



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

CHPC



NUMBER 057



1st SESSION



41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Wednesday, March 20, 2013



Chair

The Honourable Rob Moore

Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

• (1530)

[English]

The Chair (Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC)): Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. Today, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), we are studying the expenditure plans for Canadian Heritage in 2012-13.

We have here with us once again the Honourable James Moore, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages.

Welcome to you, Minister.

We will turn the floor over to you now for your opening remarks.

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

Joining me is my deputy minister, Daniel Jean, and also Robert Hertzog.

It's Robert's birthday today, so happy birthday to him.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. James Moore: I know this is how he's always envisioned spending his birthday. It's safe to say his birthday will get better from here.

[Translation]

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you for inviting me to join you today and for giving me the opportunity to discuss arts and culture in Canada. Since we are on a tight schedule, I will be brief.

As I said earlier, I am accompanied by Daniel Jean, Deputy Minister, and Robert Hertzog, Director General of the Financial Management Branch at Canadian Heritage.

[English]

Tomorrow our government will table our budget. It's a budget that's focused on what we believe is most important to Canadians, which is creating jobs, growth, and long-term prosperity. It will support this while also returning us to a balanced budget by 2015.

We will build on what we have already delivered for arts and culture across Canada and the importance of arts and culture to the quality of life of all Canadians, and indeed to the Canadian economy.

This includes our choices to increase and then maintain funding through a period of fiscal restraint for the Canada Council for the

Arts. It includes renewing and locking in for five years all of our programs across the government that support arts and culture.

[Translation]

We passed strong and balanced copyright legislation that received praise from creators and consumers.

We have created two new national museums outside the National Capital Region—the Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21, in Halifax, and the Canadian Museum for Human Rights, in Winnipeg. We are in the process of creating a third museum—the Canadian Museum of History, here, in Ottawa.

[English]

The only thing I would like to say further on this, because I know this committee will have further discussions about our government's proposal to create a Canadian museum of history—again, just to underline what I've said in the past—is that I believe this is an issue. The Canadian museum of history should be treated like the Canadian Museum of Immigration, as well as the Canadian Museum for Human Rights in Winnipeg. It's an issue that in my view, frankly, should be beyond partisanship.

I look forward to the genuine input from the opposition on the legislation we've put forward to create that museum and their suggestions on how the mandate of the museum might be improved and tweaked. We think the celebration and support for an institution that is pan-Canadian in focus—to celebrate, educate, talk about, and continue the study of Canada's history—is a very important exercise. We should all be very proud of that as we head towards Canada's 150th birthday in 2017.

[Translation]

We have also doubled the annual indemnification limit—from \$1.5 billion to \$3 billion—to support our museums and art galleries across the country.

We have done all that while at the same time making the Department of Canadian Heritage leaner and simplifying the application process for Canadian arts organizations.

[English]

As a result of our efforts, I am proud to say that the arts in Canada are thriving. They're doing incredibly well.

Two weeks ago, as a matter of fact, at the Prime Time conference that was held in Ottawa by the Canadian Media Production Association, their report was tabled, entitled *Profile 2012: An Economic Report on the Screen-based Production Industry in Canada*. In that report they noted that Canada's film and television production sector grew by over half a billion dollars last year, from \$2.5 billion to \$3 billion, a 20% increase that resulted in the creation of almost 70,000 well-paid jobs across Canada.

The volume of Canadian theatrical productions rose by 14% last year—a 10-year high. Theatrical production is an industry now worth over a third of a billion dollars to our economy each and every year. Canadian television production rose over 21% from 2011. That's a 10-year high of \$2.58 billion. The Canadian documentary production in Canada also increased by 15%. It, too, is an industry with over a third of a billion dollars invested in Canada's economy: \$369 million. Canadian animation and production increased as well, by 47% in 2011, to \$208 million.

These numbers are the result of the efforts of Canadian creators combined with investments of our government, the private sector, and private philanthropy all coming together in support of Canada's creative economy. All told, with all of us working together, we have come an incredibly long way.

Sixty years ago in Canada this was not the case. For much of Canada's history, the creative economy was not understood and not supported by any level of government, and the results, quite frankly, were an embarrassment to this country.

• (1535)

[Translation]

In June 1951, the Massey Commission published one of the most significant reports on arts and culture in Canadian history. The report outlined how Canada's culture was crumbling and slipping into foreign hands.

One of the findings of the Massey Commission was that the only truly national publication in Canada was *Reader's Digest*, which was the sole magazine to reach households across the country. Of course, *Reader's Digest* consisted entirely of American content at that time.

[English]

Because of American dominance in the textbook industry, American textbooks filled Canadian classrooms. Canadian students of the day knew more about the 4th of July than about the 1st of July, more about George Washington and Abraham Lincoln than Sir John A. Macdonald, George Étienne Cartier, or George Brown. In fact, the largest collection of Canadian publications in the world were at the Library of Congress in Washington, the New York Public Library, and at Harvard University in Boston. The National Gallery of Canada at the time had a permanent staff of only four people. At the exact same time, at the Toledo Museum of Art in Ohio, they had 26 full-time staffers.

In 1948 there were over 1,800 original works of fiction published in Great Britain, over 1,000 published in the United States, and in Canada there were exactly 14.

[Translation]

We have come an incredibly long way when it comes to supporting our culture. Some fantastic opportunities lie ahead of us over the next few months, as we prepare to celebrate Canada's 150th anniversary in 2017.

