally really translates into how many dollars? Can you give me a dollar—

[Translation]

Mr. Stanley Péan: The ratio is usually about one to three.

[English]

Mr. Scott Simms: Okay, I'm going to open up the same line of questioning to artists in this particular area, because I'm very interested in this foreign market development. I think we underestimate the value. What we invested in the PromArt and Trade Routes programs really catapults us by eightfold or ninefold, as per the investment. Do you understand what I'm saying? A lot of people will say, "Why are you doing that? You should let the private sector promote your product abroad", which is similar to what happened in the United States. Well, they're having problems right now because perhaps they relied on the private sector too much, whereas in Europe it's the other way. It's totally the public sector. So we had this happy medium—if we can call it happy.

I'm just trying to find out how much is a \$1 investment from the federal government to take your product outside of this country...?

• (1720)

[Translation]

Mrs. Colette Brouillé: As far as we are concerned, the numbers are very much like the ones mentioned by Mr. Paré. As performance presenters, there is one thing that has not yet been mentioned, but should, in my opinion. As presenters, we know that hosting foreign presenters here allows for a lot of sharing among people with different kinds of professional expertise. That is very important, in terms of helping members of the profession to train and develop; professionals here in this country need an opportunity to talk and exchange views in their respective areas of expertise. At the Bourse RIDEAU, we provide training and bring in foreign professionals at the same time. Our primary relationship is with professionals, as opposed to artists. However, the Bourse RIDEAU does give artists access to foreign markets, because we host professionals. In terms of the leverage for artists on foreign markets—

[English]

Mr. Scott Simms: Okay, so it's the import as well. I understand.

[Translation]

Mrs. Colette Brouillé: —I prefer to let artists associations talk about specific numbers.

[English]

Mr. Scott Simms: Monsieur Blain, I have a quick question on the issue of training. I know you provided invaluable service to the training of individuals in that type of artistry, whether it's film, video, you name it. Let me paint a scenario for you very quickly. Where I come from, if someone wants to learn how to drive heavy equipment, they apply to either the province or the federal government to receive, under Human Resources, some investment in training. Do you receive that type of assistance as well, or in other words, what is the ratio? How much do you rely on Canadian Heritage for your aspect of training people?

Mr. Jacques Blain: It was 25% of our budget.

Mr. Scott Simms: Now, there was 75% that came from where?

Mr. Jacques Blain: From the private sector and the provincial government.

Mr. Scott Simms: For the provincial government, when it comes to human resources training, how much is that?

Mr. Jean Hamel: Is the question related to the budget of INIS or the budget of a private enterprise?

Mr. Scott Simms: I'm talking about INIS.

Mr. Jean Hamel: Then it's 25% from the provincial government, 25% from the federal government, and 50% roughly from the private sector.

Mr. Jacques Blain: At the beginning, when INIS was created, the deal was 50-50, public money and private money, to fund the organization.

[Translation]

Mrs. Colette Brouillé: The international component of the Bourse RIDEAU, the \$16,000 contribution from Canadian Heritage and Trade Routes, represents about 10 per cent of the budget.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you for that.

I skipped over Mr. Davies so I could give him the last question of the day.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your courtesy and kind indulgence. In that 15 minutes, I've gotten firmly up to speed on all heritage and culture issues in the country.

Mr. Angus has kindly left me some questions that he would like me to ask on his behalf. My first question will be directed to Mr. Hamel.

We are concerned about the loss of the Canada New Media Fund. We're interested in finding out what role that fund played in your organization and what impact the loss of this program might have on the future of your organization.

Could you elaborate on that first, please?

Mr. Jean Hamel: We were receiving about \$150,000 a year from this new media fund. In fact, there was an announcement today that the new media fund will be merged with the Canadian Television Fund, and we will not be able to have money from the new fund created by this merger because it will be allocated to the production of television shows and series. It will not fund other types of projects anymore. That means the \$900,000 we were receiving from the training program in film and video must be added now to the \$150,000 coming from the new media fund, so we've now reached a cut of over \$1 million.

• (1725)

Mr. Don Davies: My next question is to Madam Brouillé.

I understand you represent the largest organization of arts presenters in Quebec. Our notes indicate that you're very dependent on touring and international markets. What effect will the loss of the export touring funds have on your organization?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Colette Brouillé: The market which we organize allows us to provide programming to presenters in Quebec and Canada, and also to send artists abroad through the invitations we send out to foreign presenters. This year, we will run a deficit because the PromArt cuts were announced when it was already too late for us to change our plans. It was a grant of \$12,000. As regards the loss of both Trade Routes and PromArt, I can tell you that that money represents almost 50 per cent of the public funding for the international component of our programming, the other 50 per cent being provided by the Government of Quebec. So, that greatly compromises the existence of even the international component of the Bourse RIDEAU.

[*English*]

Mr. Don Davies: Monsieur Péan, speaking for book publishers, can you please tell us about the impacts you expect will be felt by your industry from losing programs that support the export of products? In particular, I understand that government has paid travel

costs for authors. What impact will any reduction in funding for that particular program have on building your domestic industry?

I apologize if you've covered that before, but I would like to hear your answers to those questions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stanley Péan: A little earlier, I was pointing out that, for a modest amount of money, these programs facilitate travel by writers—in the case of PromArt—concurrently with other provincial government programs. Publishers assume the financial risks of taking writers abroad, but will now have to find new sources of funding if they wish to continue to do so. Not every part of the industry has succeeded in achieving increased recognition for writers in recent years. However, those that have done it brilliantly. Are we prepared to sacrifice the future Gil Courtemanches, Yves Beauchemins or Gaétan Soucys? That is the question we must ask ourselves if we are no longer able to ensure international outreach and promotion of writers' work and the writers themselves abroad.

[*English*]

Mr. Don Davies: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

I thank our witnesses here today for coming and giving us their thoughts. I very much appreciate the effort you've put into this meeting today. Thank you for the questions, and thank you for the answers.

Mr. Simms.

Mr. Scott Simms: Mr. Chair, I'm putting in a notice of motion. Will that be all right for Wednesday's voting?

The Chair: It will be okay for Wednesday, yes.

Mr. Scott Simms: Okay. I just wanted to know.

Thank you, sir.

The Chair: The meeting is adjourned.

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

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

**Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante :
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

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

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