The road to 2017 will allow us to tell Canada's stories to all Canadians. We should use Canada's 150th anniversary to stimulate our creative economy.

As my time here is brief, I will now turn it over to you for questions.

[English]

I do again want to thank the committee for inviting me to speak with you today. I think there's a great deal to be proud of in Canada's cultural communities—how far we have come since that Massey report, the great accomplishments that have been achieved by the creative sector in spite of incredibly difficult times, when we see larger and larger crowds coming out for festivals than ever before, and the philanthropic community stepping up and supporting things.

I think it's really important that this committee continue to do the great work it's done in the past, as we move forward to continue to support Canada's creative economy.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Minister, and thank you for your presentation.

Now we'll go to our time for questions and answers, and we'll start with Mr. Boughen.

Mr. Ray Boughen (Palliser, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

Minister, gentlemen, welcome to our committee meeting. Good of you to take time to share part of the afternoon with us.

Minister, you talked about the Canadian Museum of Civilization. I'm just wondering if you can share with us what's happened lately in terms of feedback from Canadians who have been through the museum and took the time to give your office a call.

Hon. James Moore: Sure. I appreciate the opportunity.

The Canadian Museum of Civilization, which will become the Canadian museum of history, is actually moving forward very well. Mark O'Neill, the president of the museum, and the board are now undertaking the hard work that it takes to build and to stand up this new museum that will be national in scope—not just as a great institution here in Ottawa, but one that has roots all across the country.

They've been going to cities across the country—I'm not sure if they have completed their entire tour yet—inviting Canadians to come in and participate in a dialogue about how Canadians.... Again, it's not my museum, it's not yours, it's not ours; it's the museum of Canadians. They've been going to Canadians and asking Canadians how they think Canadian history should best be told.

There are different ways, of course, to do that. If you look at different history museums around the country and around the world, you can take a chronological, thematic.... You can do thematic based on regions of the country, thematic based on different Canadian experiences, and so on. So they're having that discussion and dialogue with Canadians. They've been going around the country. The feedback has been great.

I know civilization.ca, which is the current website, has an online opportunity there for Canadians to engage. As part of this project, the Canadian museum of history is going to be.... They're signing MOUs with other history museums all around the country. I had the privilege, I believe it was just two weeks ago, to be in Victoria at the Royal BC Museum, where we signed the first MOU with another institution.

There were folks there. They had school kids there. The whole staff of the museum was there. They were enthusiastic about it, signing an MOU, which will open up to this museum the entire vault of the Canadian museum of history—over three million items, 90% of which are in storage right now—so that local museums across the country will have access to it and tell stories of Canada's history locally, not just here in Ottawa.

That's how we're going to bind this country together. There are three more museums that I can tell you we've signed MOUs with. We're going to be announcing them in the next couple of weeks in other regions of the country.

We're moving forward and it's going to be a great success. I hope that all parties will see this for what it is, which is an opportunity to build a pan-Canadian institution to talk about Canada's history.

•(1540)

Mr. Ray Boughen: Thank you, Minister.

Question number two: how can the federal government and the Department of Canadian Heritage play a role in increasing Canada's awareness of its history? You talked about what's happening down south. How can we pull this together in our country and put it on display?

Hon. James Moore: About 10 years ago, Jack Granatstein had his great book, *Who Killed Canadian History?* I told Jack I didn't agree with the title of his book, though I agreed with the thesis of it. The title of the book was wrong: Canadian history is not dead; it's alive and well. It's not who killed Canadian history, or who is challenging Canadian history. It's *what*, and what is challenging Canadian history is system-wide; it's all levels of government walking away from the importance of teaching and talking about Canada's history.

It's a sad but true fact that only four of Canada's thirteen provinces and territories require students to take a history class in order to graduate from high school—New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec, and Manitoba. Other provinces teach social studies, but it's not specifically history in the way it has been historically, which is a frustrating thing. I know you're a former teacher, and it's something that frustrates you as well.

There's only so much the federal government can do. One thing we can do is build this institution that I've just described. The other thing we can do is work together on areas where we have agreement

and can support funding for the celebration of events of large consequence. It was a national celebration, not a Quebec City celebration, to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the establishment of Quebec City. It's a national celebration next year to talk about the 100th anniversary of the beginning of the First World War. It was a national moment of recognition during Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee last year, and there are others to come in a few years.

We ought to seize those opportunities and talk about them. It's important for the government and all members of Parliament to understand that these things, in talking about the facts of Canada's history in an energetic way, have to be thoughtful, non-partisan, and responsible if they're going to be meaningful to Canadians. I think we'll come a long way towards filling the gaps that Jack Granatstein identified in his book.

•(1545)

Mr. Ray Boughen: Mr. Chair, how am I doing for time?

The Chair: You're doing great. You have two minutes left.

Mr. Ray Boughen: Two minutes? Okay.

Minister, as you know, the centennial of World War I is approaching, as well as other important dates and battles fought during World War II. Could you speak on the importance, to Canada and the world, of recognizing these crucial events?

Hon. James Moore: We'll be coming forward with a plan on that very soon. The way we've divided it up, as a government—I don't think this is a secret—is that I'm responsible for domestic celebrations within Canada and the Minister of Veterans Affairs is responsible for celebrations and commemorations that will happen in Europe for the First World War. That's how it's traditionally been done, and we'll continue that.

I think this country made a real mistake in the past by not taking advantage of the fact that our First World War veterans were alive, allowing them to tell their stories, to digitize their stories, and to have made a proactive effort on that.

We're now working with the legions all across the country, reaching out to veterans, and asking them to come forward and tell their stories. We've already put funding forward for this, and we've announced a second tranche of funding for the Korean War as well. We are digitizing these stories, housing them at the Canadian War Museum, and putting them online so students can have access to them. These are stories of gallantry in battle, of service and self-sacrifice. They might be stories about how they met the love of their life and came home after the war and had a new beginning. There are stories of sorrow, courage, pride, and fear. We're working with the legions, reaching out to Second World War veterans and asking them to come forward and tell us their stories so we can digitize them, make them available to the next generation, so that their stories will forever be protected in Canada.

We missed that opportunity with the First World War, but this is the centennial of the beginning of the war, and I don't think we should miss the opportunity to tell the stories of the First World War to Canadians. So we'll be doing that with a commemoration program that I think all members of Parliament will embrace as something that is meaningful and respectful to those who fought for Canada.

Mr. Ray Boughen: Am I over time?

The Chair: That's just about it.

Mr. Ray Boughen: Thanks, Chair.

The Chair: Next we will move to Mr. Nantel for seven minutes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Jean, Mr. Hertzog and Mr. Moore, thank you for accepting our invitation. Your visit is even more appreciated given that, normally, the members of this committee should have enough time to properly examine budgets and estimates. It's a good thing you are here to tell us about your goals. We have not yet seen the report on plans and priorities.

Don't you think it's a bit surprising that we are here even though we have not had an opportunity to study the estimates? Do you think it is acceptable that no report on plans and priorities has been submitted?

Hon. James Moore: This year's process is no different than it has been in past years.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: Nevertheless, we are voting somewhat blindly. We could have had until May 31 to look into this more closely.

Hon. James Moore: The committee decides how to do its work. You invited me; I am here today and ready to answer your questions.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: Very well. As I said, it is a good thing you are here.

My question is about the Council for the Arts.

If we look at the pages dedicated to the Council for the Arts, we see that \$1 million has been cut from the budget.

[*English*]

It's under "Grants and services to support creation, production and dissemination...." It's on page II-18.

[*Translation*]

Clearly, that is a considerable loss of funds, but we're even more concerned about maintaining the \$25-million contribution from Canadian Heritage.

Hon. James Moore: Yes, the contribution will be maintained.

The Deputy Minister is telling me that the \$1-million amount was part of the Roadmap for Canada's Linguistic Duality. That initiative is ending in March 2013. As I said during the last hour in the House of Commons, we will renew the roadmap. As for the previous \$1-million investment, that will be part of the new roadmap, which we will introduce very soon.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: Will the Council for the Arts' total budget be maintained at \$181 million?

Hon. James Moore: Yes. That was one of my goals when, last year, we began the long process to find ways to save money within the government. The first thing I told my employees and my team—and I can now talk about this openly—was that I wanted to fully protect the investments in the Canada Council for the Arts.

I am sure you have heard the same statements I have. As the Auditor General has said in the past, the Canada Council for the Arts is an organization that does a good job and is respected by artists across the country. The council meets artists' expectations effectively and responsibly. We will certainly protect the investments in the Council for the Arts.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: Thank you.

I would like to talk to you about two organizations that have had a tough year. In budget 2012, you eliminated the Arts, Culture and Diversity Program, which allocated funds to the Canadian Conference of the Arts and the Coalition for Cultural Diversity.

Canada and Quebec have been true leaders in terms of the UNESCO cultural diversity convention, but your government is now cutting the lifelines of those two organizations that play a key role—especially the Coalition for Cultural Diversity.

Are we to conclude that, in your opinion, protecting cultural diversity is no longer a priority for the federal government?

Hon. James Moore: That is always an obligation—a responsibility. We take pride in protecting our artists' interests, not only through our investments in culture—as part of our programs—but also through our policies, which will always be headed in that direction. That approach applies to our investments in the Canada Council for the Arts.

Some of the programs you mentioned were short-term projects, which are now finished. The Canadian Conference of the Arts had almost 800 member organizations at the time. The maintenance of that umbrella body is in its members' hands. We want to invest in culture and not in organizations that, frankly, have done virtually nothing over the past few years.

● (1550)

[*English*]

I can tell you, when we announced that we were ending funding for the Canadian Conference of the Arts, the protestations were virtually non-existent. Many cultural organizations realized that was an organization that over the years had become incredibly stale, to the point where.... I don't think there was a more high-profile or important debate we had in this Parliament, in a respectful way—our party disagreed on some of the elements, we agreed on others—than on copyright legislation. It is a critical issue for artists in this country, and the Canadian Conference of the Arts didn't take a position. What kind of arts advocacy organization doesn't actually take a position on the most important arts legislation to come before Parliament in a decade? But they didn't.

I can tell you, when we ended funding for the Canadian Conference of the Arts we didn't create a vacuum. There are other organizations that stepped up. You've met with them, and I've met with them as well. The Canadian Arts Coalition stepped up. They're a great organization that's actually pan-Canadian and has advocated for specific things, and we've worked with them very well.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Nantel: Clearly, you are very adamant in saying that this organization has done nothing over the past few years, and I think that's really too bad. To my knowledge, the organization has produced documents that objected to several aspects of Bill C-11 and voiced the opinion of 80 organizations from across the country, including 50 organizations from Quebec—or actually almost 30. However, we are not here to talk about that. We are here to talk about the figures.

As you know, the Trade Routes program—which had a \$9-million budget—was abolished in 2008, as was the PromArt program. The latter initiative helped artists with their tours by promoting them on an international stage in order to help them break into new markets. In 2008, Canadian embassies stopped organizing events to promote our artists abroad and demonstrate their talents.

Why has Canadian Heritage not proposed new programs since to showcase art and culture abroad and to promote our economic and cultural activities on the international stage?

Hon. James Moore: That's not the case. You talked about two programs. That decision was made by the former minister six years ago. Since the decision is quite old, we will not be renewing those programs.

However, it's not at all true that Canadian Heritage is not helping Canadian artists on the international scene. Canadian Heritage now has 21 programs for helping our artists on the international stage. We also have other ways to help them. The Canada Council for the Arts has a considerable budget.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: That's actually the problem. Since those two programs were abolished, the Council for the Arts has had to cut down its own financing systems for creation to facilitate distribution abroad.

Hon. James Moore: That's the best way to proceed, since the Canada Council for the Arts really understands artists' needs better. It's an organization by the artists for the artists. The council representatives understand that, and we are working with them on that endeavour. I also want to point out that our embassies around the world still have budgets set aside for supporting our artists when they come to visit.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: That's not what we've been hearing. Be that as it may, it makes no sense that the budget of the Council for the Arts has remained the same, while that organization has been given additional responsibilities.

[English]

Hon. James Moore: I would just say that the Canada Council for the Arts is happy to be doing this work. I talked to Simon Brault and to the board there, and they are actually quite happy to take on this work.

The idea that the Canada Council for the Arts, which under our government has had a 20% increase in funding, should stay static and not move their funding around to meet the needs of artists is opposite of the reason you would create a crown corporation independent of the government to work to the best interests of the artist.

The Canada Council for the Arts has a budget, we have increased it by 20%, and they're moving their financing around to go in the best ways to help artists. They've decided now that one of the things they want to do is this, to help artists on the international stage. That's their job; that's a good thing. They're working at arm's length, and we applaud—

Mr. Pierre Nantel: They did their job, but they need more.

The Chair: Mr. Nantel, you are way over your time now.

Mr. Simms.

Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.): Thank you, Chair. It's good to see you again, sir.

You said earlier, and I'm paraphrasing a little bit, that it's a mistake to forget our collective history. You were talking about it in regard to the new museum.

I understand that. We do not currently have a museum of that stature. The problem is this. When you start using words like “digitization” or “collecting the works of our history”, there is a group of people out there.... You mentioned one group that didn't protest too much. One group that did protest a lot was Library and Archives Canada. They're not happy. I would never think to tick off a librarian to the point that they keep writing me to the nth degree, but they are very good at it.

One of the programs was a great little program—it worked in my riding, it worked in hundreds of ridings—called the national archival development program, or NADP. It allowed small communities to digitize and to archive their collective history.

If you want to see collective histories, sir, I don't think cutting programs such as this is the way to go. It seems to be that now you have a centralized version of history that can only be done by the people who can afford it outside of government help.

I know the budget is tomorrow. It's always a little awkward to talk about estimates before we actually get our budget, but having said that, the Library and Archives Canada has a pretty good beef about this program and the ILL they use.

Would you not agree? Is there something for them?

• (1555)

Hon. James Moore: I'm sorry, are you asking whether there is something tomorrow? Is that what you are asking?

Mr. Scott Simms: Yes. I know I have one more sleep, as the saying goes.

Hon. James Moore: Yes, exactly.

As I've said in the past in the House in some different contexts, we were elected as a government asking Canadians to trust us with a majority government and saying that we would arrive at a balanced budget without raising taxes and without cutting health care. That means that we have some difficult choices to make.

I have to tell you that this was a difficult choice. I'm not going to pretend it wasn't. When we worked with Daniel Caron and Library and Archives Canada and asked them to put together proposals to reduce their spending by between 5% and 10% and to come up with the programs that are the least efficient and the least effective in their eyes, based on their own self-assessment, this is what they arrived at as the program that was the least effective. It doesn't mean that in the future there won't be a reallocation of resources to try to backfill some of the lost opportunities you described.

Mr. Scott Simms: I look forward to the backfill, but the one thing I can say about people involved with Library and Archives Canada....

In question period, you suggested that the respective critics should bring Mr. Caron in to this committee to speak to us. If you're talking about a shift, then let's talk to the experts who know how to do this. If I were to move a motion to have Mr. Caron and others come in to talk about the situation that we currently see ourselves in with Library and Archives Canada, would you recommend to the whole committee that they come in?

Hon. James Moore: I believe Mr. Calandra, my parliamentary secretary, has spoken with Mr. Nantel to that exact effect, about having a motion before the committee. That was yesterday in question period, with regard to the issue of the code of conduct that has been in the news in the last few days.

But absolutely I would. Library and Archives Canada, like the CBC, like our national museums, operates at arm's length. I don't involve myself in their day-to-day decisions. If you have questions, that's the job of Parliament—of all of us. We vote on the budgets; we vote on the mandates and the law.

Mr. Scott Simms: But I did ask for them to come before us and it was voted down.

Hon. James Moore: Library and Archives has their mandate and they have their budget. If they are making decisions on either the code of conduct question or the allocation question, and if you want to ask them about how they backfill and go forward with the existing budgets and whether they can do it, if you think that's a priority, then that's exactly what parliamentary committees are for: to bring in the heads of agencies who are making decisions at arm's length from me—the law prevents me from telling them what to do and what not to do—and that's precisely what I would encourage you to do.

If you put that motion before the committee, I think you would have a favourable outcome.

Mr. Scott Simms: Do you find that the mechanism we currently have for granting is transparent enough? Do you think there should be greater transparency concerning some of the groups that get the money?

Hon. James Moore: The outcomes are very transparent. We publish a list. If you go to the Department of Canadian Heritage, it's down to a dime—everything that every organizations gets.

The reporting the Canada Council for the Arts does is exhaustive. The Auditor General looked at the Canada Council and came back saying that if every Government of Canada organization were run as efficiently as the Canada Council, she wouldn't have a job. It was Sheila Fraser who said that.

So I think it's done quite well.

One thing that I suppose has frustrated me a little bit, and this wasn't his point, is that very often with cultural funding there's an expectation that because you received \$5,000 for your Canada Day celebration, or for your Festival du Bois in my riding, for example—they get \$5,000 a year for some staging, equipment, some fencing, some lights and all that, and sheet cake for the kids and whatever, to add a little something to it. Because they received it one year, there is an expectation that they should get it in perpetuity.

The problem with that, of course, is that there are all kinds of very entrepreneurial cultural people out there who wish to have access to funding for the first time and often can't get it because we have funding organizations, sometimes like the Canada Council, who are afraid to upset incumbents who are currently getting money. I think there needs to be a little more accountability and flexibility and openness.

• (1600)

Mr. Scott Simms: Some might say that for some of the numbers of the agencies you fund directly through the department, there is not a transparent process. I'm assuming you disagree with that, but why would—

Hon. James Moore: “Some say”? I don't know who's saying that, and if they want to say that and make an argument, I'd be glad to hear it.

Mr. Scott Simms: These are the festivals, maybe, and all those sorts of things.

Is there any way you feel you can improve the process of transparency within your own department when it comes to festivals, if certain festivals don't get their funding?

Hon. James Moore: We're pretty up front.

I can give you an example. There are two communities in British Columbia that are celebrating their centennial years this year....

I extend this to any member of Parliament. I say this often.

Many communities, as you know, especially municipalities that are very small, or organizations....

As you know, Scott, there are many organizations in this country that are volunteer-led. These are not people who are professional politicians at getting government funding and support; they don't have a bunch of lawyers and accountants and actuaries who can go in and get all this stuff. They are working on a volunteer basis, and sometimes the applications can be too cumbersome and a hassle.

What I often tell organizations, especially those who are applying for funding for the first time, is to call my office. We'll sit them down with the Department of Canadian Heritage staffer in the regions, because we have offices all across the country.

They sit down with staffers at Canadian Heritage and say: “Here’s what we have in mind for our festival. How do we put together our festival in a way that will be successful for applications?”—not “How do we apply?” and then be turned down, and then “Omigod, it’s the eleventh hour; we can’t have our festival this year.” Start it the other way around: what does one have to do to qualify for funding?

Design your festival that way, and then you have a successful outcome. We’ve had great success with that all across the country with organizations. That’s what we do to try to get rid of any mystery there might be between the department and organizations seeking funding, because that’s not how it’s supposed to be: we don’t want to have a tall wall that’s impossible for small organizations to scale.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Simms.

Next we will move to Mr. Hillyer for seven minutes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jim Hillyer (Lethbridge, CPC): I want to thank the minister for joining us.

I will talk about heritage, as a general concept, and about history, more specifically.

[*English*]

You’ve talked about the importance of history and of making Canadians in general more aware of their history. You talked about the fact that there are several provinces in which history is not a required course; it’s squeezed into their social studies.

I come from pretty conservative country where everyone wants to know the practical reasons for doing things when it comes to time and resources and money. You’ve talked in this committee before about how investing in the arts and in culture in general will actually have an economic spinoff. But not even focusing on that, can you address how we’re going to help Canadians increase their awareness of history and why that is so important?

Canadians, a lot of us, think our history started in 1867. We have a really rich and fascinating history since then, and also before then, but who cares? Why would we want to spend time and energy on that?

Hon. James Moore: As you said, our pre-Confederation history and the importance of it were the reason we supported so robustly the 400th anniversary of the founding of Quebec City. It’s why we’re very proud of our commemorations of the bicentennial of the War of 1812. The War of 1812 was the most important thing, pre-Confederation, that led to the confederation of Canada in 1867. Without the War of 1812, you don’t have the protection of aboriginal peoples. Aboriginal Canadians would have had much the same future as American Indians did. There is the protection of the French fact in North America, and the defining of our territorial boundary and integrity with the United States. It also paved the way to Confederation in 1867, with the conferences in Quebec City and Charlottetown in 1864. It was the most important event that happened prior to Confederation itself.

So you’re right. But to answer your bigger question, I always phrase it this way: Canada is the second-largest country in the world, but in terms of population we’re the 34th-largest country in the world. A great number of things can be said about this country. The

most impressive thing is that in spite of extraordinary differences of east and west, north and south, Protestant and Catholic, francophone and anglophone, and aboriginal and non-aboriginal, this is a country in which, with extraordinary tensions east and west all over this country, we have been able to not only endure and stay united, but to thrive in a way that few other countries in the world have. It’s a remarkable achievement by all Canadians that we’ve been able to do that over the years.

It’s a very impressive story, and I think Canadians should know more about it. We should have institutions like the Canadian museum of history that talk about that. And by the way, it should wrestle with not just the great and glorious and wonderful stories, but also with some of the more challenging questions of our time: Japanese internment, the Chinese head tax, the treatment of aboriginal peoples in our residential schools. We’ve had some very challenging parts of our history, issues we should not be afraid to discuss and debate. The War Museum does it already in some ways. The Canadian Museum for Human Rights will do it as well.

Canada’s history is a story of really impressive achievements in the face of extraordinary odds. These are the things we want to highlight and talk about and celebrate in a non-partisan way as we head towards 2017.

Again, I hope that all political parties will take me up on it when I say sincerely that this is really what we’re trying to do. It’s really what we want to accomplish. That’s why we put people on the board of the new Canadian museum of history who are not Conservatives. Richard Gwyn is on the board. He’s a columnist with the *Toronto Star* who is very thoughtful and smart, an intelligent man. He is Pierre Trudeau’s biographer. He also wrote the biography of John A. Macdonald. He’s a very thoughtful guy. We put him on the board as well because of his expertise in Canadian history.

I hope all parties will see the merit of this effort and support the legislation when it comes before this committee.

• (1605)

Mr. Jim Hillyer: Thank you.

The more I study Canadian history, the more I feel that if we had a better understanding of it, a lot of our problems and issues of unity and the conflicts amongst the various founding peoples and the new immigrants who are coming in would be resolved, because we would have a deeper understanding of how we got to this point and recognize those achievements.

Now I’m going to go a little bit broader and go beyond history to talk about heritage itself. I actually put heritage as my number one pick for which committee I would like to be on. A lot of people wonder why. We talk about how important the economy is. It is our government’s number one priority, and I think it should be, but the fact that Canada is leading the world right now economically is not really what defines Canada. It’s our heritage that defines Canada.

We’re talking about millions and millions of dollars. What does heritage have to do...? If economy is our priority, why are we spending money on heritage in general and not just on the history part of it?

Hon. James Moore: Well, it's a falsehood, and I say this as some of you have been to my movie nights as well. We've had nine movie nights on Parliament Hill and three music nights. We have another movie night in April. You'll hear me again beating this drum and telling these numbers, that anybody you encounter who suggests that arts and culture isn't central to the Canadian economy is someone who doesn't get it.

Arts and culture represents \$46 billion in the Canadian economy, over 640,000 jobs. It's three times the size of Canada's insurance industry. It's twice the size of Canada's forest industry. It's a massive generator of economic growth and activity in all regions of this country. So it is part of the economy.

Second, you're right. I too am passionate about Canadian history. I'm passionate about Canada. When you have those great moments like we had in Vancouver—we had the privilege of hosting the 2010 Olympics, and we had these great moments of celebration across the country. It's something that I think has been lacking in our country's history for a long time, which is to have great moments of celebration and recognition of Canadian achievement. We have a lot to be proud of as we head toward our 150th birthday.

The Chair: Mr. Cash, for five minutes.

Mr. Andrew Cash (Davenport, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Minister, for being here, and Mr. Jean and Mr. Hertzog.

I'm just going to take a minute here and address a recommendation from you, Minister, that you made in the House during question period on Monday and that you referred to once again a few minutes ago.

I'd like to give notice of the following motion: that the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage undertake a comprehensive study of the recent changes at Library and Archives Canada, including the introduction of a code of conduct, and invite relevant witnesses, including Daniel Caron, as well as representatives from library, archivist, and archaeological associations.

Based on your comments, I hope that your parliamentary secretary and the rest of the Conservative members on the committee will support the motion, and I look forward to that happening. Perhaps we could get unanimous consent now and move on. If not—

• (1610)

Mr. Paul Calandra (Oak Ridges—Markham, CPC): A motion to move in camera.

The Chair: There's a motion to move in camera.

Mr. Andrew Cash: Don't I have the floor? Can he move a motion while I have the floor, Chair?

The Chair: Yes, there's a motion to move in camera.

Mr. Andrew Cash: But don't I have the floor?

The Chair: He just moved a motion.

Mr. Andrew Cash: To go in camera.

The Chair: That's right. You said you were introducing a motion, but we're not debating it.

Mr. Calandra has a motion to move in camera.

We will take a little break while we move in camera.

[Proceedings continue in camera]

• (1610)

(Pause)

• (1610)

[Public proceedings resume]

The Chair: When we left off, Mr. Cash had about four minutes left.

Mr. Cash.

• (1615)

Mr. Andrew Cash: I wanted to get into the issue of the reality of how artists make a living in Canada and the sense we have that your government doesn't understand the way artists make a living in this country.

One of the reasons we feel this way is that when your government slashed the budget for StatsCan, it was forced to abolish its culture division and its programs to understand arts and culture in Canada.

The music industry is one that I know well. It's close to my heart. Based on a recent Canadian Independent Music Association report, they pegged the average annual income for musicians in Canada at \$7,228. That's the reality for many people in the music sector.

But in the independent music sector, for every dollar the government spends on support, they get back about a 22% return on investment. For every dollar that federal and provincial governments put into the independent music sector, they get \$1.22. An amount of \$76 million was invested from combined provincial and federal sources, and an amount of \$93 million was received in revenue in 2011.

I just want to give a couple of other quick little facts. The reason I'm doing this is that we need to track these things.

In 2011 the total direct impact on GDP from all the culture and arts sector.... Well, we know that the number for 2007 for the sector in totality, with the spinoffs, was \$84 billion. In 2011 the direct impact on GDP was about \$46 billion.

Some of these numbers are from the Canadian Independent Music Association and some are from the Conference Board of Canada.

The question is this. You've mapped out a lot of ways in which the government works in the arts and culture space, but isn't it time to invest in departmental measures to help government understand how artists make a living in this country?

Hon. James Moore: I agree, and we are—and we've increased that funding.

You mentioned at the beginning of your statement, or question, or what that was, that our government has ended cultural collection of data through Stats Canada. That's factually not true. We've actually taken money from our department, \$500,000 of internal administrative costs, and we've continued to collect that data.

So there's actually no gap that you're describing. As a matter of fact, we've increased the data collection to achieve exactly what you've described.

It is important, as you've said. We talk as a government about the importance of culture not just for its own sake and for the sake of quality of life, community living, and all these things; it also is incredibly important for the economy. That's why you do have to know where artists are getting their money from, as you've said. That is an important thing to keep track of.

• (1620)

Mr. Andrew Cash: Minister, there's been a lot of talk about how seasonal workers are affected by cuts to EI, but there's been very little talk about the effect of those cuts on the arts and culture sector.

The Directors Guild of Canada said that they are concerned that:

...new regulations may force some members, whose use of employment insurance benefits places them in the "Frequent Claimant" category, out of the screen-based industry.

I'm wondering, were you consulted by the minister on how changes to EI would affect artists? And did Heritage provide any impact notes on EI reforms and how they would affect artists?

The Chair: Mr. Cash, your time is up, but we'll allow just a quick response from the minister.

Hon. James Moore: Certainly, the reforms that Minister Finley has put in place are widespread. The whole goal of them, of course, is to make sure that Canadians have EI when and where they need it across the country regardless of the nature of their employment. But if you have a specific question—and it sounds like a reasonable one—about how the EI reforms are impacting Canada's cultural communities across the country, you're free to invite the minister here to describe those reforms in detail, and how they impact the cultural community.

Don't forget, when we make changes to policy with regard to Employment Insurance, for example, it's not just a budgetary measure. These also can be amended and tweaked over time through regulation. If there are particular regulations that could be implemented that would have beneficial outcomes to the overall goal of our government, which is to have a healthy and strong EI system when and where Canadians need it, I know that Minister Finley is a very reasonable person who would be more than open to hearing those suggestions if they're coming from a place of sincerity.

The Chair: Mr. Richards, for five minutes.

Mr. Blake Richards (Wild Rose, CPC): Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Thanks for being here, Minister.

I have a few questions. Hopefully I'll get time for them all.

I think it was Mr. Boughen who was asking about the upcoming centennial of World War I, and you mentioned in response the efforts being made to digitize the stories of the Second World War veterans, and now the Korean War veterans. That's something that I believe very strongly in. Three years ago I had an opportunity to take my son, when he was 14, and one of his friends over to tour some of the battlefields that Canadians have fought on and to see Juno Beach, where so many Canadians laid down their lives for our freedoms. The impact that had on my son, at 14 years of age, to see those battlefields and to see those beaches.... I think it's something that all young Canadians should have some ability to experience. One of those ways is through those stories. Certainly, our generation had the opportunity, whether it be the fathers or grandfathers, to hear first-

hand those accounts, those stories of the sacrifices that were made on our behalf.

I want to just ask a little more. I had a chance to participate and bring the memory project to my riding and to visit with a lot of my World War II veterans. There were a lot of great stories that were shared and are going to be very well preserved for future generations to be able to have that understanding. I know the World War II project was in partnership with the Historica-Dominion Institute. I assume the Korean project is as well.

Can you give us a little more information on that project, how it's proceeding, and what we, as members of Parliament, can do to help and support it?

Hon. James Moore: It's modelled in very much the same way. Anybody who's curious about it should go to the Historica-Dominion Institute, which is managing the memory project. We'll follow the same procedure, because we found that it was very successful as well.

We fly to and from Ottawa a lot—you're from western Canada—so we accumulate a lot of Aeroplan points. Over the years I've taken it upon myself, on my own self-guided trips, to go to Commonwealth grave sites in all different parts of the world. On my desk I have sand from all five D-Day beaches. Of course, Juno is prominent. And then I have rocks from the beaches of Dieppe. I have sand from the beaches of Anzio. And I have a rock from the train bed of Auschwitz as well, from a different tour I did of 16 different Holocaust camps.

It's very important to understand World Wars I and II, what they were about, why they fought, what was sacrificed, what was to be learned from those battles as well. I've had the privilege to go and visit all these different sites and learn those lessons and see those museums and talk to veterans.

One of the great things the Canadian War Museum does here in Ottawa is that when you go in there, typically the first person you'll meet is a veteran—all volunteers. I did a tour of the Diefenbunker a month ago or so. You go in there and there are veterans just waiting to volunteer to tell their stories. After a life of public service in the most noble way possible, they give back and they volunteer again at our museums to tell our kids stories. It's an impressive thing.

So anything that we can do to make it easier for them to tell their stories, not just to those like me, who have the privilege to go and visit all these museums, but to generations of kids to come, and digitize their stories and have them online at the national Canadian museum of history or at the national War Museum, so that kids can hear in the correct tone and voice and the chosen language how people describe their experiences.... It's incredibly impactful. That's what we're trying to achieve with the Second World War project and the memory project's extension for the Korean War. It's really important.

• (1625)

Mr. Blake Richards: Well, I thank you, Minister. That's a very important thing that future generations have—an ability to share in those stories. I thank you for your efforts in doing that.

I'm going to turn the rest of my time over to Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Thank you, Mr. Richards and Mr. Chair.

In light of the brief but very fruitful discussion with colleagues, I seek unanimous consent to move the following motion: that the committee invite the president of Library and Archives Canada to appear before the committee and inform the members of his vision and the future mandate of Library and Archives Canada.

The Chair: Mr. Calandra is asking for unanimous consent. Do you want to repeat that?

Mr. Paul Calandra: I move that the committee invite the president of Library and Archives Canada to appear before the committee and inform the members of his vision of the future and mandate of Library and Archives Canada.

The Chair: There was already notice of that motion, so we can deal with it. Is there unanimous consent?

Is that the same motion that was already distributed, Mr. Calandra? Regardless, if there's unanimous consent, the motion can pass. Is there unanimous consent for the motion, Mr. Simms?

Mr. Nantel wants to move an amendment.

Mr. Scott Simms: I would like to move an amendment as well. That was the point of my interjection. I'm not sure at what point you want to do this. Can we do it at this point?

The Chair: Mr. Calandra, you're asking for unanimous consent for the motion. Is there unanimous consent for the motion?

We're not in camera now.

Mr. Scott Simms: Can I move to go in camera?

The Chair: You can move to go in camera.

Mr. Simms has asked that we move in camera. Those in favour?

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Scott Simms: I just want to see if I can do it.

The Chair: We have the minister here. The meeting is going to be over in 30 seconds anyway, but Mr. Simms has asked that we go in camera.

Mr. Scott Simms: If he moves for unanimous consent, am I able to move to go in camera at that point? That's my question.

The Chair: Well, he will already have had unanimous consent for his motion.

Mr. Scott Simms: No, he didn't get it.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: I have a point of information.

I think the idea is that we are asking for unanimous consent to discuss the motion.

The Chair: Right. Mr. Calandra has asked for unanimous consent, so I'm going to ask if there is unanimous consent for his motion.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: You mean for his motion as it is? No.

The Chair: There is not unanimous consent.

Minister, thank you for coming here for the hour. We appreciate your taking the time to answer our questions, and we appreciate the

information you gave us. We look forward to your return visit at some point in the future.

We'll allow the minister to leave, and then we have a few procedural votes to deal with. We'll suspend.

• (1625)

(Pause)

• (1630)

The Chair: As is the practice, you all have a number of votes in front of you. It's voting on the main estimates 2013-14. I'll quickly go through these, one by one, asking if the vote will carry. This way, I can report back to the House that we've looked at it. If we don't vote on the estimates, they will be deemed reported back unamended anyway. Normally we would want to vote on them. Usually this takes about 30 seconds.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: We feel strongly that

[*Translation*]

we need more time to study the issue further before we can vote. So we are asking for some additional time.

[*English*]

The Chair: Well, we only have until 4:30. How much time do you want to have?

Mr. Pierre Nantel: To the next meeting.

The Chair: Okay. We can still vote, though. Do we want to wait on the vote until the next meeting or do we want to just proceed with the vote? It's up to the committee. I need some direction from the committee.

Mr. Paul Calandra: I move that we proceed.

The Chair: Who is in favour of moving to proceed with the vote? Who is opposed?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Okay. We will proceed with the vote.

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Department

Vote 1—Operating expenditures.....\$162,928,160

Vote 5—Grants and contributions.....\$1,131,552,460

Canada Council for the Arts

Vote 10—Payments to the Canada Council for the Arts under section 18 of the Canada Council for the Arts Act, to be used for the furtherance of the objects set out in section 8 of that Act.....\$180,260,816

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

Vote 15—Operating expenditures.....\$956,913,060

Vote 20—Working capital.....\$4,000,000

Vote 25—Capital expenditures.....\$103,856,000

Canadian Museum for Human Rights

Vote 30—Operating and capital expenditures.....\$31,700,000

Canadian Museum of Civilization

Vote 35—Operating and capital expenditures.....\$57,418,730

Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21

Vote 40—Operating and capital expenditures.....\$18,450,000

Canadian Museum of Nature

Vote 45—Operating and capital expenditures.....\$25,834,904

Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission

Vote 50—Program expenditures.....\$4,403,550
 Library and Archives of Canada
 Vote 55—Operating expenditures.....\$85,212,191
 Vote 60—Capital expenditures.....\$2,956,827
 National Arts Centre Corporation
 Vote 65—Operating expenditures.....\$33,796,174
 National Battlefields Commission
 Vote 70—Program expenditures.....\$6,417,451
 National Film Board
 Vote 75—Program expenditures.....\$62,890,037
 National Gallery of Canada
 Vote 80—Operating and capital expenditures.....\$35,426,120
 Vote 85—The acquisition of objects for the Collection and other costs attributable
 to this activity.....\$8,000,000
 National Museum of Science and Technology

Vote 90—Operating and capital expenditures.....\$26,491,340
 Telefilm Canada
 Vote 115—Payments to Telefilm Canada to be used for the purposes set out in the
 Telefilm Canada Act.....\$99,622,354

 (Votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 70, 75,
 80, 85, 90, and 115 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall I report the main estimates to the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Chair: Okay. I will report the main estimates to the House.

The meeting is adjourned.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

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